WAR AND CIVILISATION.¹

By W. J. PERRY, B.A.

Each of us is endowed with certain innate tendencies, termed instincts. These instincts, which have been acquired during the evolution of the human race, play a fundamental part in the lives of its members. In addition, each human being is susceptible to the influence of his surroundings, and especially to that of his fellows; his actions are moulded according to the circumstances in which he lives, into manifold forms. Cruelty, kindness, pride, deceit, honesty, diverse modes of conduct and thought are possible, and it depends upon the relative strength of inherited tendencies and educative influences whether this, that, or the other form of behaviour will result in any given circumstances. The intricate form of society in the midst of which we live produces a great variety of type and behaviour. Institutions already in existence exert their pressure upon the unsuspecting child from his earliest days, until, when arrived at maturity, he finds that, if he thinks at all about the matter, he has unconsciously acquired most of his opinions and tendencies from his surroundings.

There is a profound distinction between the innate tendencies and those acquired during life. The first—the instincts are possessed by the whole of mankind; while the second are only found in those who have been subjected to the action of certain formative influences, who are living in the midst of particular forms of society. This is a truism. We expect to find the institution of marriage wherever we go in some form or other, but we should be surprised to find a savage of Central Africa behaving like a London clubman, or a working man voicing the sentiments of a duke. If, therefore, a certain form of behaviour is widespread among men, if it exists in all ages and in such circumstances that its presence could not be due to purely social influ-
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ences, we are entitled to say that this form of behaviour is instinctive, that it is characteristic of each member of the human family. If, on the other hand, it is only displayed by certain people and in definite circumstances, its social origin is thereby made probable.

With these general principles in mind, I will ask you this evening to consider the problem of determining the part that war has played in the development of civilisation. It is necessary first to define what is meant by a warlike people. This term can surely only apply to those peoples who attack others, not to those who fight solely in self-defence? Self-preservation will cause most human beings to defend themselves when attacked, and thus the act may be termed instinctive. But it is far otherwise in the case of acts of aggression. For a wide survey shows beyond doubt that aggressive warfare is not a common characteristic of all forms of human society. During the past half century our knowledge of the earliest stages of human society has increased enormously, and much of the handiwork of those times is known to us, so that it is possible to imagine with a certain degree of success what manner of men they were and how they lived in those days. An examination of the products of the earliest parts of the Stone Age has revealed nothing in the shape of a weapon, but merely implements designed for domestic purposes. All through the later stages of the Stone Age tools for scraping, cutting, and boring, abound and but few weapons are made (1). Even the arrow-heads of the last stages of the Palaeolithic Age in Europe are incapable of killing anything much bigger than a rabbit (2). Men of the early Stone Age would have been quite equal to the task of designing weapons for combat: masters of their craft, they could easily have made pieces of jagged flint into formidable weapons. The complete absence of weapons on the early Stone Age thus constitutes strong evidence that fighting, even personal combat, was unknown at that period, or was so rare and innocuous as to be negligible. And the domestic note which is so prominent in the craft throughout the Stone Age is indicative of the main preoccupations of those times.

This evidence alone would be satisfactory enough for the purpose. But fortunately there exist peoples who, so far as is known, represent the cultural stage of very early times. They lack, in their pure state, any form of civilisation. They are hunters. They make no houses, wear no clothes, do not work metals, do not dispose of their dead, but
leave them where they die, and live in communities of relatives without social classes and holding their property in common. Such peoples are to be found in South India and Ceylon, Siberia, North America, South America, the East Indian Archipelago, Australia, and Africa, as well as in Northern Europe. These peoples are, one and all, when untouched by higher cultural influences, entirely peaceful. Wars between communities and combats between individuals do not happen (3). The existence of such peoples therefore makes it certain that a warlike form of behaviour is not a universal feature of mankind. It is not instinctive, and therefore must be due to certain causes, social or otherwise, which act upon some peoples and not on others. That being so, it is our task this evening to determine, if possible, what these causes are.

The entire lack of weapons in the earliest stages of the Stone Age and the close association between peaceful behaviour and cultural status which is exhibited by the hunting peoples, suggest that all mankind was once peaceful, and that certain peoples have emerged from the hunting stage and have somehow or other become warlike. Whether the advance in culture is a sign of innate superiority, or is the result of a process of natural selection, or of diffusion of culture or migration of peoples, is a matter to be studied, as is the relationship between the advance of culture and a warlike temper. The entire absence of any signs of warfare among the earliest peoples of the earth makes the problem historical in the sense that we can point to a time when, so far as we know, it did not exist, and it will be convenient to endeavour to find out how the warlike nations of the earth originated.

