

SOME INTERESTING PHASES OF THE CON-
TACT OF RACES INDIVIDUALLY
AND *EN MASSE*.

BY ALEXANDER F. CHAMBERLAIN.

SINCE the beginnings of great human civilizations as contrasted with the simpler and more primitive life which the great majority of mankind outside of them continued to live *more suo*, one of the most interesting of all the phenomena of the race's history has been (as it still is) the contact, sometimes the shock and conflict, of these two expressions of the ideas and the ideals of man.

This contact has both a humorous and a pathetic aspect. It is humorous when we view the man of the "higher civilization," in spite of his learning, his scientific knowledge, and all those other "superior" things for which his "culture" stands, at his wit's end among a naive and simple people of another race; or, if we follow some savage or "young barbarian" in his first crude attempts to understand and to interpret the "civilization" in the midst of which he suddenly finds himself, often by no act or intention of his own.

It is humorous, too, when we can watch the efforts of two individuals of different races and of different stages or forms of human progress, one of whom (usually the representative of the "higher civilization") is endeavoring as speedily as may be to inform himself regarding the language, habits and customs, arts and industries, mythology, philosophy and religion of a more or less primitive people, and the other is either honestly engaged in the transmission of such material as he really possesses, or thinks he does, or, since delight in such action is generally human, is occupying his time with deceiving and gulling his inquisitor to his heart's content.

It is pathetic, when we have to consider the more or less wanton destruction of primitive races by the white race in particular, and the

failure of so many well-meant but often misdirected schemes for the social, religious or political welfare of "the lower races."

It is pathetic, too, to know some good and wise old "savage" who sees the coming doom of his race, recognizes its injustice, feels his utter inability to avert it, and goes to his grave with the firm conviction that the race which has so ruthlessly exterminated his own will one day itself meet destruction as swift and as ineluctable.

It is pathetic, again, when institutions in immemorial use among primitive peoples are abolished at a stroke by their white conquerors and no real substitute for them offered, the "higher" race contenting itself with an attempt to transplant ideas and institutions, which among themselves have never been thoroughly successful, nor have been shown to be of world-wide application.

SOME PITFALLS OF LANGUAGE.

The truth contained in the famous couplet of Pope

"A little knowledge is a dangerous thing,
Drink deep, or touch not the Pierian spring"

is borne in upon the investigator from all sides. Ignorance, on the part of inquirer or subject or of both, is naturally the source of many errors in recording the speech of primitive people, as it is also in other fields of research where savages (or children) are concerned. Vocabularies have not infrequently been recorded when the civilized investigator has had absolutely no personal knowledge of the language of the savage or barbarous people among whom he was for the time being, while, on the other hand, the primitive individual whom he was questioning had as little acquaintance with the stranger's mother-tongue, both using often, as their sole means of intercommunication, sign-language only half understood, or some jargon imperfectly controlled by both parties. Where "a little knowledge" is present there are many chances for error.

Some years ago, when beginning his studies of Algonkian philology among the Mississaga Indians of Skugog, Ontario, the writer had occasion to ask an Indian, supposed to know some English, what was the Mississaga word for "honey-comb." The answer was *amo pinokwan*; and, upon a second inquiry, *amo sisibakwat pinokwan*. Now, *pinokwan* signifies "comb," but one used for the hair, and not the sort to be found in hives; *amo* means "bee"; and *sisibakwat* is "sugar." Both expressions are, therefore, linguistic as well as biological nonsense. The Indian, with imperfect *Sprach-*

gefühl for both his mother-tongue and the foreign language, or perhaps with intent to deceive the white man, just "translated" the word *honey-comb* literally, and let it go at that.

Absolute, intentional deceit has often occurred. The "savage" sometimes coins words or phrases to please or to delude his questioner. The same thing happens in child-language, where the young human takes delight in deceiving his adult observer, or in catering in fanciful mode to his unfortunate suggestions. Child-study could, doubtless, furnish parallels for the experience of the scientist among a certain Polynesian tribe, who, instead of receiving as he thought the higher numerals in their language, really obtained many obscene and indecent expressions, all of which, of course, went duly on record.

