

61

IN THE

District Court of the United States

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TATOS O. CARTOZIAN,

Defendant.

DEPOSITION taken in accordance with notice served by Solicitors for Defendant, before PHILIP ADLER, Notary Public, at the office of GUTHRIE, JEROME, RAND & KRESEL, No. 37 Wall Street, in the City of New York, on Friday, 11th April, 1924, at 2:30 oclock p. m.

APPEARANCES:

WILLIAM D. GUTHRIE, Esq., of the firm of Guthrie, Jerome, Rand & Kresel, of New York City, representing MESSRS. McCAMANT & THOMPSON, of Portland, Oregon, Solicitors for the Defendant.

HERMAN L. FALK, Esq., Assistant to the United States Attorney, Southern District of New York, appearing for the Plaintiff, United States of America.

It was stipulated that the testimony of the witness shall be taken by WILLIAM F. SMART, as Stenographer, and that the same be transmitted by typewriting.

The Notary Public, PHILIP ADLER, thereupon cautioned and duly swore the witness to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and the witness was thereupon examined as follows:

DR. FRANZ BOAS, called as a witness on behalf of the Defendant, testified as follows:

Direct examination by Mr. Guthrie:

Q. Will you please state your name, age, residence and occupation? A. Franz Boas, age 65; residence, Grantwood, New Jersey; occupation, Professor of Anthropology, Columbia University.

Q. Please also state what academic and professional positions past and present you have held? A. Lecturer in Anthropology, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, from 1889 to 1892. Anthropologist to the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, from 1892 to 1894. Lecturer in Anthropology, Columbia University, from 1895 to 1899; Professor in Columbia University since 1899. Assistant Curator of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, 1895 to 1901, and Curator from 1901 to 1905. Philologist to the United States Bureau of Ethnology, 1901 to 1918, I think; Professor of Anthropology, University of Mexico, 1910 to 1912. Director of the International School of American Archeology and Ethnology, Mexico, 1912. That is all I now recall.

Q. Will you likewise kindly give us any degrees that you have and membership in scientific bodies? A. Doctor

of Philosophy, Kiel University, Germany, 1881. Doctor of Laws, Clark University, Worcester, Mass., Doctor of Science, an honorary degree from Oxford University, England, and Honorary Doctor of Philosophy, Graz University. Membership as to societies: I am a member of the National Academy of Science, U. S. of America; the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia; the Academy of Arts and Sciences, Boston; the American Ethnological Society, of which I was President for two years and of which I am now editor; the American Anthropological Association, of which I was President for two years; the New York Academy of Sciences, of which I was President for one year; the American Association for the Advancement of Science, of which I was President of the Anthropological Section twice; the American Folk Lore Society of which I was President and am now editor; the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts, and the American Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Philadelphia. I am Honorary Member of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, of the Société des Américanistes in Paris; member of the Folk-Lore Society in London, and Corresponding Member of the Anthropological Societies of Washington, D. C., Paris, Brussels, Florence, Rome, Moscow, Stockholm, Berlin. I can not think of any others just now. I am also Corresponding Member of the Academies of Sciences of Berlin, Vienna and Munich.

Q. Have any works by you on this subject of Anthropology or Ethnology been published? A. Yes, quite a

good many. I have a printed list here, issued in 1906, an extract from a book dedicated to me by Anthropologists from all over the world, on the 25th Anniversary of my doctorate. I wrote volume No. 38 for the Immigration Commission.

By MR. FALK:

Q. That is the Immigration Committee of Congress?

A. Yes.

By MR. GUTHRIE:

Q. What date was that? A. 1910. It was a volume entitled "Changes in the Bodily Form of Immigrants", and I also wrote—

By MR. FALK:

Q. Was that for the House Committee or Senate Committee? A. The Senate Committee, of which Senator Dillingham was Chairman. I wrote the 31st and 35th Annual Reports of the Bureau of American Ethnology. I wrote "Studies on the Growth of Children" in two volumes of the Reports of the United States Commissioner of Education; Bulletins 20, 26, 40 and 59, and one or two others I have forgotten, for the Bureau of American Ethnology, which is part of the Smithsonian Institution, a Government Bureau. Also, I wrote reports on the Indians of Canada for the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

Q. Have you made a special study of the origin and history and racial grouping of Armenians? A. Yes, as part of my general work.

Q. Have you ever been to Armenia? A. No.

Q. Are you familiar with the general geography of Armenia? A. Yes, surely.

Q. Where is the city of Sivas located? A. In Western Armenia, towards Anatolia.

Q. Are you familiar with the use of the terms "White" and "Caucasian" in the eighteenth century, as shown by the writings of recognized authorities of that century? A. Yes. The term "Caucasian" dates back to 1795. It was coined by Blumenbach. It does not occur in his classification of the human race in the first edition of his dissertation of 1775, nor in the second edition (1781). In the second edition, he did not use the term "Caucasian", but the general grouping of races was not changed. Later on, in 1795, he used the term "Caucasian" for the first time, and in defining the "Caucasian" type he used the description "colore albo" in Latin, which means of white color. But the term "white" was in common use before that time. It appears, for instance, in a Thesis by John Hunter of Edinburgh, 1775, in which he speaks of the white race in such a way that it appears quite clearly that this was the common term by which at that time the whites were known. I think it will be helpful to quote from Murray's Dictionary, the most authoritative source on the English language. It is as follows: "Caucasian: of or belonging to the region of the Caucasus; a name given by Blumenbach (ante 1800) to the 'white' race of mankind, which he derived from the region of the Caucasus; hence the substantive, a member of this family, an Indo-European (now practically discarded)." In other words, the term "Caucasian" came into use in 1795, and has spread very

rapidly, and before that time we find almost everywhere simply the term "White" used popularly. Linné used the term "European", but not confined to the geographical unit Europe, but extending over the limits of that continent. He applied it not only to people living in Europe, but also to those in neighboring countries, and he describes them as of white color.

