

American Race Theorists

A Critique of Their Thoughts and Methods

By

BYRAM CAMPBELL



BOSTON
CHAPMAN AND GRIMES
PUBLISHERS

Copyright, 1952, by Chapman & Grimes, Inc.

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

PART I.

I. Values, and Mode of Procedure	9
II. Kroeber	13
III. Hooton	27
IV. Gillin	36
V. An Historical Note	45
VI. An American Dilemma	52
VII. A Rebuttal	63
VIII. More of Myrdal	72
IX. Pierson	84

PART II.

X. Some General Ideas	90
XI. Race, A Subject of Propaganda	100
XII. A Further Look at Brazil, With Social Im- plications	108
XIII. Social Preferences	115
XIV. The Basis for a Conclusion	123
XV. Race Attitudes Based on Emotions	126
XVI. Other Motives	139
XVII. In Conclusion	142
Bibliography	146
Index	155

FOREWORD

I have been acquainted for a considerable time with the fallacies to be found in the arguments of the authors who are believers in racial equality. Based on these, I concluded that a false doctrine, one unjustified by the facts, was being fostered in this country, and that a worthy undertaking would be to place the truth before the public. As a preliminary step I hired a graduate student of Anthropology to search for material that could be used to this end. However, instead of gathering such, he submitted a *paper* in which the idea of racial equality was defended. It was quite obvious that he had but adopted the fallacious thoughts that I was already acquainted with. This beginner justified his position on the fact that it was based on the beliefs of the "best minds in the profession." His acceptance in principle of their opinions suggested to me the form which this book has taken; that is, an exploration of the mental processes of these so-called "best minds." In the following pages the reader will find the discoveries of this exploratory excursion.

B. C.

PART I
CHAPTER I
VALUES, AND MODE OF PROCEDURE

The American people have been subjected to an all-out attempt to change their racial beliefs. I think it a safe assumption that in the past a majority of our people have believed that significant differences in capacity could be found between our black and white citizens. Since then, a change may have occurred, but for convenience I shall refer to those entertaining such a belief as though they were in the majority.

A Word on Method

If our race conceptions have changed, or are in the process of being altered, this is due to the widely publicized expressions of the believers in race equality. Those who profess such beliefs we will refer to as "equalitarians." We shall examine their position, but more particularly the mental processes by which they arrive at it. This should throw sufficient light on their views to determine their soundness.

Intelligence, Our Measure of Equality

If we wish to find the relative standing of races we must have a value, which will provide a scale for measurement. We choose intelligence. This quality is placed first by all recognized thinkers, whether by statement or implication. Here we find the attribute that most strikingly differentiates man from the rest of the animal kingdom. Our pre-eminence as a species is dependent upon it. The greatness of a country in peace; its success in war, is largely a reflection of the all-around ability of its people, and this in turn is based on their intelligence. The state spends no end of money to develop the minds of its citizens, and democracy can succeed only if they

prove to be intelligent and become well informed. However, education alone cannot make a person born dull into a bright one, though it can give a certain improvement to his mental qualities. When inborn capacity is high, less money need be spent for a given result, or the same amount will carry the individual to greater heights, with important advantages for the state.

Intelligence and the Individual

With the individual, the amount of his intelligence will be the greatest single factor allowing him to find an advanced position in society. Its existence in high or low order will be responsible for determining the fields that he can cultivate with success. Either these will be limited or all but unlimited. As far as other personal advantages are concerned, high intelligence should offer the possibility of a better adjustment to life's complex problems, and where it is employed in quiet fields, as with the thinker, it gives its possessor the reward of an enriched outlook on life.

Nor need this faculty be compensated for by limitations in other directions. Tests on the most intelligent school children show that in most cases they are better endowed physically than are average children. Thus we usually find an all around superiority.

Equality of Intelligence of Races Not Proven

Are races equal in intelligence? Let me first say that no valid proof has been offered that they are, and in a few paragraphs I will show why it is improper to make claims of this sort. For if we judge by the evidence of mental tests, we find an overwhelming indication that whites are superior to Negroes. Therefore, those who profess to believe in race equality must claim that the differences found result from other factors, those of an environmental nature usually being stressed. However, this qualification remains an unproved assumption. There is no known method of determining what

portion of a person's intelligence is native to him, or the amount of the contribution of his environment.

To show how difficult a problem this is, we cite one writer (Stoddard) who believes that the relative effects of these two factors can never be determined. (*Intelligence, Its Nature and Nurture.*) Therefore, until or unless this problem is resolved, we cannot make comparisons in the broader field of race and be *certain* that they are valid.