Sometimes, too, the investigator chances to get among the young people first, and, taking down his vocabulary from them only, ultimately discovers that he has really recorded the most colloquial terms, and not the real language of the people at all. For, in the uncivilized, as well as in the civilized world, youth has its own slang and kindred forms of speech. If, for instance, a white man obtained from the Lower Kootenay Indian youth the word for "horse," it would be *k'atla*, and not the imposing *k'itlk'atlahaatltsin* of their elders. But the Kootenay youth's abbreviation of the long word is after all no different from the cuts in our own English that have given us such monosyllables as "cab" and "mob," which once were but slang terms. Nevertheless, to record them as in polite usage when they were mere slang would be a misstatement of fact which the inexperienced investigator among savage and barbarous peoples is often liable to make.

In obtaining words relating to the human or animal body, its parts, functions, etc., the more or less ignorant investigator, innocent of the speech of the people he is studying, has recourse to the method of physical interrogation, i. e., he points to, or touches, that thing of which he desires to record the name. In this way, many amusing and embarrassing mistakes have occurred. Even good investigators cannot always escape such errors. Thus, in a vocabulary of the Kootenay language recorded by Dr. G. M. Dawson, the word for "armpit" is given as *a-kit-hloo-e*. Now, *ah-kit-hloo-e* (properly, *aqkitkwi*) really signifies "heart." In this case, the person questioning the Indian touched him, or himself, somewhere under the left shoulder near the heart, and received the Kootenay name for that organ. Had the physical indication been more exact, the correct term might have been obtained.

In the same vocabulary, the word given for "bone" is *a-ko-klá*, evidently the Kootenay *aqkoktla*, "skin." Here the investigator touched an Indian, or himself, on some part of the body, or on one of its members, where a bone was prominent (e. g., the wrist), and the Indian, understanding him to have touched or pinched the skin and not the bone, gave him the term in his language for the former and not for the latter.

The writer himself had two very interesting experiences along very similar lines, while among the Kootenay Indians. One day, in an endeavor to obtain the Kootenay word for "pinch," he pinched an Indian on the flesh of his body, whereupon the Indian said at once *kakoktla*, i. e., "my skin." This was all right from his point of view, but had nothing at all to do with "pinch," an idea quite ignored in this answer. The Indian was attending to his own feelings and his own personality, and to him the "pinch" administered to his skin was but one way of asking its name.

On another occasion, when in search of the Kootenay word for "tickle," I picked up a feather and with it tickled an Indian upon the bare chest. Asking then for the Kootenay term, I received the answer, *kisukitlqoine*, a word which signifies literally, "the body is (or feels) good," and, freely, "the bodily sensation is pleasant." Here the Indian named the sensation as he felt it, and not the action as performed by some one else. The fact recorded in the word employed by him was thus rather psychological (i. e., to be tickled on the body with a feather is pleasurable) than linguistic. Had the investigator, in this case, not possessed some knowledge of the morphology and grammar of the Kootenay language, the word *kisukitlqoine* might have gone on record as the Indian term for "tickle," with no hint whatever of its psychological significance and implication. Out of it, however, a good Kootenay word for "tickle" could easily arise.

Not all human languages are characterized by the same degree of generalization or the same system of classification of actions, movements, etc.; nor do all name by one and the same term an identical act performed by a man, a beast, a bird, a fish and an insect; nor, again, is the same organ (a *tail*, for example) named by one and the same word in all languages when belonging to a beast, a bird, or a fish. Not only are distinctions in these respects often made between man and the rest of the animal creation, but also sometimes between mammals and birds, and between these and fishes.

An investigator among certain American Indian peoples for the

first time, might observe a fish swimming along in the river at his feet, ask some native about it, and duly receive a word expressing the act performed, which he would set down in his vocabulary as the Indian term for "swim." Not until he had been in swimming himself, or had seen an Indian do so, and heard the others describing the act of the man, or until he had at leisure looked over the texts he had succeeded in recording and had become more or less acquainted with the genius of that particular language, would he know that his word for "swim" referred solely to the act of swimming as performed by a fish, and was in no way inclusive, as in our English "swim," of that act as performed by a man, a bear, a duck, a fish, an insect, etc., to say nothing of its use as a synonym of "float."