Q. And would that comprehend, as within the white race, the inhabitants of Asia Minor? A. Yes, surely. Perhaps I might add here that the reason that Blumenbach used the term "Caucasian" was because he thought that the purest type of the white was found in the region just next to Armenia. I may perhaps read that quotation to you.

MR. FALK: Not in Armenia, but next to Armenia?

THE WITNESS (continuing): Yes, I mean the same type as the Armenians. (Reading from translation of Blumenbach) "*Caucasian Variety*. I have taken the name of this variety from Mount Caucasus, both because its neighborhood and especially its southern slope, produces the most beautiful race of men, I mean the Georgian; and because all physiological reasons converge to this, that in that region, if anywhere, it seems we ought with the greatest probability to place the autochthones of mankind."

We have here in this region (referring to map "Defendant's Exhibit No. 1" and pointing out the southern slope of the Caucasians, extending into Armenia), the Georgians, and the same type practically in this district

(marked "Armenia" on the map 1, pointing out the northern part of Armenia).

Q. In common speech, prior to 1795, in Europe, and in the United States, what was the usual or popular term used in describing the inhabitants of Europe?

MR. FALK: The question is objected to as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, and of course not based on the personal knowledge of this witness. What he can describe now will simply be from some book.

A. The only way in which the popular use of the term "white" can be ascertained is through its use in literature. I find that in speaking about the people of Europe, and the neighboring parts of the adjoining continents, one of two terms is always used, either "White" or "European". "European" being here, of course, extended over the limits of the continent. That is to say, in speaking of Europeans, the Ural Mountains, the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus would not be considered as the strict limits of Europe. The term "Whites" or "Europeans" would be used for inhabitants of countries somewhat beyond those limits. In books, as for instance in the paper by Hunter, from which I quoted before, the term "White" is used without any explanation. This usage proves that the term was commonly used, and it included the inhabitants of Armenia.

Q. So that the term "white" so far as one can gather from the times of the literature of the times referred to, meant the ordinary inhabitants of Europe and adjacent parts of Asia? A. Yes. We must clearly understand

that in those times of difficult transportation, distant countries were not so well known as they might be now; and for that reason, when people spoke for instance, of the whites in what was Turkey at that time, they would not confine the term by any means to Europe, but would take in just as well Asia Minor and adjoining countries. The same way when they talked about the Russians, they would not draw a sharp line at the Ural Mountains, but they would mean just as well the adjoining parts of Asia. The terms "Europeans" and "Whites" covered more than the people of Europe in a geographical sense, and it included Armenia.

Q. Have you, in the course of your studies, had occasion to examine the historical data as to the presence of representatives of the various European and adjacent countries in the United States towards the end of the eighteenth century? A. The information in regard to that point, is of course, not very satisfactory, because so far as I know, we have only since 1820, a census of immigration by which is noted exactly where people came from. In the period from 1820-1830 we had an immigration of 143,000 more or less, I am not quite certain of the number, and of those over 16 per cent came from regions which did not belong to northwestern Europe; that is to say did not come from England and Germany and Holland and the adjoining countries. Of this amount 0.3 per cent belonged to Italy, Hungary and the whole southeastern Europe; so that the total number of people from southeastern Europe who came in during that time must have been about 500. From other sources we know per-

fectly well that there were then Frenchmen, Spaniards and Hungarians, and people from all nationalities of Europe in the United States, but I am not in a position to say exactly how many were here.

Q. But that is true, is it not, of the period of the Revolution and the period directly preceding 1790? A. Yes, as well as preceding the Revolution.

Q. We all know that there was then a large French population on the continent? A. Surely.

Q. There was also a German representation? A. Yes.

Q. There was also a large Spanish representation? A. Yes; but my point is that I cannot give the number of individuals representing those nationalities at that time. That they were here is of course, common knowledge.

Q. But can you state, Professor, that reliable historic and scientific works show that there were present in the United States, prior to 1790, substantial numbers of French, Spanish, German, Dutch and Italians, Swiss as well as immigrants from northwestern Europe and the British Isles? A. Certainly.