As positive statements in this field cannot be properly made, should we drop the subject? Those who believe in race equality have not done so, nor shall we. However, let us recognize in advance that *certainty* may elude us. We will be dealing in probabilities. However, should we prove skillful, our findings may reflect a considerable amount of truth.

Though our principal activity will be an appraisal of equalitarian writings, we shall in later chapters explore the implications of some of our findings.

The Equalitarians Among the Anthropologists

According to Myrdal there are several hundred thousand titles dealing with the Negro problem alone. Though we shall be concerned with this subject, we also wish to look beyond it. We must, therefore, follow the sampling method. I believe that this is justified, for many works simply repeat the findings or opinions of others. We have chosen for review books considered either typical, or because of other reasons that will be mentioned.

Because of copyright restrictions I am able to offer but few quotations. Therefore, I have had to paraphrase most of the statements employed.¹ This I regret, for those who do not

¹ Often it has been difficult to arrive at an acceptable paraphrasing of these statements. However, in this connection I have been guided by a principle; it being to try to capture the essence of meanings, using the fewest possible words. To further complicate the problem, the authors reviewed sometimes make a point, then wander from it for several sentences or paragraphs, but finally base a conclusion on it. In these cases I have eliminated the extraneous passages unless I have felt that they had a sufficient bearing.

agree with me may claim that my wording is improper. But even with quotations, it might be asserted that these, out of their context, are misleading. Therefore, where possible, I am giving sufficient reference to allow the reader to refer to the original material. Before we start examining them I will list the books to be discussed, or from which information will be principally drawn. With the works analyzed, this will be only of portions dealing with the problems of race equality. Following are the books to be critically evaluated:

- Anthropology*, by A. L. Kroeber, revised, 1948
- The Twilight of Man*, by Ernest Hooton, 1939
- The Ways of Men*, by John Gillin, 1948
- An American Dilemma*, by Gunnar Myrdal, 1944
- Negroes in Brazil*, by Donald Pierson, 1942

Other books that I will draw on heavily without analyses, however, are:

- This Is Race*, by Earl Count, 1950.
- Applied Eugenics*, Popenoe and Johnson, Revised, 1933
- A New Theory of Human Evolution*, by Sir Arthur Keith, 1949.

Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture, National Society for the Study of Education, 1940.

Races, by Coon, Garn, and Birdsell. This book came off the press after the completion of my manuscript. However, I have rewritten portions of it to include some of the ideas of these authors, and in other places have added notes dealing with these.

Still other books referred to will be listed at the end of this volume. We are now ready to plunge into the details of our subject.

CHAPTER II

KROEBER

Statements from *Anthropology* (revised 1948), by A. L. Kroeber, Professor of Anthropology, University of California, will be examined. We deal with him first because he makes the greatest pretense of employing scientific methods. At the same time Kroeber is such a profuse writer that I will analyze only what I consider his more important arguments. Let me say in advance that I have not found Kroeber claiming that races are equal in capacities. At the same time, he so disposes his material and so slants his arguments that it would be all but impossible for the uninitiated or the uncritical to come to any other conclusion from his writings than that, with respect to innate capacities, they must be all but identical.

Our Analysis

Now to our analysis. On page 178 Kroeber treats of a certain inferiority of the Negro. Thus, he says that he shows an apparent lack of intelligence, a lack of character, together with a lack of accomplishment. He then gives us to understand that it by no means follows that the Negro is necessarily inferior in innate qualities, though he cautiously admits that he may be.

His appraisal of the Negro's inferior position cannot be gainsaid. Therefore, if Kroeber is to end with a show of equality, he must convince us that appearances belie facts. This is quite an undertaking, but apparently he considers himself up to it. Let us see how he proceeds.

Kroeber's Proof

Kroeber tells us that there is nothing more misleading than direct observations. This, indeed, is a bold statement, to

the point of rashness. In addition, it is surprising to find it offered in a book not devoted to theoretical concepts of this nature. However, let us continue with Kroeber's presentation. To prove his assertion Kroeber cites the fact that it was formerly believed that the sun moves around the earth. So far Kroeber's evidence backs him, for he has hit on an instance of a mistaken concept, based on what he refers to as "direct" evidence. However, Kroeber has not introduced us to an all-embracing principle, for we can find any amount of evidence showing where "direct" observations lead to correct conclusions. As an example, I have an apple and an orange before me. I wish to eat the apple. Now, if Kroeber's theory had general applicability, I should reach for what appears to be the orange, for he tells us that nothing is more misleading than "direct" observations.