A broad preliminary survey does not appear to offer much hope of disclosing the beginnings of warfare. For, from the earliest times of which we have historical knowledge, there have been warlike states such as Egypt, Babylon, and others, whose origins cannot be discovered as yet. These states may for convenience be called the "Ancient Empires". The warlike nature of these ancient empires may be due to any of a number of causes, and to endeavour to dissect out from a consideration of the activities of these states the effective cause or causes would be a task of the greatest difficulty. I propose, therefore, to leave such states on one side for the present, and to ask you to consider those warlike peoples whose origins are known with
some degree of exactness. When we have watched the genesis of such peoples, it will then be possible once more to return to the examination of the ancient empires.

I shall survey each continent in turn, beginning with Africa.

Although the first Europeans found warlike peoples scattered practically all over Africa, there is ample evidence that formerly much of this continent was inhabited by peaceful Bushmen and Negritos, whose hunting grounds covered the whole of the region south of the Sudan and the Great Lakes. During the past thousand years or so negro races have migrated into this region. These peoples may be divided into two distinct groups. First there came tribes practising agriculture, who settled in certain spots and remained there in isolation, so that their languages became distinct. These first-comers were, and are still, quite peaceful. It therefore appears that warfare does not necessarily accompany an advance beyond the hunting stage of culture.

The second wave was of a very different constitution. The languages of the various tribes were all akin—whence they derive their generic name of Bantu—which shows that they are all intimately connected; they are pastoral, except in the basin of the Congo where natural conditions prevent this occupation; and they are all warlike (4). The similarity which exists between the warlike organisations of these Bantu peoples is emphasised by Ratzel. "The distinction between the settled agriculturalists in the West and in the interior and the restless cattle-breeders of the south, are far more sharply conspicuous than the dissolving boundaries between the dialects of Africa or between the characteristics of their anatomical structure. . . . Going south from the sixth parallel of south latitude to the south-east point of Africa, we find members of the Bantu family maintaining the sharply-defined connection between the pastoral and the warrior life; and from the same line to 5 North, three distinct groups of races live in comparatively narrow districts side by side, all keeping the same form of culture. . . . It is a gradual and slow change from the Indian Ocean through the Arab colouring to brown and deepest brown, from the Caucasian to the negroid type the languages are far apart, and yet all these races are shepherds of one and the same stamp, and all alike maintain a similar military organisation." He speaks further of "a military organisation which . . . shows striking points of agree-
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ment from the most northerly Gallas to the most southerly Kaffirs," and goes on to say that "The development of a military aristocracy out of a race, rude and vigorous in itself, has been, from the point of view of politics and culture, the most important occurrence for the whole of East Africa. It has not stopped with the race from which it emanated, but has bound many races from the Fish River to the Blue Nile, more firmly together for protection, conquest and plunder. We meet with it, essentially alike in character, throughout the whole region" (5).

The source of this similarity of organisation, which Ratzel has noted, is known. The Bantu peoples are said to have spread from the region of the Great Lakes with a stereotyped form of culture which they have retained ever since. Traditions say that the great states round the Lakes were founded by light-skinned strangers who came from the north and imposed themselves upon the peaceful agriculturalists whom they found there as military aristocracies. These strangers were cattle-breeders, and thus it is that the Bantu peoples who moved out from this region carried with them a culture received from elsewhere (6).

The warfare of the Bantu peoples bears traces of its origin. For, as Stow tells us, "their wars were more cattle forays on an extensive scale than determined invasions for the purpose of securing territorial aggrandisement," and that "the warlike renown of any particular tribe seems almost in every case to have been derived more from the personal daring and energy of the particular chief ruling over them at the time than from any other causes" (7). Quarrels between chiefs or members of the aristocracy caused frequent wars, and the chiefs added slave-raiding to their activities (8).

The warfare of the peoples of the southern part of Africa is thus apparently bound up with the existence of a military aristocracy or foreign origin. The relationship between warfare and a military aristocracy is shown by Sketch-Map No. 1, from which it is evident that a similar relationship holds throughout the continent. In the Sudan, the Hausa, a peaceful agricultural and trading people, have been dominated by the Fulah, a pastoral people from Senegal. And other parts of the Sudan have been ruled by military aristocracies from North Africa and perhaps from Egypt (9). It is the essential problem of African warfare to discover the origin of these military
aristocracies which have dominated the peaceful agricultural negroes. These aristocracies have come from three regions which are indicated on Sketch-Map No. 2: North-east Africa, Senegal, and the interior of Morocco and Algiers. The consideration of any special features common to these regions will be deferred until the survey of the earth has been completed.