Q. Will you please state whether or not, what you have referred to as the "White" or "European", or "Caucasian race" in scientific nomenclature, is generally now classified in sub-divisions, and if so, what are those sub-divisions? A. There is a very simple division current at the present time which we find particularly in almost every modern anthropological book. It is the division into a northern Nordic group, a central European or Alpine group, and a southern or Mediterranean

group. Naturally there are local varieties in each of these groups; but as a matter of convenience the population of a certain area can be so classified. May I perhaps make one additional remark here? I believe, to some extent a terminology of this kind is misleading, in so far as it gives the impression that the northwest Europeans who are at this time frequently described as Nordic, are all blond and blue-eyed. This, of course, is not correct; for we know perfectly well that in a country like Scotland, there are a great many dark people, who, in their general appearance, might just as well belong to central Europe. In other words, if I were asked the question:— Have we in Europe a certain area in which certain types occur exclusively—I should have to say, no; and therefore the immigration into the United States, for instance, during the years of the eighteenth century, when the United States was still an English Colony, would not by any means be confined to the blonds of northwestern Europe, but would include a great many people, who might be just as well what we call Alpine. The types are not located in circumscribed areas. When we have northwest-European immigrants, there are blonds and blue-eyed individuals among them, but also those of Alpine type.

Q. So that the various parts of Europe can be said to be divided only so far as to show the predominant race into the three general groups of Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean? A. Yes.

Q. Are you familiar with the work of Madison Grant entitled "The Passing of the Great Race"? A. Yes.

Q. And are you familiar with the map which he attaches between pages 272 and 273 of his book, and which is "Defendant's Exhibit No. 1" as identified by Professor Dixon? A. Yes, I know that.

Q. Is that map substantially correct as showing generally the location of these three groups that you have described throughout Europe and Asia Minor? A. It is practically a reproduction of the maps given by Ripley and by other authors, only instead of using the various descriptive terms which Ripley uses, he summarizes them in a very simple way as "racial types." In so far as that is concerned, the map is correct.

Q. And Ripley is a recognized authority on Ethnology? A. Yes. He is always referred to in regard to this three-fold division.

Q. And in your opinion, based upon your study of Ethnology and Anthropology, would you say that the legend upon that map, and indicating the three great groups, Nordic in red, Alpine in green, and Mediterranean in yellow, is approximately correct? A. Yes, in the sense which I have stated just now, but we must not understand that it means there is nobody else in these regions, as in every one of these regions and countries other types are interspersed in considerable numbers.

Q. But that the predominant type in each of these regions is the type indicated by the color? A. Yes.

Q. And as to Armenians the predominant type would be Alpine? A. Surely.

Q. Will you please state whether or not the Armenians in body, head and pigment or face color, are similar to any particular race, and if so, to what race?

MR. FALK: Objection is made to that question on the ground that it calls for the conclusion of the mind of the witness inasmuch as he has stated he has never been in Armenia, and there is no testimony to show that he has ever come in contact with Armenians in Armenia.

THE WITNESS: May I make a statement as to that?

MR. GUTHRIE: I do not think there will be any objection to that.

MR. FALK: No. You can make a statement.

THE WITNESS (Continuing): I have had an opportunity to see a good many Armenians, although not in Armenia, and I have examined a good many Armenians. I had an opportunity, for instance, to be invited to a meeting of Armenian students where there were about I should say 70 students present.

By MR. FALK:

Q. When was that, Professor? A. It was this winter.

Q. Where? A. Here, in connection with the Immigration work which I have referred to before. I have seen all sorts of nationalities as well as Armenians, so that, if I have not been in Armenia, I am yet familiar with the Armenian types.

MR. FALK: Pardon me for asking a few more questions.

MR. GUTHRIE: I wish you would.

Q. Are you familiar or acquainted with the habits of the Armenians? A. To a certain extent.

Q. To what extent? A. Particularly in regard to matters that refer to their physical appearance. That is the point most interesting to me.

Q. But not as to their habits and general mode of living? A. Only from literature or from description.

Q. And are you familiar with their religion or their forms of religion? A. Yes, from literature, but that, of course, is not my special field.

Mr. Falk: Take this note: I move to strike out the testimony of this witness on the ground that he is not qualified to testify as to the habits and religion of the Armenians, not being personally familiar with the Armenian race as a whole, except as is stated by the witness in certain instances.

Mr. Guthrie: Please repeat the question I have put. (Last question by Mr. Guthrie repeated.)

The Witness: (Further answering Mr. Falk)—When we speak of an anthropological knowledge of a people, the knowledge is always based upon the examination of a limited number of individuals; and a man may have traveled extensively in a country and have noted his observations, yet I should say that he would not be competent to talk about the physical characteristics of the people. The only way in which such knowledge is obtained, is by making a number of observations on a limited number of individuals. For instance, we have observations by one Frenchman named Chantre, and by others. Their observations are based on the study of a

limited number of individuals, and from these reports, general deductions are drawn. That we find true, no matter where we go, for the simple fact that it is utterly impossible to carefully examine the whole people, and we make the sampling which must be sufficiently large to indicate the general characteristics of the people.

By MR. FALK:

Q. What proportion would you deem to be a proper examination, what percentage? A. That cannot be answered in a general way, because it all depends upon the characteristics of the people. Let me give you an example: If we have here in New York a school in which there are only Sicilian children, and I want to know something about the characteristics of the Sicilians in New York, then, from what I know about Sicily, I should say that if I picked out 50 individuals of each age and sex class, I should have enough data to understand the growth of Sicilians in New York. If you take, on the other hand, a school which is mixed, where you have all sorts of children, I could not do that. I should need more individuals. What I want to point out is that there are certain very definite scientific principles according to which we have to make our selection. We know from all observations which have been made that the population of central parts of Asia Minor is very uniform. From this it may be inferred that if I obtain from 50 to 100 observations from this particular area, I can conclude what the general population will be. That is the method always pursued. I should be inclined to say, from a scientific point of view, that I am just as competent to

talk about the Armenians as Mr. Chantre or others who visited the country, for the reasons that I have selected a definite region, and a number of individuals from that region sufficient to give the desired information.