By the employment of the foregoing argument as a device, Kroeber has neatly sidetracked us from a consideration of racial capacity. If the desire is to mislead us, to confuse us; to cause us to doubt our ability to judge our experiences correctly, he has hit on a clever stratagem. For we have been led into an area where no final conclusion can be had. Statements of this nature have to do with *The Theory of Knowledge* (Walsh). Such questions are so highly abstract, and so few are acquainted with this field that a discussion of these problems in their niceties should be reserved for those who have made a specialty of the subject.¹ However, we can throw further light on this theory as far as it applies to our problem.

Kroeber's theory is without a direct bearing on the question he is supposed to be evaluating. Conceivably it might throw an indirect light on the subject should it develop plausibility. However, the evidence favoring his theory is cancelled by that opposing it. I speak in general terms, for this situation,

¹ An able discussion of the implications of such a statement as that by Kroeber may be found in *Reason and Experience* by W. E. Walsh, 1947. This subject is also considered, though less specifically, in *Human Knowledge*, Bertrand Russell, 1948.

obviously, is not amenable to an exact equation. Kroeber would have us ignore evidence bearing on racial capacity, on the strength of a conception that turns out to be only so much perverted nonsense. We might further point out that Kroeber's offering is without even the merit of an analogy. In the one case, our problem is that of racial capacity. In the other, it is one of physics, involving vast spaces. We find that we have been led into a foreign field.

A brilliant and eminently successful criminal lawyer¹, whose career I followed with interest, employed a method which we can examine with benefit. If the evidence against his client was strong enough to make the outcome of the case seem in doubt, he carried the jurors away from a consideration of it. To this end he employed a stratagem; this being an attack on the motives of the prosecutor. It was said of him that he tried the court rather than the case. So occupied was the prosecutor with a defense of himself that he had but little time or opportunity to present the evidence properly. And the trumped-up case against him was so clever that inevitably doubts remained in the minds of the jurors with respect to his motives. Employing a similar technique, Kroeber attacks our ability to evaluate the evidence pointing to the Negro's lack of capacity. This allows him to escape a consideration of it and probably leaves doubts in many minds as to its validity. Further, we, along with Kroeber's readers, have been diverted from a consideration of the evidence of racial inequality which Kroeber is supposed to be dealing with. Let us return to a review of it. To this end we re-examine, though in greater detail, Kroeber's appraisal of the Negro, which he tells us is the *obvious* one. According to this, the Negro is inferior to the Caucasian, less successful, more shiftless. We find no great geniuses among his group, and no great inventors. Kroeber has not given us any proper reason for doubting that this evidence is valid.

¹ The late Earl Rogers of Los Angeles.

Kroeber Attacks

Kroeber returns to the instance of the sun appearing to revolve around the earth. He tells us that the ancients had no *insidious motive* or *perverse interest* in advocating this theory. Why should Kroeber give such a slant to this statement? Does this represent a subtle method of implying that those of us who do not agree with his racial outlook are guilty of insidious motives or a perverse interest in our racial attitudes? Apparently that is his aim, for I cannot discover any other reason for making such an observation, or inserting such derogatory terms in it. Here we discover Kroeber still on the offensive. First he launched a frontal attack on our capacity; now a circuitous assault is made on our motives.

Turning to page 179, Kroeber makes the charge that beliefs which have to do with racial capacity ultimately rest on impulse and feeling. I take it that this statement is to apply to those of us who do not find ourselves in the same boat with Kroeber. For, from the very fact that he is supposed to be piloting us through these troubled waters, the presumption should be that he knows the dangers on either side and will safely guide us. From his long experience we might infer that he sees the reefs without emotion, and therefore clearly. However, we stubbornly refuse to accept guidance on faith and continue to examine our pilot critically. We wish to know where he is taking us and why. Therefore, let us return to his statement that beliefs that have to do with racial capacity ultimately rest on impulse and feeling. The apparent purpose of his arbitrary statement is to convey the impression that our beliefs must therefore be prejudiced or mistaken, or that we are incapable of making correct appraisals in this field. Though we intend to show in a later chapter that few can escape emotion in their attitude towards divergent races, this fact probably has little or no bearing on our judgments of racial ability. If Kroeber's assertion were true in its implications, those who feel strongly about the

Jews might be expected to believe them lacking in capacity, and this is obviously not the case. Again an irresponsible attack is made on our ability to form correct judgments in the field of racial capacity. We shall encounter many more in the books which we are to review.