In some languages the foot of a man and that of any one of the other mammals may be expressed by the same word and the hand by another, whereas the foot of a bird requires an entirely different term. In the Kootenay language, e. g., there are three different words for "tail" according as the reference is to a beast, a bird, or a fish. Nor can one, in that form of human speech, use, as we do in English, one word indiscriminately for hair of a man's head, and hair of one of the lower animals. Equally incorrect would it be, in some languages, to follow the English practice of applying the one word "cold," to water, the atmosphere, metal of any sort, and bodily sensation; and the same thing is true with regard to "warm." Curiously enough, however, we find sometimes that the words for "cold" and "warm" are not always equally restricted or diversified, for it may happen in certain languages that one of these terms more approaches our own English usage, while the other exemplifies thoroughly the point under discussion here.

Among ourselves, children sometimes wonder why a cup of "tea" wet and a spoonful of "tea" dry should be named by just the same word; and "coffee" appears to them under three different forms, whole, ground, and liquid. We lighten the matter somewhat, but do not settle it completely, by speaking of "tea leaves" and "coffee beans," using the same analogies as are employed by primitive peoples. An investigator, meeting a Kootenay Indian at a grocery-store and asking from him the words for "tea" and "coffee" would receive as answers, respectively, *aqkotlakpe'k* and *tsam'na*, the first signifying literally "leaf," and the latter "bean." But enjoying the hospitality of some Indian lodge, and inquiring the names of the liquid "tea" and "coffee" there dispensed, he would get the words *aqkotlakpe'kmatlak* and *k'komk'akitttel*, since

there exist, apparently, no Kootenay terms of a nature indefinite and general to the same extent as our English "tea" and "coffee." The investigator needs always be on the watch for the different ways in which things denoted in his own language by a single comprehensive and loosely-used term, may present themselves to the native mind, and hence require separate and definite naming. In the matter of "leaf" and "bean" the Kootenay Indian is of one and the same thought with ourselves, but differs from us when it comes to the loose generalizing so common in the languages of civilized man. It would be natural with us to assume that to an object of foreign origin or manufacture, identical, or practically so, with one of native origin or home manufacture, uncivilized individuals would attach the same name. But this assumption is not always safe when dealing with savage and barbarous tribes, who often take advantage of peculiarities and characteristics too small or too insignificant to be thought of any importance by "civilized" people, to distinguish neatly and clearly what appear to the latter as incidental and are assigned but one name.

To the white trader of the eighteenth century the tobacco pipe of the Indian and his own (imported from Europe) were equally "pipes," and minor qualities of form and the like did not bother him at all. But the Nipissing Indians of the Algonkian stock were quick to notice the clay pipe of European manufacture had a little projection at the bottom of the bowl on the outside, and named them *tisicwipwagan*, or "pipe with a navel," thus marking them off their own tobacco pipe, *opwagan*. So the word for "pipe" an investigator might receive from these Indians would be different, according as he inquired after the native or the exotic article, or obtained the term he recorded from one who was familiar with both, or from one who had seen the pipe of foreign manufacture.

The savage and the barbarian, who are by no means devoid of a sense of humor, often make merry over the blunders of the white man amid the intricacies of aboriginal speech, as did a Kootenay, who brought the writer a little "tamarack-tree" instead of the "brook-trout" for which he had asked, or rather thought he had. In the Kootenay language a "tamarack" is called *k'ustet* and a "brook-trout" *k'ustet*, just a twist in the guttural to mark the difference.

Perhaps the most remarkable experience of an individual of the white race in connection with the language of a primitive people is that of Dr. E. Uricoechea, the South American philologist. When he went among the Indians of the Rio Meta in Colombia he had

in hand written texts in their language, but found it impossible to make himself understood by means of these as he pronounced them. So he sought out an interpreter, and with him learned the language, or at least a part of it, repeating and repeating words and phrases until he was assured that he had the right pronunciation. Then he went again to the Indians, but fared not much better than at first. Returning to his teacher, he found that even he could not understand them when his pupil used the words and phrases he had taught him. The *Sprachgefühl* of the white man was not delicate or sensitive enough to discriminate and to retain the numerous fine distinctions in sound which came easily to the trained apperception of the Indian.

SOME SOCIOLOGICAL MANIFESTATIONS.

Whenever two races and two forms of culture meet or clash there are sure to be some interesting sociological results, especially with regard to manner and customs. Take *scalping* for example. It is surely no compliment to our race that Dr. G. Friederici devotes some forty pages of his recent monograph on scalping and related war-customs in primitive America to the consideration of "the increase in the custom of scalping through the influence of the European colonists." But this title is justified by the facts of history. Over certain large areas in North America the practice of scalping is shown to be of comparatively recent vogue and origin, and in several localities its extension is the result of white contact. The introduction of guns (weapons so much more effective than bows and arrows, etc.) among Indian tribes who were already in the habit of scalping their enemies increased greatly the number of the killed and the severely wounded in battles and massacres, and therefore the chances of obtaining scalps.