By MR. GUTHRIE:

Q. And this is the method, so far as you can judge, from the authoritative literature on the subject, that has been invariably pursued from time immemorial by Anthropologists? A. Almost invariably.

Q. And in your opinion is it the only practicable method to pursue? A. Yes; and I would emphasize again that the number of individuals needed depends upon the problem, and we have definite methods of determining how many we need.

Q. Can you recall about how many Armenians you have personally examined in the pursuit of your investigations as to racial characteristics? A. I do not know exactly, but between 200 and 300.

Q. And where were those examinations made? A. In New York.

Q. Have you read the testimony of Professor Dixon? A. Yes.

Q. He refers to a number of authors as being writers of accepted and scientific authority. Do you concur in the opinion expressed by him as to the reliability of those authors? A. Yes, entirely. I should be inclined to add in a number of cases the names of those authorities upon which the conclusions are based. The weight of the authority has been such, that their conclusions have been accepted without hesitation, particularly the

evidence in regard to the European origin of the Armenians and their migration into Asia Minor. The evidence is so overwhelming that nobody doubts any more their early migration from Thrace across the Hellespont into Asia Minor.

Q. And is that now generally accepted among scientists and Anthropologists, as an established historical fact? A. The only people who do not agree with them are those who do not know anything about modern literature, and the results of modern scientific research by competent anthropologists.

Q. But among those who do know modern literature and are competent as scientists and anthropologists, is the fact that the Armenians originally migrated from Europe to Asia Minor, accepted and recognized as a historical fact? A. Yes, with no exception.

Q. There is no exception? A. There is no exception. I mean in this way: For instance, when Deniker who knew only physical Anthropology, and who did not follow the other subjects, still quoted the older opinion of a Iranian affiliation of the Armenians, he was simply in error, and everybody now sees that he was mistaken. In other words, everybody who understands the value of philological evidence, accepts the position that the Armenians came from Europe.

Q. Referring back again to the question that I put you, please state whether the Armenians whose characteristics you have studied, both in literature and in personal examination of their bodies, as to bodies, head and pigment or face color, are similar to any other group or race, and, if so, what?

MR. FALK: The same objection is made to this question as was stated before.

A. They are so similar to what we call the Alpine population, that I for one would not undertake, if I had 100 Armenians present, to say that they are all Armenians. There might be Swiss among them. There might be South Austrians, Italians, Spaniards and French among them, and so on; and I am not by any means alone in that opinion, as a man of such wide experience as Von Luschan, upon whose work our knowledge of the physical characteristics of Asia Minor is based, makes the same statement. He says, in just the same words that I used just now, that he has been in a congregation of Armenians, in an Armenian Church, and that he was utterly unable to say that these people were Armenians, and not Europeans from southeastern Europe.

Q. Have you studied the fact that so far as body, head, or pigment is concerned, they seem to be identical with the inhabitants of Europe? A. Yes, particularly with the group which is called "Dinaric". The Alpine group is divided nowadays into the western Alpine and the Dinaric type.

Q. Could you give us the etymology or origin of the term "Dinaric", as we are unable to find it in the ordinary dictionaries? A. It is derived from the Dinaric Alps, or the eastern Alps, and that term is taken from the name of the highest mountain, Dinara.

Q. And those Alps are located where? A. Northeast of the Adriatic.

By MR. FALK:

Q. In Old Greece? A. No, in this region round here (pointing to map marked "Defendant's Exhibit I.") which is the northeast of the northern Adriatic Sea.

By MR. GUTHRIE:

Q. And is that what we generally refer to as the Austrian Tyrol? A. Yes, and also farther to the east.

Q. And farther east? A. Yes.

By MR. FALK:

Q. How far east? A. As far as we reckon the Alps.

Q. It does not touch Armenia, though? A. Oh, no. But I am merely answering the question regarding the derivation of the name Dinaric. This type is found in the whole northern part of the Balkan Peninsula, and in modern authoritative works, you will find the Armenians classified with the Dinaric type, and particularly, as I said, it will be easy to find on the Balkan Peninsula individuals who might easily be mistaken for Armenians and vice versa.

By MR. GUTHRIE:

Q. Professor Dixon, whose testimony I understand you have read, testified that Herodotus, the Grecian historian of the fourth or fifth century, B. C., classified the Armenians as immigrants from Europe? A. Yes.

Q. Is Herodotus accepted as a reliable authority upon such questions? A. Yes. It is rather remarkable how often his evidence has been found substantiated. We had a great many cases in which Herodotus' evidence

was doubted for more than a century, and when finally the regions which he described were re-discovered we found that he was correct, so that on the whole we lay very great stress upon the truthfulness of his statements.

Q. And is he an accepted authority as to the races in the olden days? A. Yes.

Q. And is the same true as to the geographer Strabo, to whom Professor Dixon also referred? A. Yes.

Q. Without repeating the authorities cited and quoted from by Professor Dixon, will you kindly supplement his reference to authorities by a reference to some of the leading authorities? For example, take de Morgan; who was he? A. He was a French Archaeologist who worked particularly in Asia Minor and also in Egypt.