Anatomical Evidence

On page 180, Kroeber begins a consideration of *Anatomical Evidence of Evolutionary Rank*. A generally accepted theory is that if a race is closer in its anatomical makeup to the ape, it is backward in evolution. Kroeber embraces this idea and adds that a race so proven might also be presumed to be behind in mental, as well as physical attributes. He tells us that the facts in connection with such an appraisal do not run consistently. We think, he says, of the Negro as simian. Thus, his jaws are prognathous. To explain this term let me interject a few words. The muzzle of the collie dog, as an illustration, is very long, because it reflects the rows of teeth. This structural characteristic in a modified form is found in lower races, and is referred to as prognathous. Viewed in profile it causes the area of the teeth to round outward relative to the other portions of the face. The jaws of monkeys and apes are also prognathous. For a monkey, the baboon has a very extended muzzle, and I think it is this, combined with human-like structures, that makes him appear so hideous to us.

Continuing with Kroeber, he shows that the Negro's forehead recedes, his nose is both broad and low. Kroeber also points out that Caucasians have the antithesis of these traits. Parenthetically, may I not refer to these more correctly as structures rather than traits? From this point of view, he shows that we grade up from ape, Negro, Mongolian, to Caucasian. He then tells us that one of the most conspicuous differences between men and apes is their relative hairiness. Of the races of humans, he adds, the Caucasian has the most hair on both body and face. Kroeber also points out that the

lips of the Negro are the most everted. Does the Negro's lip form have evolutionary significance? Coon and associates (*Races*, pp. 63, 64) tell us that this does not represent an advanced human character. On the other hand, I think that we must admit that structural qualities have a great deal of significance from an evolutionary point of view, and the ones shown for the Negro, as of jaw, forehead, and nose form, are the reflection of bone structure. What significance if any does the superficial quality of hair occurrence have? I wish to express, but simply as my own opinion, the thought that it has little or none. Possibly I am going too far afield in my next illustration, but let me mention that the pig is less hairy than many other mammals, as are also the elephant and the rhinoceros. Huntington believes that this is due to the tropical habitat of the latter two. Darwin shows that in the Pacific Islands the hairiness of the natives varies greatly. Sometimes this is the case with different races. However, in one instance those of the same race, though occupying different islands, differ widely in the amount of beard. Here we may be observing but an instance of what is known as "random genetic drift." This is where mutation occurs without selection. It has been said that the white races are the most given to baldness. If this is so, and if we are going to rate hairiness as bearing an evolutionary rank, we should be given "credit" for this. It is the opinion of Taylor (*Race*, p. 555) that hairiness was a help, at one time, to the northern races in resisting cold. We have here, then, a quality which to your writer has implications not at all clear. He doubts if they have significance.

Kroeber continues with other thoughts in connection with anatomical rank, but I consider them too speculative to be worthy of review. His interpretation of them all tends to belittle race differences. However, he ends the discussion with the statement that he is not denying the possibility of differential ratings. In short, he admits the possibility of rating races on anatomical grounds.

The Negro Can Be Improved

Kroeber makes a great deal of the fact the Negro's I. Q. can be improved when he moves from the South to the North. This, of course, is his strongest evidence. for it suggests the possibility that all differences might be of an environmental nature. However, others have pointed out that this improvement is but a slight one. (See *Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*.)

One of the weak points with comparative tests of Negroes and whites is that all Negroes, no matter what their type, are usually classed together. I cannot place too much emphasis on this situation, for some of the individuals classified as Negro may be genetically almost white. This fact should always be kept in mind in appraisals of the two races. Its significance is borne out by the following:

During the First World War, the Army separated Negro recruits into darker and lighter-skinned groups and then gave them both Alpha and Beta tests. Kroeber deals with this on pages 198 and 199.

Alpha tests are for literates. With these, lighter-skinned Negroes made 50; dark-skinned, only 30. With Beta tests, designed primarily for illiterates, the lighter-skinned showed 36; the dark, 29.

Principles Followed by Science

There is a principle employed by scientists (see *The Scientific Outlook* by Bertrand Russell). Where two or more equally plausible explanations of phenomena can be found, the simplest one is accepted. In this case, the most plausible as well as the simpler explanation of these differences is that they are based on race. Kroeber could not allow this to appear to be the case and retain his equalitarian position. To defend this, we shall follow him through a tortuous course of "reasoning," so strained and distorted as to be agonizing.