Asia has been the scene of many struggles, and some of the greatest conquerors of history have emerged from various parts to work havoc and destruction over wide areas. Before examining the more warlike peoples, we will consider the peoples that inhabit the northerly parts of Siberia. Although these tribes are now spread over the inhospitable regions of the north, there is reason to believe that they have migrated comparatively recently from the south. The peaceful Lapps, Samoyedes, and tribes allied to the Finns are thought to have come from the region round the headwaters of the Obi and Yenisei. Further to the east a series of movements have taken place. The Chukchi, who now live on the coasts of the Behring Straits, have driven other tribes before them, and have in their turn been pushed on by Tunguse and others. The Yakut, probably driven out by the Buryat (who in the thirteenth century moved from the Amur to the Lake Baikal region), migrated up the Lena and introduced cattle-breeding there (10). The Siberian peoples have thus apparently spread from two regions; one round the headwaters of the Yenisei, and the other round the headwaters of the Amur.

It is possible to divide the warlike peoples of Asia east of the Oxus region into three main groups: those of Manchuria, Mongolia, and the peoples of Turki stock. Of the three groups, those of Mongolia have undoubtedly played the most important part in history. The earliest Chinese annals tell of centuries of struggle with horse-riding nomads of Mongolia. Many great conquerors have arisen in this race, which has given several dynasties to China. The Turks have not always occupied the extended area over which they are now spread. They are supposed to have come either from the headwaters of the Yenisei, or from north-west Mongolia, or the region just east of Lake Baikal, in any case in close proximity to the Mongolians, to whom they are closely related. The accounts in the Chinese annals of wars with the peoples of Mongolia and Manchuria show that the various struggles were purely dynastic. The Huns
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and allied tribes were ruled over by hereditary military aristocracies, and their rulers were constantly struggling with each other and with the emperors of China. The peoples themselves played an entirely passive part in such contests. The boundaries of kingdoms were in a perpetual state of flux. After a successful battle the conqueror would kill the old men of the defeated side, appropriate the women and children, and enrol the young men under his banners. In this way the conquests of Asia were effected. An able warrior would arise and would overcome his neighbours, who thenceforth would fight for him. Other weaker peoples would attach themselves to him from motives of self-protection, and thus his empire would grow like a snowball until he died or was defeated, when it would break up and the process would recommence with a fresh grouping. The common people simply played the part of pawns in a game of dynastic chess, to be moved according to the changing fortunes of the contest (11).

These great conquerors were not men who had risen from the ranks. Professor E. H. Parker says that, during the ten centuries that the Chinese struggled with the Huns, there is no mention of the succession ever having gone out of the direct line of descent in the royal family. Some of the Tartar emperors of China themselves recognised the supreme importance of royal blood, for they extirpated, if possible, the whole family of a defeated rival, including collateral branches. In some cases they did not succeed, with disastrous results to their descendants (12).

The earliest inhabitants of India of which we have knowledge were tribes similar in physique and culture to the peaceful Veddas of Ceylon and hill tribes of southern Madras. The first known warlike kingdoms were built up by Dravidians and Aryans. The origin of the Dravidians is not known. They founded kingdoms in the Deccan and further south. Their three kingdoms in the extreme south, those of Chola, Pandya and Chera, are said to have been founded by three brothers from Korkai, a place on the Gulf of Manaar between India and Ceylon. These kingdoms are, so far as is known, the earliest in the south of India, and the introduction of warfare cannot, so far as is known at present, be associated with any but the founders of these three kingdoms (13).

The earliest warlike people of northern India of whom we have
positive knowledge are the Aryans. They were ruled over, in the period when trustworthy historical knowledge concerning them is first available, by a military aristocracy. Before their spread over the valley of the Ganges and to places such as Java, they were confined to the Panjab (14).

An important group of warlike peoples are those who have swarmed over Indo-China during the past two thousand years, the Tibeto-Burman group, who are said to have come from the region in Yunnan about the headwaters of the Yang-tse-kiang (15).

The warlike or peaceful habits of Asiatic peoples correspond closely with the presence or absence of a military aristocracy. Sketch-Map No. 3 shows the general agreement—the peaceful democratic hunting peoples, and the warlike peoples with a military aristocracy. In the warlike area the variations in behaviour correspond closely with the fates of dynasties. The early history of China is one of constant struggles between their ruling families and those of the Tartars and others. All the Chinese dynasties of whom we have certain knowledge are, moreover, of alien origin. The Chinese peoples are now, and must always have been, peaceful by nature, for how otherwise could a handful of Manchus have governed 300,000,000 people who hate them? And now that they have finally rid themselves of this incubus, the Chinese are entirely peaceful. The people of Mongolia, once so warlike, are to-day peaceful. The former conquerors of the world, now that their aristocracies are extinct or emasculated, are described as being cowardly to a degree (16). The Hindu people of India, who were warlike when they had a military aristocracy, are now peaceful, and warrior aristocracies are extinct except among certain peoples such as the Rajputs and some warlike hill tribes.

There are some remarkable contrasts in behaviour between Asiatic peoples who are closely related; for example between the peaceful Tunguse and their warlike Manchu kinsmen; the Japanese with their warrior aristocracy and martial spirit, and the closely-related peaceful people of the Lu Kiu islands (17); the warlike Turks of the west, and their peaceful relatives in the Lake Baikal region.