Q. When was his book published? A. That I confess I do not remember. It is quite recent. I think it was published in 1919.

Q. And what was the title of his work? A. "Histoire du peuple arménien", which, translated, means "History of the Armenian people", published in 1919.

Q. Will you please quote and translate any pertinent statement in de Morgan's work in regard to the origin or race grouping of the Armenians? A. Well, I extracted here the following:

"The Armenians were armed like the Phrygians of whom they were a colony. . . . According to the Macedonians, the Phrygians called themselves Briges so long as they remained in Europe, but after passing into Asia changed their name in changing their country, and took the name

Phrygians. . . . In this case as in all others in which Herodotus speaks of traditions, his statements are not to be doubted. . . . The Phrygians, Armenians, and Mesopotamians all belong to the great Aryan family. . . .”

Then, on page 43, he says:

“It follows from the documents in our possession that the movement of the Armenians from Cappadocia towards the plateau of Erzeroum took place in the 8-7th century B. C., and at least six hundred years before our era they occupied several districts in the neighborhood of Arrarat and Lake Van.”

Q. Are there a number of German scientists who have labored in this field of Anthropology, and who are recognized among the scientists as of authority upon questions of Ethnology and Anthropology? A. The fundamental papers on the subject of the position of the Armenians are by Hübschmann and Kretschmer, whose labors show definitely the position of the Armenians as part of the European group. Equally important is O. Schrader, who investigated the problem from a lexicographic point of view, and who found that the culture of the ancient Armenians belonged to the European type, not to the Iranian type. The Indo-Europeans constitute two groups, the European and Asiatic, and the Armenians belong to the European group. They had horses, practiced agriculture, raised pigs, and used salt, and the characteristics did not belong to the eastern section, the Iranian.

Q. Is there another German scientist of the name of Von Luschian to whom you have already referred? A. Yes.

Q. And who was he, and what was his reputation and authority as an Anthropologist? A. He was easily the foremost Anthropologist, I think in Europe. He had very extended experience, particularly in Asia Minor, and it would be difficult to find any part of the world he had not seen, Africa, America, Polynesia, so that his experience was world-wide.

Q. Did he publish a book on biology, discussing the types and races of men in Asia Minor? A. Yes, surely.

Q. And was that published in 1907? A. Yes.

Q. And could you give us a brief extract and translation from what he said in that work in regard to the Armenians? A. I will read the quotation: "In this connection we must point out a complete agreement between types of the Alpine race and the Armenoid one. It seems to me that there is absolutely no doubt that our central European race is directly related to the aboriginal population of Asia Minor."

Q. Had Professor Von Luschian previously published a number of works on Anthropology? A. Yes, and his fundamental work in regard to this whole question is a German treatise, called *Die Tachtadschy*.

Q. Which means what? A. That is one of the Turkish sects in Asia Minor, and it is incidental to the discussion of that race, that he speaks about the whole population of Asia Minor.

Q. Will you kindly quote and translate what he says

in regard to the Armenians? A. The material collected gives us

“a complete well rounded picture of the physical characteristics of the Armenians and we recognize that they are not only a homogeneous people according to their language and religion, but also according to their physical type. The homogeneity of this people which is not found in equal or similar degree in any other civilized nation, is interesting because it shows that owing to the striking geographical, linguistic and religious isolation of Armenia during its development and florescence, the type has remained pure and has been consolidated to such an extent that even today, many centuries after the fall of the empire, it has remained almost entirely uniform. . . .”

Q. May I call your attention, Professor, to another writer, J. Mathorez, and ask you whether he is a recognized authority upon the subject of Anthropology? A. Yes, he is a member of a society in Paris devoted to the study of Armenia, a society which publishes the “Revue des E'tudes Arméniens”. Mathorez's paper to which I refer was published in an historical journal.

Q. And is he an author of high repute in the science of Anthropology? A. Yes.

Q. Will you state the substance of what Mr. Mathorez says in the work that you have just referred to? A. He studied the general migration of Armenians into France from the tenth century up to the present time, and he discusses particularly the fate of the colony in Marseilles,

where, by the way, there is still a street called the Rue des Arméniens, showing that at one time there must have been a great many there. On page 86 he states that the most important contribution of the Armenians to French economic life is the introduction of madder by Joannes Althen (Artin). A statue of Althen was erected in Avignon in 1846. During the last two centuries the immigration of Armenians has been considerable. In concluding his remarks, the author says:

“As other foreigners who came to France under the *ancien régime*, the Armenians saw themselves devoured by the French nation. That these Catholic from the East have not played an important part in our national history and demography is probably due to the fact that their assimilation to France has been very rapid. They were too few to marry among themselves, and they have immediately upon their arrival submerged themselves in the great French family.”

Would you like me to make a remark about a similar question of immigration in Poland?

Q. I should like it very much. A. There has been a strong immigration of Armenians into Poland from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. At one time they had very important buildings, a church and a court building in Lemberg. We have of course no statistics of the numbers that came in, but a very conservative estimate would be that there must have been over 100,000. At the present time, according to the Austrian census of 1910, there cannot be more than 5,000 Armenians in Poland or

Galicia, which of course would mean that the remainder of their descendants had completely amalgamated with the people.

