ROOSEVELT GIVES ROMANES LECTURE

Former President of United States at Oxford

LORD CURZON IN THE CHAIR

Sheldonian Theater Crowded With Distinguished People When Amen Taits on Biological Analogies in History."

Oxford, England.—The Romanes lecture by Theodore Roosevelt, which was to have been delivered on May 18, but which was postponed on account of the death of King Edward, was given on June 7 by the distinguished American. The Sheldonian theater was filled to its capacity by notable persons and Oxford students and the lecture, which was on "Biological Analogies in History," was well received. Lord Curzon, chancellor of the university, presided.

In seeking to penetrate the causes of the problems that surround not only mankind but all life, both in the present and the past, said Mr. Roosevelt, we see strange analogies in the phenomena of life and death, of birth, growth and change, between those physical groups of animals and plants we designate as species, forms, races and the highly complex and composite entities which we describe our minds when we speak of nations and civilizations. In this study we are asked, and that has given science its present-day prominence, to see the histories of mankind must work in the scientific spirit and use the treasure-houses of science.

To illustrate, the lecturer took several instances of the development of new species and the extinction of others in the history of mammalian life, showing that in some cases the causes can be traced with considerable accuracy, and in other cases we cannot so much as hazard a guess as to why a given change occurred.

Analogies in Human History.

Continuing, Mr. Roosevelt said in part:

Now, as to all of these phenomena in the world of life, there are, at least, by inference, at most, certain analogies, in the history of human societies, in the history of the development and change, of the temporary, the transitory, the more or less permanent, groups of varying kind which form races or nations.

As in biology we see that history, a new form may result from the specialization of a long-established type, or a slowly-changing generation, from a single variant individual, for instance, when a barbaric race, or a barbaric nation, suddenly develops a more complex civilization and culture. That is what occurred, for instance, in western Europe when the Teutonic tribes, in the centuries later the Roman Empire, broke down from the north. All the modern countries of western Europe descended from the states created by those northern invaders. When they invaded Italy, Spain, Gaul, Britain, they found there, not a few, but that part or all of the people composing them were descended from races that hitherto had not been civilized at all, and that therefore they could not understand the career of civilized communities. The conquerors, the invaders, were, in the end, absorbed and completely absorbed by the inhabitants already in the land under the influence of which it was here that the new kingdoms first took shape. Nothing could be more interesting than to look into the conditions from which the leaders had come, and the strange and fascinating stories of the rise of communities with essentially the same environment, the same surroundings, though in those communities, the leaders, the rulers, the nobles, were an influence of a different and in some cases the new civilized nation which gradually developed and absorbed entirely the members of the same race which in the more primitive stage had been, in fact, a subjugated race or tribe. The same is true of the Slavs and the Slavonized Finns and Tartars, when an initiative of Scandinavian leaders from the north and Byzantine influences and culture from the south joined to produce the Russian empire, which, in turn, has held the Slav and Finnish and Tartar peoples, and has formed the mighty Russian empire of today.

"New" and "Young" Nations.

Again, the lecturer may represent merely a splitting off from a long-established nation, or, if it be a nation, a new nation to take rank with the nation to which it spoken of as a "young" and is recently spoken of as a "young" nation, but that term should always be used with a clear understanding of what it means. It is absolutely misleading and should be described by the same term in speaking of a civilized nation and a newly developed from barbarism. Carthage and Syracuse were new nations, and they were young in a sense, but the Greek or Phoenician was the same man as the Greek or Phoenician of the city in which he was born. To describe Western or Mantzia is a new community somewhat as the Greek colonies represented the ancestral type of civilization and culture from which they came, and yet they were of course, in a sense, a new force and that great changes are not produced by the mere fact that a civilized race is suddenly placed in surroundings where it has to adapt itself to new conditions. It does not necessarily work from nearly centuries before to the original lines of its ancestors, and yet, in the ancestral history is the same in each case. We speak of the phrase "young new people" in speaking of Canadian or Australian or South African nations. But how great a difference there is between from that in which we use it when speaking of the communities as those founded by the northmen and their descendants in the Norman conquest and those Normans, or the Saxons, or the Danish islands; we use it in an entirely different sense when we speak of the great Anglo-Saxon nation, which has spread around Warsaw, Riel, Mergland, and Melbourne, and in the Canadian prairies and the mighty forces struggled haltingly and painfully upward to become builders of a new civilization. The Anglo-Saxon, the Norman, the Dane, the Gaul, the Frank, the Slav, the Finn, the Tartar, the Hun, the Celt, the Iberian, the Teutonic, the Scandinavian, the Hellenic, the Latin, the Mongolian, the Chinese, the Japanese, the Hindu, the Mohammedan, the Buddhist, the Christian, the Jew, the Gentile