The possession of the new weapons likewise added to the frequency of intertribal disputes and to the fatalities in the combats arising from them.

Another factor leading to an increase in the practice of scalping of an intensive sort was the sale and presentation to the Indians of the "scalping-knife," a keen-bladed instrument far superior for the required purpose to anything they had previously had in their possession, and this facilitated immensely the scalping process. Not only did the whites encourage Indian tribes to scalp each other, but the various nations of white men in North America from time to time paid the aborigines to scalp their white adversaries.

Both English and French seem to have offered premiums for the scalps of red men and white. Those of men, women and children were all paid for at various times in the history of French and English colonization, and the hope of such material reward was doubtless one of the efficient promoters of not a few horrible massacres where neither sex nor age was spared. No wonder that, in possession of the gun and the iron knife and encouraged by the scalp-premium, savages with whom scalping had previously not amounted to very much now abandoned themselves to it with a zeal and a dexterity that soon equaled those of tribes to whom the custom was no new thing, and with whom the new weapons merely meant added facilities in the practice of an old-time device. And some of the whites even took to scalping, becoming not less expert at it than the Indians themselves. This was true of many backwoodsmen and "pioneers," who are said even to have taught non-scalping Indians sometimes to scalp. The cumulative effect of all these new factors upon the extension of the custom of scalping among the Indians of North America was great indeed.

The custom of smoking tobacco and the cultivation of that narcotic on a large scale were unknown to many American Indian tribes until the enterprise of Virginian tobacco-planters and European pipe-manufacturers made extension of trade a necessity, or until the Indians with whom tobacco-smoking had been more or less a somewhat limited ceremonial, followed white example and made it one of the common every-day pleasures and occupations of life.

The use of intoxicating liquors is another case in point. It is well known that much of the drunkenness now prevalent among the "lower" races is due to contact with so-called higher civilization. But even in cases where the aborigines possessed intoxicating drinks before the advent of the whites the coming of the latter has not infrequently increased the amount of drunkenness among them.

The wild Tobas of the Paraguay border afford a curious example of this result. In pre-Columbian times the Indians of this part of South America had learned to extract from the *algorabo* fruit an intoxicating liquor of considerable potency, and annually at the period of harvesting this fruit, they were accustomed to get drunk, at a festival held for that special purpose. The introduction of civilization, with its new intoxicants, has enabled the Tobas to get royally drunk at least once a week, Sunday serving them principally as the occasion of such debauches. Fric, who visited these Indians in 1903-1904, testifies to the noisy and quarrelsome character

of these weekly sprees that have now taken the place of the old annual "drunks."

With not a few savage and barbarous peoples the use of such strong drinks as they possessed was confined to the male half of the community, indulgence in these things being tabu for women. The advent of civilization, and the breaking down of old native customs as a result, has not infrequently caused the extension of drinking customs to members of the other sex with very disastrous consequences. Our race has been from time to time responsible for the appearance of several kinds of "new woman" among primitive peoples, and very rarely have these been an improvement upon the old.

The complete history of the attempt to impose Sunday as a day of rest upon certain savage and barbarous peoples would be a document of great interest and value. In lands where nature has provided abundantly for man, and where there is little need, if any, for toil on his part, as is the case in certain tropical and semi-tropical environments in both hemispheres, the setting aside of Sunday as "a day of rest" seems almost like putting a premium upon human laziness in circumstances under which it is difficult enough, in every way, during the remainder of the week, to stimulate or to induce any sort of activity of body or of mind. In some regions also the result has been to emphasize still further the already unfair division of labor between the sexes by allowing the male half of the population to escape with even less healthful exertion than before. In the language of the Cherokee Indians, one of the names for Sunday is said to signify, "when everybody does nothing all day long."

