

About intentions and focus of the document:

*The document is a collection of TH Huxley's ethnological work and anatomical work specifically, including his values and work related to race and race science. I highly recommend reading each source in its entirety, if you can!

This research document started when I was a candidate for the student senator position. I noticed that the only BSO demand that addressed the College of the Environment demanded a Huxley name change. Because I was uninformed, I grew curious: "What did Huxley do, say, or teach that was so harmful to people of color that the Black Student Organization is *demanding* a Huxley college name change?" This is the question I had moving forward with this research. I aimed to create a document of scholarly journals, scholarly articles, books, etc that discussed his harmful values and work, to best educate myself and others *why* Black students are *demanding* a name change. Thomas Huxley's significant marine biology and zoology works are frequently cited on various websites and discussed at length, but his ethnological and race science anatomical values and works are not discussed as frequently, unless in the field of anthropological studies.

I used Google Scholar and the WWU Libraries' access to databases like JSTOR, EBSCO, etc. to find sources about Huxley's contributions to ethnology, race science, and anatomical conclusions.

After I found and went through the amazing "Huxley File" source of most of Huxley's written works or written works related to Huxley on mathcs.clarks.edu, I searched the terms "Thomas Huxley" and "race" in Google Scholar and WWU Library databases in order to answer my initial inquiries about how his values and works harmed those of marginalized identities.

BSO Demands:

<https://wp.wvu.edu/facultysenatepresident/2020/06/22/statement-from-black-student-organizations-2/>

Summary of the document

Even though Thomas Huxley made significant contributions in the field of biology, he also had significant contributions to scientific racism.

He was a polygenist: someone who is of the belief that all races evolved from different origins instead of coming from one hominid. This is not only scientifically disproven, but also a racist mindset, and an argument that one of his "archrivals" at the time called Richard Owen attempted to refute with evidence that we all are the same species that evolved from the same hominid thousands of years ago. Huxley won the argument, and it is historian Nicolaas Rupke's thesis that this argument between Huxley and Owen in which Huxley's "deeply racist, polygenist viewpoint" won lead to building the scientific racism of the early 20th century.

Huxley was also an ethnologist, aka social anthropologist, but like most 19th- early 20th century anthropologists, his work was damaging to marginalized communities. He believed anthropology and the study of other cultures and races was a form of zoology and that factoring things like culture, language, customs, etc into social anthropology meant nothing about a race's category or evolution. Instead, he believed race should be entirely based on anatomical features and geographical locations. Therefore, he classified people worldwide into 9 categories of races entirely based on anatomical features and geographical location.

He also believed there are "higher and lower races" which were either primitive or civilized, which permeates his work. This came to be known as "Huxley's Rule" (watch Nicolaas Rupke's lecture about this on Youtube!) which argues that Black people are closer anatomically to apes than they are to White people, therefore there is a meaningful difference between White men and Black men.

He believed lower races such as the "Mongoloids" could be "improved into equality" or something like it, but only with the help of the higher white European races. He thought abolition was favorable because slavery didn't look good for white men and would benefit the master more than the freed man.

(All of this information can be found in this research document, with links to the pieces and quotes that reflect his "progressive assimilationist" racist values by Huxley himself)

Page 177 of the book "Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races 1800-1930" summarizes Huxley's harm:

"Viewed through the lens of Huxley's "ethical process," "civilization" means nothing more nor less than "curbing the instincts of savagery" or just curbing "savagery." The savage within... -must be tamed, repressed. But so must the savage without. In the external struggle between societies, civilization is virtually identical to imperialism, because both entail the conquest and domestication of savages. In his 1888 essay "The Struggle for Existence in Human Society," Huxley writes: "the course shaped by the ethical man -the member of society or citizen -necessarily runs counter to that which the non-ethical man -the primitive savage, or man as a mere member of the animal kingdom -tends to adopt. The latter fights out the struggle for existence to the bitter end, like any other animal; the former devotes his best energies to the

object of setting limits to the struggle" (9:203). Once again, as in most extinction discourse, savages turn out to be self-extminating "to the bitter end."

Non Article Sources!

Observing Human Difference: James Hunt, Thomas Huxley and Competing Disciplinary Strategies in the 1860s by Efram Sera-Shriar:

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00033790.2012.713511?casa_token=AKgezK-PnXUAAAAA%3AdRuSUcv6wEdWI3M8LBIXRawDbxZ0fGFbgkZMktD6x5gRn2R7aL2A_WWIIBUzveN_rWEBe6KLVE9rLA

PDF:

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00033790.2012.713511?casa_token=apW8V3aM0sQAAAAA:0ZN5pyUWOW-Qj2qQMrr4_lfmMa0uZcQMgaVIPzEew2OIkTZSlp7-ltxGgnIEIK1e60Ggtt9mRIgPwg

Note: Ethnology is social anthropology, by today's standards but modern day anthropologists note that in Huxley's time, anthropology was highly damaging because it built up modern day's stigmas and systems that are discriminatory.