The problem of Asiatic warfare is thus apparently to discover the origin of military aristocracies. Those of the Manchurian peoples sprang from the region indicated on Sketch-Map No. 4, those of the Turks and some of the Mongolian peoples from the region extending
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from the headwaters of the Yenisei to those of the Amur; the Aryans spread over India from the Panjab, and the Tibeto-Burman conquerors came from Yunnan. The problem is therefore similar to that presented by the warfare of Africa. It is necessary to explain why warrior aristocracies have emerged from certain definite areas in Manchuria, Mongolia, Southern Siberia, the Panjab, Korkai and Yunnan to found kingdoms in various parts of the continent (18).

In North America, just before the arrival of Columbus, warlike tribes occupied the region between the St. Lawrence, the Mississippi and the Atlantic Ocean, a strip of land in the north-west, and the rest of the vast area, with the exception of Mexico (which may be included among the Ancient Empires) and its northern extension in the area of the Pueblo Indians, was either uninhabited or tenanted only by peaceful peoples.

The warlike Indians of the first-named area differ profoundly from the peaceful tribes in that they practised agriculture and made pottery, both of them crafts unknown among the peaceful peoples. Their chief food was maize. Since this plant is indigenous in Mexico or Honduras, it follows that the North-American Indians must have derived it, directly or indirectly, from this region. Moreover, the customs associated with its cultivation, the methods of cooking, for which pottery was always used, and the fact that during its cultivation the Indians lived, not in their usual tipis, but in rectangular houses such as are found in the south, all suggest that they have learned their agriculture from one ultimate common source, and that source must be in Mexico or Central America.

After the arrival of the Europeans several tribes adopted the use of the horse and went into the Plains west of the Mississippi, and there forgot their agriculture. It is said that those tribes possessed military organisations so similar in type that they must have been derived from one source. Since these Plains Indians have come from places east of the Mississippi, ranging from Illinois to Louisiana, it is therefore evident that the military organisations of the peoples inhabiting the regions whence they came, must likewise have had a common origin. Little is known of the military organisations of these peoples, but the really warlike peoples had hereditary military aristocracies, or else their chiefs were chosen from certain clans; and it is said that, if we knew their history, we should probably find that the
great Indian leaders were all members of these aristocratic warrior clans. Certain warlike tribes of the South possessed organisations similar to that of the Mexicans in that they were ruled over by hereditary military aristocracies; and the culture of the Iroquois, the most warlike of the northerly Indians, showed more signs of Mexican influence than that of any other people of the North, for they were the best agriculturists and pottery makers. So, putting these facts together it becomes probable that the North-American Indians derived their military organisations, directly or indirectly, from Mexico (19).

The most warlike people of America were the Aztecs, who, descending from some region in the north not yet identified, imposed themselves upon the Maya peoples of Mexico. Their wars were unique in America, and far surpassed in magnitude and ferocity those of the comparatively peaceful peoples still further north.

The great Empire of Peru, extending as it did from Quito to 30 South of the Equator, dominated the whole of South America. The Peruvians waged war to subjugate their neighbours and to extend their territory. They were ruled over by a military aristocracy. Since the origin of the empires of Mexico and Peru are not known, I shall include them among the Ancient Empires.

Other warlike peoples exist in South America. They may be divided into four groups: Caribs, Tupis, Awawak and Patagonians. None of these peoples have occupied their present habitat for long. The Caribs are said to have lived originally at the headwaters of the Xingu, and the Paranatinga, a right tributary of the Amazon; the Tupis originally came from the country round the northern affluents of the La Plata; the Arawak spread from Eastern Bolivia, and the Patagonians probably formerly lived in Matto Grosso. So combining these facts, it is seen that these peoples originated from eastern Bolivia and the region of Brazil called Matto Grosso (20).

Finally, I will call your attention to Europe. Three main groups of warlike peoples have contributed to its warrior aristocracies. The first consists of the peoples termed Celtic. One of the centres whence these people probably spread is in north-western Bohemia and south-eastern Saxony, in the neighbourhood of the Erz- and Fichtelgebirge (21). Then there are Asiatic peoples, such as the Huns, Turks, Magyars, of diverse race, but all originating from the region round Lake Baikal. Finally, there is the important group of Teutonic
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peoples, the members of which have originated from what may be termed the Scandinavian area; Goths, Vandals, Normans, Saxons, Danes, Lombards, Burgundians, Russ and others, who spread thence after the fall of the Roman Empire to dominate for many centuries vast regions, profoundly influencing thereby the development of civilisation in Europe (22).