Q. Do you know the German writer Friederich Braun? A. Yes.

Q. Who is he? A. He is a Professor at Leipsic.

Q. And is he a man in high repute among the Anthropologists? A. He works particularly with the Russian investigator, Marr, and the two are perhaps our best authorities on Caucasian languages.

Q. Has he written on the subject of the Armenians? A. Yes.

Q. And in what work have his writings been published? A. He has a paper, *Die Urbevölkerung Europas und die Herkunft der Germanen*,—that is “The aboriginal population of Europe and the origin of the Teutonic people.”

Q. Does he at some pages prior to, and at page 89, discuss the inhabitants of the Caucasus, including the Armenians? A. Yes.

Q. And then does he summarize his conclusion? A. He discusses the relation between the people of the Caucasus, the Armenians, and all the populations of various parts of Europe, and then he sums up on page 89 in the following words:

“So far as I know, nobody has ever doubted the monogenetic origin of the whole ‘white race’ to which all these groups belong.”

This characteristic so far as it shows the general attitude of all scientific writers on the subject, in that

he took the position that the Armenians were part of the white race, is self-evident.

Q. And in the expression "to which all these groups belong", was he referring to groups which comprised the Armenians? A. Yes, particularly to Europeans and Armenians. He simply says the Armenians and the Europeans, and then speaks of both of them as belonging to the white race.

Q. Are there a number of Italian scientists who have written upon the subject of Anthropology? A. Yes, quite a few.

Q. Would you kindly refer us to one of them of high repute and recognized authority? A. Giuseppe Sergi.

Q. His work is entitled what? A. L'Uomo, Le Origini, L'Antichita, Le Variazioni e La Distribuzione Geografica. Rome 1911, which translated means, Man, his Origin, Antiquity, Variety and Geographical Distribution.

Q. Is Sergi a writer of recognized authority? A. Yes, he is one of the most prolific and best known Italian Anthropologists.

Q. And are his writings accepted as authority among scientists? A. Yes.

Q. Will you kindly give us his summary on this subject? A. He classes all the people of Asia Minor eastward to the Caspian Sea, from there to the Volga, and up the Volga and northwest to Finland, as belonging to one racial type which he calls "Neoanthropos sopra Notanthropos". This includes the Armenians and the people of the Caucasus in the same group to which the people of Europe belong. He gives a map there also.

Q. You have heretofore referred, Professor Boas, to Blumenbach, who wrote in the eighteenth century and in the beginning of the nineteenth century. In what language did he write? A. Latin.

Q. And the Latin words that you have quoted, "colore albo" were used by him, were they not, to describe the Caucasian or Caucasian race? A. Yes.

Q. Within the term Caucasian which he was then using, as I understand for the first time? A. Yes. He used the description "colore albo" before in 1775.

Q. But it was to the same general type of race or group of races that he was referring? A. Yes. He simply changed the name later on to Caucasian.

Q. Later on he gave it the name "Caucasic" or "Caucasian"? A. Yes.

Q. What is the concurrent opinion of modern Anthropologists of authority in America and in Europe as to the proper race grouping of the Armenian people who inhabit Asia Minor? A. I think I answered that before, —undoubtedly to the Alpine branch of the European race, and more particularly with the Dinaric group.

Q. And are they always grouped as part of what is known familiarly as the "white race"? A. Surely. The Alpines are clearly a part of the white race.

Q. Is it the fact that many of the modern writers, beginning with Blumenbach down, have invariably classified the Armenians with the white or Caucasian race? A. I do not know of any case where they have been classified otherwise. I might refer you perhaps again to an English writer, Duckworth, who speaks about a varia-

tion of the form of the nose in the white race, and who speaks incidentally also of the Armenians and some other European type, and just in the same way as Braun; he includes the Armenians in the white race as a self-evident fact.

Q. In your opinion as an expert, are the Armenians readily recognizable as not belonging to the yellow, brown or black race? A. It would be utterly impossible to classify them as not belonging to the white race.

Q. During all your studies and researches in Anthropology and Ethnology, have you run across the writings or reports of any traveler or of any writer who has ever classified the Armenians as other than belonging to the white or European race? A. Never. On the contrary, I have run across, I think, references to people traveling through the country, and who remarked that they met people who were not white, contrasting them with the Armenians. I mean that travelers met with people who came from southeastern or eastern Asia or some other parts of the world. Then the travelers remarked that these visitors were not white and were different from the Armenians. This brings out again the clear conception that the Armenians are considered as white.

Q. And is this true as distinguishing them from the Hindus or the Japanese or the Chinese? A. Absolutely true.

Q. In the course of your studies, have you investigated as to the ancient separate nationality of the Armenians? A. You mean politically?

Q. Political nationality and independence of the Armenians? A. Yes, the history of the Armenians is very

varied and complicated. They were the first state that became as a state Christian, I believe, 301 A. D. This set them off definitely from the surrounding nations. They were at one time part of the Roman Empire.

Q. For how many centuries was the Armenian Kingdom part of the Roman Empire, do you remember? A. I am afraid I can not answer that with any great degree of accuracy, but it was several centuries.

Q. Do you know whether any Armenians were Byzantine Emperors? A. Yes, beginning with Leo.

Q. Do you recall any others? A. Well, his descendants, I think there were about eight.

Q. Have you made any study as to the effect of the Crusades upon the Armenians and assimilation or intermarriage, have you any historic knowledge upon that subject? A. I know that the Armenian nobility intermarried freely with the west European peoples, the Frenchman and those others who came there with the Crusades.