Huxley's strategy for reforming most natural sciences followed a similar process. First, he would introduce Darwinian evolutionary theory into the discipline.³⁰ This was fairly straight-forward for ethnology because many of its practitioners already argued in favour of common descent, and topics relating to species and varieties were at the forefront of ethnological discussions.³¹ The next step for Huxley was to attempt to make the science ideologically neutral and separating it from both religious and political debates.³² It was a highly effective strategy for achieving an influential social status, because Huxley and the other scientific naturalists such as John Tyndall (1820-1893) could emphasise the important and impartial perspective the sciences had on a broad range of issues.³³ The third step for Huxley was to villainize researchers in the discipline who did not adopt an evolutionary stance and scientific-neutrality. This was a strategy that Hunt and Huxley shared. Both targeted established scholars who clung to older ideologies, which they viewed as outdated.

One of the reasons he struggled to establish himself within the scientific community when he returned from the Rattlesnake voyage was because the older guard of naturalists in Britain were

striving to maintain their authority over the various research-fields. Consequently, once Huxley finally

Traditionally, the historiography has positioned Huxley as the liberal thinker, whose ideas blended easily with those of the older guard of ethnologists. However, his perspective on race had more in common with Hunt than it did with Hodgkin and Christy. For instance, Huxley was of two minds about the American Civil War. On the one hand he believed that slavery was an outdated practice and an insufficient economic system for a country to maintain. Conversely, his favourite sister Lizzie lived in Tennessee and her husband was a surgeon for the Confederates. Thus, Huxley had familial ties to Southern politics. In addition, unlike Hodgkin and Christy, Huxley was not sympathetic to the Africans' plight. In a letter to his sister Lizzie from 4 May 1864 he wrote,

"I have not the smallest sentimental sympathy with the negro; don't believe in him at all, in short. But it is clear to me that slavery means, for the white man, bad political economy; bad social morality; bad internal political organisation, and a bad influence upon free labour and freedom all over the world. For the sake of the white man, therefore, for your children and grandchildren, directly, and for mine, indirectly, I wish to see this system ended."⁷²

Huxley reiterated this point publicly in his 1865 article 'Emancipation Black and White', where he stated that, The doctrine of equal natural rights may be an illogical delusion; emancipation may convert the slave from a well-fed animal into a pauperised man; mankind may even have to do without cotton shirts; but all these evils must be faced, if the moral law, that no human being can arbitrarily dominate over another

As we can see, abolishing slavery for Huxley had little to do with the exploitation of Africans and the natural rights of all humans. Rather, it had to do with the moral consequences it had on Caucasians. Such a stance placed him much closer to Hunt and the anthropologists than it did to monogenists such as Hodgkin and Christy. Moreover, as we shall see in due course, Huxley argued that scientifically-objective representations of human varieties was a primary concern for ethnology, and those depictions began with observable evidence based on anatomical and physiological descriptions.⁷⁴ Therefore, as with the woman question, Huxley's ideas about race were similar to Hunt's racial ideologies, and clearly affected his writings on humans. Unlike figures such as Prichard and Hodgkin, he was not striving to demonstrate that all humans were of one origin to support abolitionism. Instead, Huxley aimed to accurately depict the different races that inhabited the world according to the observable evidence available.

Accordingly, Huxley argued that ethnologists should prioritise anatomical and physiological research because it was a more empirically grounded approach to studying humans. He wrote, '... it is plain that the zoological court of appeal is the highest for the ethnologist, and that no evidence can be set against that derived from physical character'.¹⁰⁴ Although, Huxley was critical of Prichard's language studies, he did approve of his classificatory practices when organising humans into groupings based on physical structure. Therefore, we can see the influence that figures such as Blumenbach, Prichard and Latham had on Huxley's ethnological taxonomy. Moreover, just as his predecessors, Huxley aimed to further refine the observational

practices of ethnologists and one can see how his training in anatomy and physiology shaped his practical model.