So far as is revealed by this survey, the warlike peoples whose origins are known have certain features in common. In Africa the rulers of the warlike negro tribes are of a light-skinned stock which has emerged from the centres denoted on the map; in India the Aryans differed profoundly in race from the indigenous peoples whom they subjected; the castes which originated from the fusion are distinguished by physical characteristics as well as by occupation, for the members of the higher castes are light-skinned and taller in stature than the dark-skinned lower castes (23). In central Asia peoples of Iranian stock have been dominated by conquering dynasties of Mongolian origin (24): among the Mongolian peoples the dynasties in the various countries are, so far as is known, of alien origin; those of China have always come from Mongolia or Manchuria, those of Indo-China from Yunnan, and so forth. In Europe the Turks and Magyars are examples of warrior aristocracies who have subjugated peoples of entirely different races. And after the fall of the Roman Empire the Teutonic conquerors who swarmed over Europe ruled over Latin and Slavonic races, as well as over stocks kindred to themselves. It follows that warlike states are not, in those cases where precise information is available, the result of a process of growth, or of natural selection, but of superposition. Their aristocracies are not, as might be expected, composed of families which have proved their superiority over the rest of the community, but are the descendants of warlike strangers who have imposed themselves upon peoples who, in several cases, are known to have been of peaceful habits.

This survey has further shown that these warlike aristocracies have originated from certain regions, which are indicated on Sketch-Map No. 8. Moreover, the movements of these warrior aristocracies have taken place in historical times: that of the Bantu within the past thousand years or so; that of the Fulah a century or so ago; those of the Teutonic peoples at dates subsequent to the fall of
the Roman Empire; those of the Magyars and Turks into Europe at certain times within our era; that from Yunnan within the past two thousand years; and those from Manchuria and Mongolia at periods subsequent to the beginnings of precise historical records in China (25).

A broad survey of the problem has thus revealed the existence of three groups of peoples. There are the great empires of antiquity, warlike and ruled over by military aristocracies, the precise origins of which are not known. There are also warlike states whose origins in time and place are approximately established. These ruled over by military aristocracies which have emerged from certain centres have in some cases, to our certain knowledge, occupied lands hitherto tenanted by peaceful peoples—the third group—who have been forced thereby from their immemorial hunting grounds to occupy the outlying parts of the earth.

Sketch-Map No. 8 shows the relative distribution of these three groups, a distribution which is similar both in the land mass of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and in the continent of America. Although our knowledge of the origins of peoples is fragmentary, yet when shown in the form of a map it reveals an extraordinary degree of uniformity. The central regions have been the sites of Ancient Empires of the past: then, on the boundaries of these empires, are the centres whence the historical migrations of warlike peoples have set out: finally, on the outskirts there are peaceful peoples.

The survey of the warlike peoples showed that their aristocracies have emerged from the frontier kingdoms of the Ancient Empires to found warlike states further afield. Since the origin centres are adjacent in space to, and of later origin than, the Ancient Empires, it would seem from a consideration of the map that they have been formed from the Ancient Empires in exactly the same way as other warlike states further afield have originated from them. There is conclusive evidence that this is so. Speke, in his "Journal of Discovery of the Source of the Nile," says that the pastoral military aristocracies of the Bantu races probably arose as follows: "It may be presumed," he says, "that there once existed a foreign but compact government in Abyssinia, which becoming great and powerful, sent out armies on all sides of it, especially to the south, south-east and west, slave-hunt- and devastating wherever they went, and in process of time be-
coming too great for one ruler to control. Junior members of the royal family then, pushing their fortunes, dismembered themselves from the parent stock, created separate governments, and, for reasons which cannot be traced, changed their names” (26). This view has gained common acceptance as the explanation of the origin of the Bantu military aristocracies. The foreign government in Abyssinia had close relationships with the ruling dynasties of Egypt, for the King of Abyssinia, when he went to Egypt, officiated as high priest in the temple of the sun—and therefore of the Pharoahs at Heliopolis. The Bantu aristocracies are consequently, in a sense, ultimately of Egyptian origin (27). Sir H. Johnston indeed claims that many of them are obviously Egyptian in type, although they are entirely ignorant of the existence of such a country (28).

In the case of the regions adjoining China a precisely similar explanation is given by Professor E. H. Parker. He says that: “In nearly every case the Chinese trace the political beginnings of their frontier kingdoms to some Chinese exile or adventurer who, accommodating himself to local circumstances . . . succeeded in welding a series of homogeneous tribes into a nation. It is quite certain that this was later the case in Corea, Foochow, Canton, Yunnan, Kansuh, and Formosa, and this being so, there seems no good reason for rejecting the traditions that the same thing took place with the nomadic races of Tibet, Manchuria, and Mongolia.” He says further that, “The Huns have a tradition that about B.C. 1200 a royal personage, who had most probably been misconducting himself, fled to the nomads of the north and founded among them a sort of dynasty (29).” The kingdoms founded by the Aryan conquerors of India in the East Indian Archipelago were ruled over by members of the warrior caste, and from these kingdoms have gone out younger members of royal houses to intermarry with the indigenous peoples and to found war-like dynasties among the less civilised peoples of that region. In that way there has been produced a network of chiefs and ruling houses all ultimately descended from the warriors who entered the Panjab at the dawn of history (30).