Q. The writer Von Luschan from whom you have already quoted referred to the homogeneity of the Armenians in the preservation not only of their language and religion, but of their physical type. Do you know from your studies that that statement of Von Luschan is authoritative and reliable? A. Yes. I know that from my own personal investigation and researches, as well as from literature. There is one point I should like to indicate here if I may. Some writers have tried to make a difference between Armenians and Alpines on the ground that the Armenians have an exceedingly flat occiput and

they distinguish the Armenians on that basis. They class them on this basis as a sub-race or sub-division. Now, Chantre, a French author, and an authority supposed that this flatness of the head was due to the way in which the children are put into the cradle. The Armenians were in the habit of putting their children in the cradle and letting them lie on their backs without ever changing them. From my personal observations, the custom of the Armenian people was this: they would put a diaper under a child and fill this diaper with white clay; then fold it over and wrap the child in another larger blanket which was put round his neck, folded over, so that the child practically could not move. Then the child is again wrapped around with cloth and is laid in such a way that even the arms cannot move. It is the same kind of swathing that was customary in Europe up to recent times. Then the mid-wife will model the shape of the head of the child, and will squeeze the nose here (indicating) so as to make the bridge of the nose higher, because they like that appearance. Now, this custom of course has gone out of use, and the question therefore arose,—and that was part of my work in connection with the immigration work, in how far this handling of the children has an influence upon their head and face form, and it turned out with perfect clarity, that just as soon as this artificial treatment of the child ceases, then the form of the head becomes the same as that of the central Alpines. In other words, the difference which was supposed to exist, does not exist. It is merely a matter of custom.

Q. Then there is no somatic or head difference between the Armenian proper and the inhabitants of other parts of Europe? A. No.

Q. And this characteristic of the back of the head was due to the manner in which the head of young babies was treated? A. Yes. Children born here do not show it.

Q. Children of Armenians, born and reared in the United States do not show this characteristic of flatness in the back of the head? A. No, they do not.

Q. Have you any knowledge from personal observation or from study of statistics and authorities, of the presence and assimilation of Armenians in any of the countries in Europe? A. I mentioned the case of Poland before, and I quoted Mathorez in regard to conditions in France. For America the fullest statistics were collected by Drachsler, whom Professor Dixon also quoted.

Q. Who is he? A. He was formerly of Smith College, Northampton, and is now professor at the College of the City of New York.

Q. And is he a recognized authority on the subjects he treats? A. His paper is considered the best paper on the subject in existence and practically the only one.

Q. And what is its title? A. "Intermarriage in New York City". He has a discussion of the same problems in "Democracy and Assimilation".

Q. And his full name is Julius Drachsler? A. Yes.

Q. When was his work published? A. 1921. I should like to point out that according to his statistics which cover the period, I think, from 1908 to 1912, for which he examined about 100,000 marriage certificates issued by

the Clerk of the City of New York, he found that for the first generation of immigrants, the intermarriage rate is 10.4 per cent. That means that 10 per cent. of the first generation of immigrants marry people not belonging to their nationality, Americans, or whatever others they may be; and that in the second generation, this percentage rises to 30 per cent. Now, the rate for Armenians is practically the same as the average rate. It is 9.63. There is a peculiar contradiction in his book to which I think attention should be called, inasmuch as in another table he says the intermarriage is 17.56 per cent. In my opinion 17.56 per cent. is the right figure, for this reason: Seventeen per cent. of the men of the first generation marry non-Armenian women, but the Armenian women marry all Armenian men, the reason being that a great many of the Armenian men send for their fiancées to Armenia, and get them to come over here. It is the same as in other groups with men and women in the first generation. Now, of course, when we take the two together we find the lower percentage of 9 per cent. That is the reason for the discrepancy.

Q. What are the statistics in regard to the second generation? A. Practically there are none.

Q. By that, what do you mean? A. I mean at that time there existed here no second generation of marriageable age. The number of Armenians of the second generation who were marriageable in this period, 1908 and 1912 in New York City, was so small that nothing could be inferred from it, but I think it is perfectly safe to say on the basis of what we know about other nation-

alities, that we have to expect in the second generation a rate of intermarriage of about 35 per cent. There is absolutely no doubt about that.

Q. And increasing again in the third generation? A. Yes, surely, based on the general experience, which is paralleled in all nationalities. I think it is quite obvious from the information which I obtained, especially from one church, that the number of intermarriages is constantly increasing. These statistics are not quite satisfactory, but looking at the matter simply as parallel to the experience with other nationalities as given in the Drachsler report, it seems to be perfectly clear that in the second generation the intermarriage rates have at least trebled, so that when we have 10 per cent. for the first generation, we will assume the lower figure of 10 per cent., then we shall get for the next generation thirty per cent. If we take the ratio of 17 per cent. which I think is correct, we might expect about 51 per cent. of intermarriages.

Q. Are you familiar at all with the statistics of immigration of Armenians into this country? A. Not in detail. I know approximately how many there may be now in the country.