The first step for Huxley was to collect and organise his data. He began by separating the various 'persistent modifications' or 'stocks' inhabiting the world into larger regional groupings with descriptions of each type. For instance, Huxley described both the physical form and the material culture of Australians, which included Tasmanians, New Zealanders, New Caledonians and Papuans.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, because he had travelled to the South Pacific during the Rattlesnake voyage, his account was a mixture of his own observations collected in situ, and those of other researchers and informants. Huxley provided his readers with a general physical description of South Pacific peoples. He wrote, 'Australians have dark, usually chocolate-coloured skins; fine dark wavy hair; dark eyes, overhung by beetle brows; course projecting jaws; broad and dilated, but not especially flattened, noses; and lips which, though prominent, are eminently flexible'.¹⁰⁶ Building upon Prichardian methods, Huxley also discussed the physical conformation of Australian skulls. He stated that, "The Skulls of these people are always long and narrow, with a smaller development of the frontal sinuses than usually corresponds with such largely developed brow ridges. An Australian skull of a round form, or one [where] the transverse diameter of which exceeds eight-tenths of its length has never been seen."¹⁰⁷

Once Huxley had organised his various 'persistent modifications' or 'stocks' into groupings, the next step for him was to tabulate the material into columns for comparative analysis (Figure 5). As we can see, despite Hunt's claim that the Baconian method of induction was a distinctly anthropological practice, Huxley utilised it in his framework. T

Huxley's classificatory system based its groupings on those outlined by Prichard in the various editions of his *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*.¹¹¹ However, he further refined the method by visually arranging the data into tables. In doing so, readers could further analyse the material and draw more conclusions. Huxley also provided examples on how to use the tabulated evidence. For instance, he wrote, 'It is curious to observe that almost all the woolly-headed people are long-headed; while among the straight-haired nations broad heads preponderate, and only two stocks, the Esquimaux and the Australians, are exclusively long-headed'.¹¹² Finally, as with Hunt, Huxley had reservations about Darwin's theory of 'natural selection'. First, he argued that Darwin's hypothesis was excellent, but it required further evidence. Secondly, Huxley remained unconvinced by Darwin's commitment to the principle that 'Natura non facit saltum' or 'Nature makes no leaps' and argued that the smallest change at the molecular level could create sudden and major

Therefore, Huxley did not staunchly support 'natural selection' as he did other Darwinian theories such as 'transmutationism', but he did encourage its testing. In his 1859 review of the *Origin of Species* (1859), Huxley wrote, "If it can be proved that the process of natural selection, operating upon any species, can give rise to varieties of species so different from one another that none of our tests will distinguish them from true species, Mr. Darwin's hypothesis of the origin of species will take its place among the established theories of science, be it consequences whatever they may [be]. If, on

the other hand, Mr. Darwin has erred, either in fact or in reasoning, his fellow-workers will soon find out the weak points in his doctrines, and their extinction by some nearer approximation to the truth will exemplify his own principle of natural selection.114”

...

(Cf. “Reader”, Feb 27 onwards where these general arguments against slavery appear in a controversy arising from his ninth Hunterian Lecture, in which, while admitting the negro inferiority, he refutes those who justify slavery on the ground that physiologically the negro is very low on the scale)

https://books.google.com/books?id=bJTzDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA236&lpg=PA236&dq=I+have+not+the+smallest+sentimental+sympathy+with+the+negro.+don%27t+believe+in+him+at+all.+in+short&source=bl&ots=OviJsbMKiJ&sig=ACfU3U2B0MsGP_N5M4Yp2ITI_DarQkowLQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjTpMyagrDuAhW7CjQIHwygBAkQ6AEwAHoECAUQAg#v=onepage&q=I%20have%20not%20the%20smallest%20sentimental%20sympathy%20with%20the%20negro%2C%20don't%20believe%20in%20him%20at%20all%2C%20in%20short&f=false

Letter of Praise from Ernst Haeckel (father of eugenics) “Scientific Worthies: Thomas Huxley”

<https://mathcs.clarku.edu/huxley/comm/ScPr/Nature/ScWorth.html>

This section is most noteworthy:

Huxley was the first who extended it to man, and in 1863, in his celebrated three Lectures on "Man's Place in Nature," admirably worked out its most important developments. With luminous clearness, and convincing certainty, he has here established the fundamental law, that, in every respect, the anatomical differences between man and the highest apes are of less value than those between the highest and the lowest apes. Especially weighty is the evidence adduced for this law, in the most important of all organs, the brain; and by this, the objections of Prof. Richard Owen are, at the same time, thoroughly refuted. Not only has the Evolution Theory received from Prof. Huxley a complete demonstration of its immense importance, not only has it been largely advanced by his valuable comparative researches, but its spread among the general public has been largely due to his well-known popular writings.