In North America the rulers of the Natchez of Louisiana were aliens speaking a language different from that of their subjects, who claimed to have come from a place which, so far as can be told, was Mexico (31). There is thus at least one direct connecting link be-
tween the warrior aristocracies of Mexico and those of the North American Indians.

Although there is no direct testimony with regard to certain of the other regions, there is an immense mass of indirect evidence, to be submitted in due course to students of ethnology and comparative religion, which shows that the ruling families of the warlike frontier kingdoms are intimately connected with the dynasties of the Ancient Empires.

The evidence just quoted shows that the historical process here concerned has been one of expansion. The military aristocracies of the Ancient Empires, spreading out into regions beyond, have founded new states which in their turn have propagated others. The circumstances of this expansion present a problem of great importance. The boundaries between warlike peoples and the peaceful hunting tribes mark what is apparently the limit reached by the outward movement of migrant warriors. The profound cultural distinctions between the warlike peoples with social classes on one side of the boundary, and the peaceful democratic hunters on the other side, as exemplified, for instance, in North America, cannot, in the absence of intermediate stages of culture, be explained except on the hypothesis of a cultural movement which has stopped short at these borderlands.

The conditions of this movement must now be examined. The earlier part of the lecture has been devoted to the consideration of the belt between the region of the Ancient Empires and those of the peaceful hunters. The warlike peoples of this region whose origins are known with any definiteness are ruled over by aristocracies which have originated from certain centres situated near the boundaries of the Ancient Empires. It is now necessary to inquire into the condition of affairs in this vast region before the spread of the warrior aristocracies. Was this area in the days before the founding of the frontier kingdoms which have spread so widely in various directions occupied solely by peaceful tribes, or have the warlike peoples exterminated or subjected pre-existing warlike tribes?

One remarkable feature of the origin centres must particularly be noted. None of them are inside the boundary of the Ancient Empires which gave them birth. (The apparent exception of the Panjab is due to the fact that I have drawn the boundary in this region as it was at a date far subsequent to that of the first settlement of the
Aryan warrior aristocracy in this region.) The royal founders of these frontier kingdoms evidently could not establish domains of their own inside their ancestral empires, but had to seek their fortunes elsewhere.

It is also to be noted that, while in the region of the Ancient Empires the origins of states are obscure and uncertain, directly the boundary line is crossed comparative certainty obtains. For example, no one can yet demonstrate exactly whence came the Aryan invaders of the Panjab, but it is well known that their descendants founded kingdoms in other parts of India and in Java. The origin of the Chinese Empire is obscure, but, as has been seen, we have certain knowledge of the foundation of such kingdoms as Corea.

How is this profound contrast between the two regions to be explained?

It is well known that the region of the Ancient Empires was, while these states flourished, the scene of countless wars and campaigns, in the course of which the destruction of life and property was simply tremendous. Whole nations were annihilated, transported, or incorporated among the subjects of their conquerors. Consequently the histories of peoples such as the Hittites are practically lost, and can only partially be reconstructed from scattered fragments of evidence or from stray references in the literature of contemporaneous nations. Who can tell the beginnings of the Hebrews, the Medes, the Babylonians and many other peoples? And what other cause can be assigned for this widespread obscurity than the warlike nature of all these states which has led to their mutual destruction?

Outside the boundary the conditions are vastly different. The origin centre of the Scandinavian peoples was directly contiguous to regions occupied by peaceful peoples. And in North America the area of warlike peoples at the time of Columbus was adjacent to that of peaceful hunting peoples. In Africa the Bantu aristocracies founded kingdoms among the peaceful agricultural negroes of the region of the Great Lakes, and the expansion of the Bantu group gradually forced the peaceful Bushmen and Negritos out of their former hunting grounds. The conditions in Siberia are such as to warrant the belief that the origin centres round Lake Baikal were established in regions occupied by peaceful peoples. Indeed in the country round the headwaters of the Yenisei remnants of this early
population are still to be found (32). The gradual occupation of India by warlike Dravidian and Aryan peoples can be assumed with confidence. And the existence in the East Indian Archipelago of peaceful representatives of the earliest stocks which are known to have inhabited that region is conclusive evidence concerning the former condition in that region (33).