This thoroughgoing appreciation of the day of rest has a curious origin. Among these Indians Saturday afternoon was the time for their great ball-play, and the strenuous game was prepared for by a dance on the night previous. Thus did Sunday come to be a real day of rest. Another side of the question was revealed among one of the many tribes of Polynesia. This people had always been a very hospitable sort, and their latch-string was always out, strangers being welcome at all times. This naturally caused a great deal of work on every day of the week, and Sunday, like the others, was often full of feasting and entertainment. This did not suit the missionaries of Sabbatarian tendencies, who desired to have Sunday a day of complete rest from secular activities. The net result of a strict observance of Sunday here was, therefore, to reduce native hospitality by more than one-seventh, and, eventually, perhaps, to sap its strength altogether.

The representatives of the "higher civilization" sometimes achieve reforms among uncivilized tribes or peoples, for reasons they little dream of. A change in manners and customs is once in a while effected on a very strange basis and one in which the foreign missionary or teacher has had no intentional part. That all call for soap indicates an instinct for cleanliness, or the dawn of such at least, is the first thought that comes into the mind of the enlightened member of the white race on hearing of the demand for this article on the part of some far-off savage people. But the situation sometimes arises not through hygienic but through merely cosmetic or ornamental reasons. That the primitive individual "will not be happy till he gets it" is plain enough, but what inspires him is not a desire to be clean, but his knowledge of a new way to make himself more attractive. Thus Van der Sande reports that he once washed half the face of a young Papuan of the Manikion tribe in New Guinea with soap, with the result that the operation seemed to "bring on a lighter hue." The young man was quite pleased with this and walked about somewhat proudly conscious of a newly-acquired charm or ornament. The subsequent demand on the part of the natives for soap was, therefore, not attributable to the desire to be clean, but to the feeling for personal beauty or adornment.

In another region of New Guinea a sudden demand for washing-blue was entirely unconnected with any improvement in the laundry facilities of the people in question, but arose solely from the fact that they had discovered the excellent quality it possessed for tinting the human skin. Here, again, the motive was cosmetic, not hygienic. And many other products of our "higher" culture have in like manner among savage and barbarous peoples been put to uses strange to us but to them entirely reasonable.

SOME PEDAGOGICAL DIFFICULTIES.

The attempts of the higher races to confer upon the lower the blessings of their own civilization reveal many humorous and many pathetic situations in which often the prejudice of the civilized teacher in favor of his inherited culture is greater than his wit and wisdom in overcoming the objections of his uncivilized pupils. It is too commonly the case that the representatives of our superior culture decree that there is but one way of conferring the new status upon the savage or the barbarian, and that way must be gone through, though the primitive heavens fall.

A good deal depends on how the young "savage" is introduced

to the ideals of our race. Take, for example, the following instance of contact between the white and the red races, which comes from a certain Indian school in the Canadian Northwest. It was the custom to cut the hair of all boys as soon as they entered the institution. One boy objected, even more strenuously than his fellows to this treatment. One day, running his hands over his close-cropped head, he said to his teacher: "Me no like this. Just like Debbil." In astonishment the teacher exclaimed, "Why, what do you mean?" For answer the Indian boy turned over the pages of the illustrated Bible that lay before him and observed: "See, all good men long hair, only Debbil short!" And so it was. The patriarchs, kings, prophets and other estimable characters in sacred history all had long hair, while Satan, the personification of evil, was distinguished either by having his hair close-cropped or else had none at all. Resemblance to the Devil is hardly the best idea to cause to spring up in the mind of one who has newly come into the pale of our modern Christian culture.

First contacts, such as that just noted, often decide for good or ill the whole course of education in the case of the individual. The really human points of contact and the psychological moment are the things of supreme importance. Missionaries, in their efforts to convert and to instruct the heathen by means of sermons based upon particular Bible texts, are often guilty of the most grievous tactical errors, if of nothing worse.

There is on record (on the authority of the Rev. E. R. Young, a Methodist missionary among the Indians of the Canadian Northwest), the instance of a missionary in that region, who took as his text: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest." His congregation were treated to a discourse on life and labor, and particular stress was laid upon the fact that all *men* had to toil and bear heavy burdens. This was among a tribe with whom the women were the burden-bearers *par excellence*, and the men prided themselves as being above work. The result was a primitive indignation meeting on the part of the men after the service had ended, and the preacher was thus advised: "Let him go to the *squaws* with that sort of talk. *They carry the burdens and do the hard work.* Such stuff as that is for women, not for men."