The Reader's report on two of Huxley's lectures (Royal College of Surgeons) 1864:

The context of this section with the rest of this source is described below:

Within this lecture delivered by TH Huxley to the Royal College of Surgeons, Huxley addresses anatomical variations within the “different species of mankind” and addresses these species as the higher and lower races. He also addresses other scientists' claims that Black peoples' anatomy is simply different, for example, the blood is vastly dissimilar, their posture simply

cannot be upright, their pelvis indicates the greater animality of the Black person, etc. He refutes some of the claims, directing attendees to refer to the anatomical structures they have at the institution to judge for themselves if the claims hold merit.

Quote from the source:

The important question now remains—What is the value of the differences which have been shown to exist in the structure of human beings? This question resolves itself into two others. 1. Are these differences sufficient to justify us in supposing them to indicate distinct species of men? 2. Can any of the deviations be considered as transitional towards the lower forms of animals? In respect to the first, it is certain that well-defined types occur in different geographical localities, so distinct that any zoologist, taking a single example of each, without any other evidence, would probably pronounce them to be distinct species; but the fact that every intermediate form can be found between the most typical, and the absence of any proof of their infertility inter se, conclusively show that there is no sufficient ground for the doctrine of the diversity of species among men. As to the second question, it can be answered equally positively. Although in the lower races of men now upon earth, and in the skeleton found in the cavern in the Neanderthal, the human characters vary a little in some particulars in a pithecoïd direction, the extent of this variation is very slight indeed when compared with the whole difference which separates them; and it may be safely affirmed that there is at present no evidence of any transitional [8] form or intermediate link between man and the next succeeding form in the vertebrate scale

He said this during his lecture which reflects his progressive assimilationist viewpoint:

"The fanatical abolitionists do not scruple to affirm that the negro is the equal of the white man—nay, some go so far as to tell us that the Ameri[9]can stock would be the better for the infusion of a little black blood; while the milder sort maintain, at least, the indefinite modifiability of the negro, urge that he is capable of being improved into such equality or something like it, and therefore conclude that the attempt to improve him is a great duty. The two former propositions are so hopelessly absurd as to be unworthy of serious discussion. The third is fairly open to discussion; but anything like good evidence of its truth seems to me to be wanting; while, if it be true, the conclusion drawn from it is not indisputable.

<https://mathcs.clarku.edu/huxley/comm/Books/Taylor.html>

Richard Owen and Charles Darwin on Race: A study in contrast

<https://evolutionnews.org/2020/01/richard-owen-and-charles-darwin-on-race-a-study-in-contrast/>

Owen engaged Huxley in a longstanding debate over the nature of the alleged simian/human connection, a debate that in hindsight Owen should have won. **Huxley's**

openly racist formulations were answered by Owen, who pointed out that the large brains of humans compared to apes made *Homo sapiens* not an example of evolutionary continuity but instead truly unique and distinct. In stark contrast to Huxley's pessimistic prospect for African Americans, Owen demonstrated that such racist asseverations had nothing to recommend them. Christopher Cosans has shown in *Owen's Ape and Darwin's Bulldog* how Owen's careful selection of anatomical data from black races "indicated that those individuals were extremely different from orangutans, chimpanzees, and gorillas. Hence when Owen drew his general conclusion that humans are distinct from apes by comparing blacks with apes, he also presented an unspoken secondary conclusion that anatomical inspection refutes those people [like Huxley] who assert that blacks are an ape-like variety of humans" (pp. 51-52).

Darwin and Huxley's naturalistic reductionism, as witnessed in their ill-considered persistent attempts to derive animal continuities with humans, exposes their unsightly racism. It will do no good to say they were just "a product of their time." Richard Owen told them how wrong they were from the beginning, a historic clash of "metaphysical attitudes" worth pondering at the next Darwin Day celebration.

