

If the causes and the consequences of the inferiority of this region were well known, it would enable commercial nations and colonization societies to calculate the chances of success in planting colonies. This knowledge would be valuable—it would save much useless expense, when it is ascertained that *other* causes than their great distance are in operation to check the growth of Australia and Cape-Colony.

Will the Anglo-Australian colonies ever become rich, enlightened, and independent? Every present appearance is against it. Nothing has, as yet, appeared to show that the descendants of Englishmen will not remain as subjects of a crown colony, and continue to be ruled by a remote island. The Anglo-Australian will fear the rod of a master 15,000 miles off.

Time tries all things. If at a future period some powerful nation should arise in the southern zone, and become in arts and arms to that region what Great Britain, France, and the United States, have been and now are to the northern zone,—why, then this theory must be abandoned, as not true to the *extent* claimed, and these speculations be buried with other rubbish.

It matters not whether this rich and powerful nation, *that is to be*, be Anglo-Australian, Hispanio-American, Lusitano-American, Anglo-Belgo-African, or Oceanian. Even the cannibal natives of New-Zealand, might be mentioned, for they are superior in physical force and intellectual energy to any other native tribes in the Austral zone.

If, on the contrary, the nations of the southern zone should continue stubbornly and successfully to resist all efforts made to civilize them—then the physical causes of their inferiority will be firmly established, and uniformly admitted by all reasonable men.

The degeneracy of man in every degree of longitude in the southern zone, is too uniform and general to be the result of accident and moral causes alone. Here I shall take leave to repeat the substance of what has been said before. Respectable writers have called the descendants of the Dutch at the Cape, and of the Spaniards at La Plata, savage barbarians; but these same learned authors say, that it is wholly owing to their scattered situation: that is, if they had settled nearer together, they would have been prosperous and rich, and of course, would not have been what they actually are—semi-savages. This theory well deserves the attention of the statesman and philanthropist. Were they, then, forced to form scattered settlements? Do not these writers put the effect for the cause, and the cause for the effect? Is their dispersion the cause of their barbarism, or their barbarism the cause of their dispersion? Savages cannot live in thickly settled communities,—their improvident habits could not provide for their subsistence in a dense population. They, therefore, disperse from necessity, and become hunters and herdsmen. If dispersion alone would cause barbarism, why is this cause inoperative in Louisiana, in Mississippi, in Georgia, and Alabama. If it be the sole cause of degeneracy, why are its dire effects confined to the southern zone? Is the dense population of China caused wholly by her superior civilization? If the subjects of the Celestial Empire were scattered over the fertile lands south of the Oregon, would they lose their industrious habits, and become wandering, helpless savages?