Some cases are doubtful. Such is that of South America, of which so little is known outside Peru. The Tibeto-Burman conquerors from Yunnan found in Indo-China a civilisation of Indian origin (34). It is therefore difficult to say from the consideration of this region alone whether its earliest inhabitants were peaceful. It must be remembered, however, that the wave of Indian culture which engulfed Indo-China also swept over the Archipelago, introducing warfare among many peoples of that region, but leaving certain remnants of the original peaceful inhabitants stranded high and dry above its high-water mark. So, in view of the close relationship which the peoples of Indo-China bear to those of the East Indian Archipelago, on the one hand, and to the Chinese on the other, they can be credited with the general peaceful disposition of these two last-named branches of the Mongolian stock. In this case there is a direct analogy with the Ancient Empires, for the displacement of one ruling caste by another has obscured the manner of origin of the earlier states.

I do not propose to discuss the problem of the Pacific, and shall content myself with remarking that warfare is everywhere associated with a military aristocracy of immigrant origin, so that there is no reason to believe that the conditions have been different from those obtaining elsewhere (35).

The general trend of the evidence, therefore, makes it highly probable that the frontier kingdoms were first founded among peaceful peoples, and that the initial outward expansion thence of military aristocracies was always into regions occupied by unwarlike tribes, part of whom were subjugated by them, and part of whom retreated before them until they occupied the regions indicated on the map. Such a mode of expansion is entirely consonant with the known facts. It accounts for the position of the centres, for the royal wanderers would have no difficulty in founding kingdoms in such circumstances. And it affords an explanation of the comparative
precision of the knowledge which we have of the origin of military aristocracies in the region outside the Ancient Empires. It must be remembered, too, that the existing remnants of the earliest stocks which are known to have inhabited these regions are invariably peaceful when untouched by higher cultural influences.

So, in whatever way the matter be regarded, the conclusion reached is that the dynastic expansion proceeded uniformly outward among peaceful peoples until certain limits were reached. The subtraction of the origin centres thus brings the borderland of peaceful peoples right up to the boundary of the Ancient Empires.

If the process of reversing history be continued, it follows that, if historical continuity be assumed, the states which gave rise to the frontier kingdoms must in their turn originally have been frontier kingdoms of pre-existing empires. The area of the Ancient Empires would therefore, as still earlier times were reached, contract, and that of the original peaceful peoples would expand. Finally, if this process be persisted in, there would remain a nucleus of one or more states to contest the priority of aristocratic government and warfare, and the rest of the world would be tenanted by peaceful peoples.

The examination of the manner of growth of warlike peoples has thus led to a conclusion entirely consonant with that already formulated as the result of the consideration of the earliest known forms of human culture. In both cases the evidence unhesitatingly points to a former time when men were entirely peaceful. The investigation just ended has shown that the ultimate problem is to discover the manner of origin of the aristocracies of the primordial warlike state or states.

If the introduction of warfare into all parts of the earth be due to a dynastic expansion which has its focus in one or more original states, it follows that all the dynasties of the earth would really be descended ultimately from one or more parent stocks, though intermarriage with men and women of all races would produce physical diversity. In spite of ramifications there will persist links of kinship connecting the dynasties of the different stages of the expansion. This is a matter which, although of crucial importance, must be left on one side. But all over the earth the ruling classes are exclusively associated with so many similar customs and beliefs that the assumption that they are all related is open to far less objections than any other. A continuity of that sort affords an entirely satisfactory explanation of the known facts.
The prominent part played by warfare and by aristocracies since historical records have been made has necessarily attracted the attention of students to the comparative exclusion of other less obtrusive features of the growth of civilisation, so that aristocratic institutions and warfare have come to be looked upon as the necessary concomitants of progress. That this is false will be apparent later.

One feature of the distribution of the origin centres must now be explained. They are few in number and are scattered in an apparently haphazard manner along the boundary. This apparent capriciousness is the result of a definite cause, which is revealed by Sketch-Map No. 9. The shading shows the gold-fields situated near the boundary. The small squares mark the area in the Baltic where amber is found, and the small circles denote pearl fisheries (36). The migration centres are therefore situated on gold-fields or in places where there existed pearls and amber, both of them highly prized and much sought after in antiquity. The founders of the military aristocracies, therefore, had a reason for settling in such places that will appeal to each one of us. They evidently appreciated the same forms of wealth as ourselves, and the extent of their appreciation is manifest.

It must not be imagined that the founders of these warlike states were pioneers of civilisation who set out on a journey of discovery and settled with a few followers in places where they found gold and other treasures. In the Yenisei region, in Mongolia and perhaps in Manchuria, in the Sudan and Northern Africa, in the Scandinavian region and Bohemia, there is the clearest evidence that the gold and amber of these regions were being exploited long before the arrival of any warrior aristocracies (37). In some cases the extent of the workings show that many centuries must have passed before the arrival of aristocratic strangers. The expansion of the Bantus was not into a region tenanted only by Bushmen, for it has already been said that a peaceful agricultural people had preceded them. In North America there are many signs of the presence of a population prior to the warlike Indians who lived there at the time of Columbus. These people built mounds which are strangely like those of Mexico. These mounds are grouped near streams, occurring but rarely in the open country, according to the map of Cyrus Thomas. They contain many pearls and are mainly concentrated in the valleys of the
Mississippi and Ohio, and on the gold-field of West Virginia, Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee. Their northernmost extension coincides with the distribution of old copper mines in Michigan and round Lake Superior. In short their distribution is precisely that which would be expected if their makers had wandered northwards from Mexico seeking pearls, gold, copper, and other things. Their gold-work is very similar to that made in Mexico (38).