***Best summary of Huxley's Harm:**

Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800-1930 by Patrick Brantlinger. Chapter 8 Darwin and After is significant. The below copied and pasted selection is pg 164, 170-177

https://alliance-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/openurl?sid=jstor:jstor&genre=book&title=Dark%20Vanishings&isbn=9780801438097&eisbn=9780801468681&vid=WWU&institution=WWU&url_ctx_val=&url_ctx_fmt=null&isServicesPage=true

Starting with Thomas Henry Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature* (1863), evolutionists offered what quickly became the dominant view, accepted by most scientists and intellectuals, concerning

racial variation. Homo sapiens was one species, not several; the separate races had a single origin; they evolved through the same processes and stages; and the differences among them were insignificant compared to the similarities. Nevertheless, some races - the Australians, for example - had been isolated for millennia, and hence occupied the very lowest rungs of the evolutionary ladder. Whether this meant that they lacked the ability to become civilized was less than clear, but most evolutionists believed they were slated for extinction

Darwin, Huxley, and their immediate followers also believed that "the survival of the fittest" had nothing to do with ethics. Human survival, however, depended on social cooperation, and progress could be defined as the strengthening of such cooperation

From *Man's Place in Nature* forward, Huxley's "ethnological" writings present a vision of the human past as "the struggle for existence" among "races." Huxley is less prone than many nineteenth-century scientists to attribute specific moral, emotional, and intellectual qualities to races, and he also stresses the influence of geographical and climatic factors in the "struggle" through which the "fittest" races have survived while apparently "unfit" ones such as the Neanderthals and the Tasmanians have perished. Huxley stresses that, though there are apparently great differences between races, with the "lower" ones not far removed from the gorilla and chimpanzee, humanity forms a single species. No extant race or species is the "missing link" between humans and the anthropoid apes. Yet in *Man's Place in Nature* Huxley cites evidence suggesting the similarities between sub-Saharan Africans, on the one hand, and chimpanzees and gorillas, on the other, including a gratuitous reference to "African cannibalism in the sixteenth century," based on a Portuguese account he admits is irrelevant to his argument. He illustrates it with an even more gratuitous woodcut of a "human butcher shop" (7=73-74)

For Huxley, ethnology is not primarily about customs and culture but about the physical and mental characteristics of the human races. In "On the Methods and Results of Ethnology" (1865), he writes: "ethnology is the science which determines the distinctive characters of the persistent modifications of mankind" (T209). The important modifications are morphological, involving bodily structure; these are what differentiate one "race" from another - or, rather, these are the differences that Huxley believes can be scientifically measured and compared. At the outset of his essay, Huxley insists that the terms "persistent modifications" and "stocks" should be used instead of "varieties," "races," or "species" because each of these last well-known terms implies, on the part of its employer, a preconceived opinion touching one of those problems, the solution of which is the ultimate object of the science" of ethnology (T209). But Huxley's solution elsewhere is to use "race" while insisting that humanity forms one "species." Anyway, Huxley considers "ethnology" to be a branch of zoology, "which again is the animal half of BIOLOGY - the science of life and living things" (T210).

for Huxley neither language nor artifacts offer reliable evidence about the real differences between the human races or about their past: "That two nations use calabashes or shells for drinking-vessels, or that they employ spears, or clubs, or swords and axes of stone and metal ... cannot be regarded as evidence that these two nations had a common origin, or even that

intercommunication ever took place between them" (T213). Nor can the fact that two nations or races speak the same language prove much: Frenchmen speak French, says Huxley, but so do Haitians. Huxley here, as in later essays such as "The Aryan Question and Prehistoric Man" (1890), dismisses the language-based speculations of the philologist Max Muller and his followers, who claimed to be able to read the ethnological past and present from the distribution of languages and dialects. The supposed physical differences between the races provides Huxley with evidence for a taxonomy that, in "On the Methods and Results of Ethnology," includes eleven distinct racial "stocks" (7:234- 37): Australians, "Negritos" (such as Tasmanians and Papuans), "Amphinesians" (Polynesians, the Maori), American Indians, "Esquimaux," Mongolians, Negroes, Bushmen, "Mincopies" (the Andaman Islanders), and the two great groups that make up most of the population of Europe, North Africa, and much of western Asia: the blond "Xanthochroi" who may be either "short" or "long-headed" (though in other essays they are described as "long-headed" only), and the dark, "long-headed" "Melanochroi." Huxley remarks that "of the eleven different stocks enumerated, seven have been known to us for less than 400 years; and of these seven not one possessed a fragment of written history at the time it came into contact with European civilization" (T237-38).

(according to Huxley) The Negro "stock" has been known to Europeans for centuries but is also history-less. Only the Xanthochroi, the Melanochroi, and, though within limits, the Mongolian "stocks" have entered history- that is, written, Western history. Huxley says that "archaeological and historical investigations are of great value for all those peoples whose ancient state has differed widely from their present condition, and who have the good or evil fortune to possess a history. But on taking a broad survey of the world, it is astonishing that few nations present either condition. Respecting five-sixths of the persistent modifications of mankind, history and archaeology are absolutely silent" (T212). Like Hegel, John Stuart Mill, and many other nineteenth-century thinkers, Huxley identifies history with progress toward civilization (and therefore with the eventual capacity to compose written histories, even when these are largely mythological). The Xanthochroi and the Melanochroi alone, he claims, are currently civilized and still making progress.