Q. And what are the figures? A. I think about 80,000, if I am not mistaken.

Q. Have you any other information in regard to intermarriage or other assimilation than the statistics published by Drachsler in the book to which you have referred? A. We have nothing that is very good for the United States, but we have, of course, evidence from

Europe, and the whole evidence shows that the assimilation of Armenians is exceedingly ready and rapid.

Q. When you say "evidence", what do you mean?

A. I mean the whole history of Armenian colonies, their gradual decay,—which means and shows their assimilation by the rest of the people.

Q. Are you familiar at all with the statistics in regard to the naturalization of Armenians in the United States as citizens? A. I am not.

Q. According to the current concept of persons belonging to what we know currently as the white race, would you, as an expert from your life-long study of these questions, group the Armenians with them as white persons? A. I should say it would be utterly impossible to group them otherwise from a scientific point of view. All the characteristics of the white race are there.

Q. Have you any knowledge, or have you made any study of the rating or grouping of Armenians in India, among the Hindus? A. No, not particularly, except in one respect. I know that in all parts of Asia where we have a mongoloid people, or brown races, that the Armenians are always considered as whites. We have that in India and also in Ferghana.

Q. And where is that, Professor? A. In the southern part of Turkestan.

Q. And do you group the high caste, full-blood Hindus of India with the brown races? A. The conditions in India are peculiar. Notwithstanding the assumption of an absolute caste endogamy, there really has been no such thing, and in consequence of that all the immigrant

Aryans have more or less intermingled with the aboriginal inhabitants of India who are very decidedly of a different race, so that the lowest castes are to the strongest extent non-white. Let me use that term, as I do not want to commit myself to say what they are. The highest classes in eastern India are also considerably affected by intermixture with the aboriginal, non-white population. In that respect there is a fundamental difference between Armenia and India, because in the Armenians there is no foreign, non-white racial background.

Q. What is meant by the cephalic test or index in determining race? A. By cephalic index we mean the width of the head expressed in percentages of the length of the head measured from the front to the occiput.

Q. And are the races of man divided into two classes called the short heads and the long heads? A. Those are names. For convenience's sake, scientists call people with a short rounded head brachycephalic, and they call people with an elongated head dolichocephalic. If we take, for instance, the Scotch or the English, as they were here 150 years ago or longer, they would not by any means all be dolichocephalic, but there were among them also a good many who were brachycephalic.

Q. Generally speaking, in what class would you group, and do scientists invariably group the Armenians as to the cephalic test? A. One of the characteristics of the Alpine group is the tendency to have rounded heads, that is to be brachycephalic; and so are the Armenians, but less so than usually supposed, as I indicated before, on account of the artificial flattening of the head which

increases the shortness of the head of the individual subjected to this process.

Q. Now what is known as the test of color of hair in determining race? A. By far the majority of the human races have what you call black hair, the negroes, the Asiatics, the American Indians.

Q. The American Indians? A. The American Indians all have black, or at least very dark brown hair. We find blonde hair only among the Europeans or whites. Blonde hair is somewhat irregularly distributed in Europe. We have the greatest percentage of blonde hair in the north and much less in the south, but among the people of the Mediterranean area there are still a good many that have blonde hair. Furthermore, it is a characteristic that in all human races, that hair gets darker with age. Younger people have lighter hair than older people, and we find among all Europeans very commonly very light hair among young children which later becomes much darker.

Q. What have you found to be characteristic of Armenian children in respect to the color of their hair? A. The same as among the Europeans. They darken very much, and we find cases of blonde hair, and of rather light brown hair, which later on will become quite dark.

Q. And black hair of the type and kind that you find among the Hindus, the Chinese, and other Mongolians, and the Japanese, have you ever seen or heard of among Armenians? A. Hair like the Chinese or Japanese or Hindus never occurs. Perhaps I ought not as a scientist to say—never; but I have never seen it; and it is very

unlikely that an individual would be found that has it, so far as I have been able to test here, I have seen among the two or three hundred whom I have seen, only two individuals that had really what we call absolutely black hair, but not of the Chinese or Japanese kind because it is wavy.

Q. You mean by individuals—individual Armenians?

A. Individual Armenians, yes, who have really black hair. The majority would have lighter colors. We can group the hair colors in order like other measurements. The color of the hair of adults should be called dark brown, but not that of children.

Q. Is there any race outside of the European or Caucasian race as you have described it, in which the children have blonde or brown hair? A. No blonde hair, brownish hair does occur now and then. In all races there is a darkening of the hair with age, but blonde hair does not occur outside of the white race.

Q. It only occurs where? A. Only in the white races.

Q. In what we call the white races? A. Yes.

Q. And I understood you to say that you have repeatedly found blonde hair among Armenian children and adults? A. I am not prepared to say in just what percentage, but my recollection is that among young children blonde hair is fairly common. I do not recall the figures.

Q. You have not got the figures, but that was your actual experience in the course of your investigation? A. Yes. I should be inclined to say there must be 30 per cent. of young Armenian children that had blonde hair.

97

Q. Of the young Armenians? A. Of the young Armenians.

MR. GUTHRIE: That is all.

MR. FALK: That is all. I have no cross-examination.

It was thereupon stipulated between the counsel for the respective parties, that the witness having been already duly cautioned and sworn, need not verify the deposition after it has been transcribed by the Stenographer, and that subscription of the same by the witness should be sufficient.

(Signed)

FRANZ BOAS.