This missionary had no more success than had another in the Japanese field, who is reported to have discoursed eloquently from the text: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife" (Mark x. 5)—and that in a country where

filial obedience (nay, even filial servitude) constituted the primal virtue. This is one of the texts in our Bible, seized upon by the opponents of the foreign religion, in their efforts to prove it immoral and antagonistic to the fundamental principles of Japanese society.

Of course most of these mistakes of missionaries are due to ignorance or mere indiscretion, but it is sometimes difficult to accept such excuses when we remember what has occurred not infrequently where the congregation consisted wholly of white people, or nearly so, as has been the case, for instance, in the Canadian and American Northwest. The writer himself heard an Episcopalian minister, who at certain stated times visited the settlements in parts of northern Idaho and southeastern British Columbia, preach a sermon from the text: "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. iii. 12), a sermon which was really an arraignment of woman as responsible for so many of the sins and the shortcomings of mankind. The audience, gathered in the large room of the only inn for 100 miles each way, consisted of some 20 whites, 3 Chinamen and 4 or 5 Indians. Of the white men all but two were bachelors, and in all that region the white women could have been counted on the fingers of one hand. Women, indeed, were at such a premium that good-looking squaws found but little difficulty in obtaining white husbands. And yet a minister of the Gospel could preach such a sermon in such a place!

Humorous, rather than pathetic, was the situation of another missionary, who in his innocence began, as he thought, his discourse with the words, "Noble red men, children of the forest!" But what he really said was: "Great painted people, rabbits!" for at the time of his advent "children of the forest" happened to be a colloquial term for rabbits. Instead of using whatever might have been the Indian expression corresponding to our "red men" as applied to the American aborigines, he had employed native words which could signify only "painted (red) people," and the words used for "noble" meant simply "great" or "large." What strange notions of our civilization and its ideals primitive peoples must sometimes get from listening to the accounts of it given by such representatives!

The teacher has about as many troubles of this sort as has the preacher. Witness an example from negro Africa. The progress of education in mission schools in various parts of the world has led to the inclusion of physiology in the curriculum of some of

them, as, for instance, the Training Institute for Boys maintained by the Baptists at Yakusu among the Lokele, a Bantu tribe, in the region of Stanley Falls on the Upper Congo. The attempt to give these young negroes some elementary physiological ideas met with no success on account of the peculiar views of the natives concerning the human stomach, the discussion and representation of which figures so largely in our scientific treatises and text-books. The Lokele are of opinion that good men do not have stomachs at all, the process of digestion being all performed in the intestines. Absence of a stomach is the reason why people are able to come off unscathed when made to submit to the ordeals by poison, etc., in vogue among these African tribes. Only evil men, possessed by some bad spirit, have ever a stomach, which is regarded as the abiding-place of the spirit of evil himself, something thoroughly unlucky and ill-omened for any human being to harbor within his body. No argument availed to remove or weaken this curious idea. If the teachers pointed out that certain men, who had died or been killed within the knowledge of all, had stomachs, the answer was that it was their very possession of the organ in question that had been their undoing. Nor did experiments with such animals as goats, monkeys, etc., settle the matter. Here the reply was made that facts derived from the observation of animals could in no way prove anything with respect to human beings.

One sees at a glance the impossibility of convincing the Lokele of the evil results of the consumption of alcohol by our familiar American method of the pictorial display of the effects of its consumption upon the human stomach. Good, strong men, having no stomachs, must, in the opinion of these negroes, be entirely immune from such consequences.

Another interesting item comes from far-off New Zealand. In spite of the fierce battles of other days between the Polynesian aborigines and the English colonists, they are still a long way from becoming extinct. In 1908 there were over 9000 Maori children in attendance at various educational institutions, including some 4000 in the native village schools. In many of these schools the attempt has been made by white teachers to popularize the study of agriculture among the Maoris by the introduction of school-gardens for the children, an experiment very successful in America and elsewhere. But all efforts to induce the Maori children to take up the school-garden utterly failed. The reason for this is rather curious. To the Maoris all sorts of manure are tabu, and they will not even use products of the fields fertilized by such means. Hence

no little Maori could ever "garden" like his white companion or friend. Not even the observed fact that the manured garden-plots of the whites produced four times as many pounds of potatoes as the unmanured availed anything to weaken the tabu, although some of the more conservative Maori adults wondered to see the manured plots produce anything at all. Thus an ancient tabu of manure affected the curriculum of the modern school-system of New Zealand.