While the Mongolians - or that branch of this "stock" identified as Chinese, at any rate - "have attained a remarkable and apparently indigenous civilization, only surpassed by that of Europe" (T229), they have stalled (as in *The Wealth of Nations*: the Chinese were Adam Smith's main example of a "stationary" social condition). In contrast to the Chinese, says Huxley, "everything that is highest in science, in art, in law, in politics, and in mechanical inventions" has "originated" with the Xanthochroi and the Melanochroi. "In their hands, at the present moment, lies the order of the social world, and to them its progress is committed" (T232). Huxley implies, of course, that if the other racial "stocks" are ever to become progressive or to achieve even a modicum of civilization, then one or both of the European "stocks" must lead them. This is the same message implicit in the colony-as-garden metaphor at the outset of *Evolution and Ethics*, where the actual colony named -Tasmania-suggests the fate of those "native savages" incapable of gardening or, in other words, of entering historical time and becoming civilized. Huxley's stress on morphology and his skepticism about languages and cultural artifacts as historical evidence means that history, for him, as for earlier race scientists, is a spectacle of races in collision.

Compared to evolutionary time, recorded historical time is insignificant. During the short span of history, civilization may have begun to allay "the struggle for existence" within the bounds of certain societies, but that is hardly the case, Huxley thinks, with savagery; anyway, modern intersocietal relations are just more of the same - the struggle for survival among races continues.

Huxley believed that ethnology was a science capable of providing much useful information to British imperial administrators and colonists. As president of the Ethnological Society in 1868, he "launched what amounted to an ethnological census of the populations of the British possessions," starting with India (Di Gregorio, 175). Huxley's goal was the mapping and measurement of all the races of the world. Only such a total mapping would provide the evidence necessary to develop an accurate taxonomy of the races, to understand how they had evolved and interacted through prehistory and history, and to judge their greatly varying capacities for civilization or progress. No doubt Huxley believed that such a mapping of races would also provide the answer to the mystery that absorbed Darwin in the chapter on race in *Descent of Man* -namely, why some or perhaps all primitive races were dying out, apparently on mere contact with civilization.

Huxley identifies the progress of science unproblematically with social progress; he also identifies it more generally with evolutionary progress, upward from the apes. Thus, in *Man's Place in Nature*, Huxley offers multiple, overlapping narratives of "progressive development." There is, first and most obviously, the evolution of "man" literally upward from the apes (or, rather, from the apes' ancestors). Paralleling this evolution but in much foreshortened chronology is the development of scientific knowledge, banishing ignorance, as in the opening sentence: "Ancient traditions, when tested by the severe processes of modern investigation, commonly enough fade away into mere dreams" (TI). This second narrative is the intellectual version of eliminating "savagery" from the world. It is also the recent, most important version of a more general, third narrative of progress, "from blind force to conscious intellect and will" (TI51), which is, in turn, a version of "Nature's great progression, from the formless to the formed- from the inorganic to the organic" (TI51). Every individual organism, moreover, and every species (also every society), undergoes a related Uprogressive development" from the simple to the complex, from the acorn to the oak tree or the embryo to the adult animal. However, that organisms also peak, degenerate, and die, and that all previously recorded or unrecorded empires have declined and fallen, make all the processes of nature and history ultimately ucyclical," revolving in uthe procession of the great year" (9:85), as in Lyell's *Principles of Geology*.

Although Huxley deplors "the unfortunate ambiguity of the phrase 'survival of the fittest' " because it equates might with right or, in other words because it confounds what is "fittest" in the "struggle" in and against nature with what is morally "best" (9:80), throughout *Evolution and Ethics* he implicitly and sometimes explicitly identifies those societies that succeed in dominating others with progress and civilization, and the dominated with unfitness, barbarism, savagery. Though Huxley does not spell out this conclusion, it follows that those societies capable of

constructing empires are more "ethical" than those that are imperialized. (This conclusion is already implicit in the opposition between "savagery" and "civilization" that informs all evolutionary anthropology.) Huxley places his (secular) faith concerning the gradual "improvement" of the human condition in that "intelligence" and "science" that he everywhere identifies with both "civilization" and the "ethical process." Though all evolutionary processes are ultimately "cyclical" rather than "progressive" (9:49), so that beyond whatever heights of civilization humanity may attain there looms a future decline and fall, during the "progressive" upswing of social evolution Huxley sees "no limit to the extent to which intelligence and will, guided by sound principles of investigation, and organized in common effort, may modify the conditions of existence" for the better (9:85). Humanity has the capacity to alter both external and internal nature, Huxley declares: "much may be done to change the nature of man himself. The intelligence which has converted the brother of the wolf into the faithful guardian of the flock ought to be able to do something towards curbing the instincts of savagery in civilized men"