The presence of gold and other forms of wealth in certain places just outside their boundaries seems to have attracted the peoples of the Ancient Empires. This point does not need labouring, for once gold is accepted as a standard of wealth, our modern experience tells us that such an expansion is inevitable. Gold rushes are not an exclusive feature of the last few centuries, for the men of a few thousand years ago were endowed with the same fatal greed for wealth that many of us possess. Once gold is accepted as a standard of value, nothing can prevent a world-wide movement in search of it.

The existence of earlier inhabitants in such regions suggests that the settlement of royal strangers from the Ancient Empires has not been influenced simply by the presence of gold and other forms of wealth. They appear to have sought not merely the wealth itself, but, what is much more important, a wealth-producing population which could be dominated and made to support them and supply them with what they desired. The dynasties in such places, in addition to controlling those who work the mines, always control the gold mines.

The further movements of these military aristocracies show that the desire for domination over other people is the great factor determining their movements. In Africa the warlike Bantus have moved on southwards, and were still subjugating the peaceful agricultural peoples that they had pushed in front of them when the Europeans arrived on the scene and caused the tide to reverse its direction. The Tibeto-Burman conquerors from Yunnan have moved southwards to dominate the peoples of the settled wealthy and fertile regions of Indo-China: the Aryan conquerors have spread over much of India and even into the East Indian Archipelago, to dominate the populations; the Fulahs have spread out to dominate the peaceful Hausas. The steppes of Russia and the mountains of Norway have had no attraction for the military aristocracies from the Scandinavian region, who overrun those
parts of Europe which were occupied by wealthy settled populations. And the warrior aristocracies of the Turks, Mongols, and Manchus did not conquer the icy wastes where there was much gold, but no one working it, but left them to the hunters and turned south to dominate the settled gold-producing agricultural populations of Central Asia.

The localisation of the empires of Mexico and Peru on the sites of the richest gold and silver mines of that continent, and contiguous to the most important pearl fisheries, suggests that they were founded by peoples who appreciated these forms of wealth. This at once opens up the question of outside influence in America, which cannot be considered here.

This all shows that where there is wealth, and a population to produce it, military adventurers will sooner or later arrive, bent on securing for themselves ease and luxury, and using their docile subjects as the means whereby to gain their ends. If the wealth be very great, the competition will be correspondingly keen, and war will succeed war until some ruling house is triumphant, or the rival dynasties so emasculate one another that they bring ruin and desolation upon the region for the possession of which they are struggling, and thus defeat their own ends. Thus it is apparent why so many military adventurers have struggled for the wealth of Bactria, which region they have in the end nearly depopulated, bringing ruin on themselves in the process.

Warfare thus appears to owe its origin to migrant military aristocracies. These have settled in places where there is an established population producing tangible and desired forms of wealth, and live the lives of social parasites. They force their subjects to feed, clothe, house, and amuse them, and to form armies to aid them in their quarrels with their rivals or in their plundering expeditions to secure the wealth of and to dominate surrounding peoples. Their subjects are looked upon by them as mere ciphers, creatures who do their will and serve their pleasure without questioning, passing, as the fortunes of war decide, from one ruler to another. The essence of warfare thus appears to lie in the fact that peoples will usually submit to such treatment without resistance. In short it can be said that: Warfare is the means whereby the members of a parasitic ruling class of alien origin endeavour, while exploiting their own subjects, to
dominate those surrounding peoples who produce wealth in a tangible and desired form.

This process of exploitation and domination of the many by the few will last until the common people of the earth recognise their condition and become aware of their power. The spread of education has caused the masses in every civilised country to develop a class consciousness which is destined eventually to produce the greatest revolution in the world’s history. The day when the peoples of Europe say to their rulers and dominant classes, “We will no longer work to maintain you: we care not one jot for your quarrels and refuse to be parties to them; we will not be your instruments to enable you to plunder our neighbours,” will see the end of war. The very patience with which the peoples of this earth have submitted to domination, and their resignation under the most unjust and cruel treatment, constitute powerful evidence of the innate peacefulness of mankind. And now that the democracies of civilised countries are uniting and voicing their sentiments, who can deny that they are on the side of peace, that they alone proclaim the brotherhood of man and the solidarity of interest which unites all branches of the human family?
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