Viewed through the lens of Huxley's "ethical process," "civilization" means nothing more nor less than "curbing the instincts of savagery" or just curbing "savagery." The savage within-not distinguishable from the beast within -must be tamed, repressed. But so must the savage without. In the external struggle between societies, civilization is virtually identical to imperialism, because both entail the conquest and domestication of savages. In his 1888 essay "The Struggle for Existence in Human Society," Huxley writes: "the course shaped by the ethical man -the member of society or citizen -necessarily runs counter to that which the non-ethical man -the primitive savage, or man as a mere member of the animal kingdom -tends to adopt. The latter fights out the struggle for existence to the bitter end, like any other animal; the former devotes his best energies to the object of setting limits to the struggle" (9:203). Once again, as in most extinction discourse, savages turn out to be self-extminating "to the bitter end."

“Culture on the Ground: The world perceived through the feet” by
Tim Ingold, shared by anth Professor Josh Fisher

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1359183504046896>

In the second of his three essays on Man's Place in Nature, published in 1863, T.H. Huxley illustrated these changes through a comparison of the skeletons of the gibbon, the orangutan, the chimpanzee, the gorilla and the human being (Figure 1). There is an engaging liveliness about this depiction: the human skeleton seems to be lightly stepping towards you, and preparing to shake you by the hand. Nevertheless the picture has been deliberately constructed to tell a story, one that has entered the textbooks and been retold on countless occasions ever since. It is the story of how man's eventual achievement of upright posture laid the foundations for his pre-eminence in the animal kingdom, and for the growth of culture and civilization. In the

picture, man marches confidently into the future, head high, body erect, while the stooping apes trundle along obediently behind (Huxley, 1894: 76).

As the savage was regarded as anatomically intermediate between the ape and the civilized human, it would stand to reason that his feet would retain some vestiges of the ape-like form. T.H. Huxley, however, has rather more to say on the matter. He too observes that primitive people seem able to do things with their feet – his examples are rowing a boat, weaving cloth, and even stealing fishhooks – that might strike us civilized folk as pretty extraordinary. But rather than being a function of their innate anatomical endowment, might this not have more to do with their habit of going barefoot? 'It must not be forgotten', Huxley warns us, 'that the civilized great toe, confined and cramped from childhood upwards, is seen to a great disadvantage, and that in uncivilized and barefooted people it retains a great amount of mobility, and even some sort of opposability' (Huxley, 1894: 119). Paradoxically, it seems that with the onward march of civilization, the foot has been progressively withdrawn from the sphere of operation of the intellect, that it has regressed to the status of a merely mechanical apparatus, and moreover that this development is a consequence – not a cause – of technical advance in footwear. Boots and shoes, products of the ever more versatile human hand, imprison the foot, constricting its freedom of movement and blunting its sense of touch.

Article Sources

“Thomas Huxley’s Hideous Revolution in Science” by Paul Glumaz. *This is a longer article, but worth the read

https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2015/eirv42n24-20150612/18-29_4224.pdf

“Post Darwin: social Darwinism, degeneration, eugenics” by Carolyn Burdett

<https://www.bl.uk/romantics-and-victorians/articles/post-darwin-social-darwinism-degeneration-eugenics>

“Huxley’s Rule and the Origins of Scientific Racism” by Nicolaas Rupke: a lecture

<https://youtu.be/koFbc1RD5Go>

Can watch the whole video if you have time, because it is very interesting, however the discussion about Richard Owen vs. TH Huxley is from 19:00- the end

Professor Nicolaas Rupke's thesis: "The infamous clash between Richard Owen and Thomas Henry Huxley which took place during the early 1860s, which is known as the hippocampus controversy.. It represented a clash over the origin of homosapiens, pitching Owens's monogenist, mega mutational and antiracist model against Huxley's polygenetic, Darwinian, and deeply racist model. In the course of and in the wake of this clash, racism was given its late modern, 19th century and early 20th century scientific definition in the form of what became known as Huxley's Law, or more accurately, Huxley's Rule."

"Emancipation- Black and White (1865) by Thomas Huxley in his collected essays

<https://mathcs.clarku.edu/huxley/CE3/B&W.html>

The question is settled; but even those who are most thoroughly convinced that the doom is just, must see good grounds for repudiating half the arguments which have been employed by the winning side; and for doubting whether its ultimate results will embody the hopes of the victors, though they may more than realise the fears of the vanquished. It may be quite true that some negroes are better than some white men; but no rational man, cognisant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal, still [67] less the superior, of the average white man. And, if this be true, it is simply incredible that, when all his disabilities are removed, and our prognathous relative has a fair field and no favour, as well as no oppressor, he will be able to compete successfully with his bigger-brained and smaller-jawed rival, in a contest which is to be carried on by thoughts and not by bites. The highest places in the hierarchy of civilisation will assuredly not be within the reach of our dusky cousins, though it is by no means necessary that they should be restricted to the lowest.

But whatever the position of stable equilibrium into which the laws of social gravitation may bring the negro, all responsibility for the result will henceforward lie between nature and him. The white man may wash his hands of it, and the Caucasian conscience be void of reproach for evermore. And this, if we look to the bottom of the matter, is the real justification for the abolition policy.

The doctrine of equal natural rights may be an illogical delusion; emancipation may convert the slave from a well-fed animal into a pauperised man; mankind may even have to do without cotton-shirts; but all these evils must be faced if the moral law, that no human being can arbitrarily dominate over another without grievous damage to his own nature, be, as many think, as readily demonstrable by experiment as any physical truth. If this be true, no slavery can [68] be abolished without a double emancipation, and the master will benefit by freedom more than the freed-man.

On the Geographical Distribution of the Chief modifications of Mankind (Huxley's map of his classified races)

<https://mathcs.clarku.edu/huxley/SM3/GeoDis.html>

This source dives into Huxley's characteristics attributed to each of the races he divided into 4 categories, again, using such terms as "primitive and civilized" and using the word "stock" which can mean the descendants of one individual or in biology can mean breed or strain and is often attributed to animals. There could be much debate revolving around his intended meaning of the word "stock" but given his prominent position as a biologist and belief about the "higher vs lower species" of human kind, it is likely that his choice to use the word "stock" instead of "race" like his scientific counterparts may have stemmed from the fact that he viewed anthropology as a type of zoology. He provides justification for his division of the world into these groups and the division of the white/ European race into subcategories as well.

Something notable that I found within this source was the ending reflection upon Huxley's division of the people of the world into 4 races:

Mr. Alfred R. Wallace said that, as a small contribution to the subject, he would venture to point out that there were certain mental characteristics which in two at least of the primary groups were as well marked and as constant as the physical characters by which Professor Huxley had defined them. The great Mongoloid group, for instance, was distinguished by a general gravity of demeanour and concealment of the emotions, by deliberation of speech, and the absence of violent gesticulation, by the rarity of laughter, and by plaintive and melancholy songs. The tribes composing it were pre-eminently apathetic and reserved; and this character was exhibited to a high degree in the North-American Indian, and in all the Malay races, and to a somewhat less extent over the whole of the enormous area occupied by the Mongoloid type. Strongly contrasted with these were the Negroid group, whose characteristics were vivacity and excitability, strong exhibitions of feeling, loud and rapid speech, boisterous laughter, violent gesticulations, and rude, noisy music. They were preeminently impetuous and demonstrative; and this feature was seen fully developed both in the African Negro and in the widely removed Papuan of New Guinea. This striking correspondence of mental with physical characters strongly supported the view that these two at least were among the best-marked primary divisions of our race.

(Laura's commentary:)

Such generalizations of unique groups of people worldwide into 4 groups (9 subcategories) based only on perceived physical features allows for even more generalizations about those individuals based on their behavior as we can see above. Generalizations and stereotyping are dangerous. They are used today as a way to maintain power over certain groups and were used in Huxley's time to justify imperialism and taming the primitive or savage who according to "scientific findings" about anatomy and further theorizing (which historians and anthropologists

recognize now as speculation) about their behavior, needed to be tamed because according to these scientists, they were inferior.

Sources of Interest that were not as valuable:

Darwin effect : its influence on nazism, eugenics, racism, communism, capitalism & sexism.

***Found it and Huxley was only referenced as an example of scientific racism in lists, there wasn't much that reflected on or discussed his beliefs**

Superior: The Return of Race Science by Angela Saini

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/may/27/superior-the-return-of-race-science-by-angela-saini-book-review>

Again, I found how to access this source, but TH Huxley was merely referenced as an example of scientists who contributed to scientific racism, instead of there being discussion about his values and works