Kroeber first assumes that the mulattoes during the slave period were "likely" to be house servants and therefore in

contact with a better environment, while their half brothers and sisters stayed in plantation shacks. This is but a rank assumption on Kroeber's part. Stuart Landry, in *The Cult of Equality*, shows that the number of slaves per plantation varied from one or two to a thousand or more. Are we to suppose that the number of mulattoes in each situation just happened to coincide with the number of house servants? And, of course, there is neither proof nor evidence offered that they were favored in this capacity. Kroeber goes on to tell us that the initial advantage gained while they were servants has allowed the mulattoes to keep a step or two ahead of the descendants of the pure blacks.

In the foregoing, Kroeber assumes that he has discovered an initial advantage, then continues on the basis that this assumption has been proved. To put it mildly, Kroeber's "reasoning" is so wild that we may properly raise the question of why it found its way into a book that is striking a pose of scientific objectivity. However, we reserve our principal consideration of motives for a later chapter. Not only have we found Kroeber guilty of faulty reasoning, but his presentation of the findings of the Army is, indeed, slanted. It conveys the impression that the discovered differences between the groups are but slight. Hence his reference to a step or two ahead. One of my dictionaries says of "step": "A small space or distance, especially a small distance forward." Another one, ". . . any short distance, a space easily traversed."

Kroeber tells us that the lighter-skinned Negroes as servants were in a position during slave days to get more information and perhaps more education. Again these are but out and out assumptions on Kroeber's part. As such, they have no place in a book purporting to be scientific. However, unabashed, he continues on his reckless course.

Kroeber employs this assumption as though it were a fact and gives us to understand that this better information has been handed down to the descendants of the lighter-skinned Negroes. Even if we allow, just for argument's sake, the

possibility that such an advantage might have existed, surely by the time the tests were administered this must have faded to but a flickering flame, or much more likely, completely died. And what has prevented the darker group from acquiring advantages by contact with their "half brothers and sisters" — not to mention others; just as this latter group are supposed to have benefited from those about them? In Kroeber's anxiety to bolster the fantastic case which he would have us accept, he ignores a fact that deserves first consideration. It is, since slave days both groups have had equal opportunities to attend school, and this should be the paramount factor in their mental development. Further, he has overlooked, or hopes that we will, the fact that his theory cannot account for the poor showing of the dark Negroes in the Beta tests.

We Learn About Kroeber

Again, from Kroeber, we do not learn anything about race, but we do learn a great deal about his methods. I think that I need not apologize for a clear expression of opinion at this point. This is that Kroeber's attempt to account for the different showings of the light and dark-skinned Negroes is by a vast margin the most absurd concoction that I have ever encountered, offered in the name of science. It is properly rejected.

A Different Interpretation

After following Kroeber's apology for the extremely poor showing of the dark-skinned Negroes, I would like to show how I think this situation should be interpreted. In the case of the Alpha tests, we can reduce the figures to a simple decimal. This shows the dark-skinned Negroes with but sixty per cent of the capacity of the lighter ones. How much importance should we attach to this difference? Certainly in other biological fields an inequality in performance of this magnitude would be considered nothing short of prodigious. I once read a statement by a breeder of fine horses to the

effect that properly trained thoroughbreds should not be over two or three lengths apart at the end of a mile race. What would we think of horses found only sixty per cent of the way around the track when the others had finished? We would not hesitate to conclude that they were completely out-classed. Are we entitled to expect as close a finish in one case as in the other? I do not know what valid argument I could use against such a position. In fact, if two groups are to be considered equal they should make an equal showing. However, I will not belabor this point, and I recognize that the measurement of mental capacities is not apt to be as accurate as that of physical distances. At the same time these measurements of capacity could vary in one direction as well as the other. And where we are dealing with groups rather than with individuals the law of averages should apply so as to give a very close approximation of the truth.

I have branded Kroeber an out and out equalitarian in spite of the fact that he is about to deny that he is one. What is back of his denial? It appears to be employed as a stratagem. For, if he can convince us that he has an open mind on the subject of race equality it will shield him from the otherwise obvious conclusion that in connection with this subject he is dominated by a monomania.

Kroeber's Claims

Kroeber tells us on page 204 that it may appear he is arguing in favor of race equality. He denies this. He admits that the anatomical differences make it "likely" that corresponding psychological differences exist. He gives us to understand that these differences "might not" be profound when comparisons are made with the sum total of human faculties. He also admits that in connection with the vexed question of superiority, some races might have greater powers in some directions than others. Kroeber then tells us that this pre-eminence might be rather evenly distributed, so that no one race would notably excel another. He then admits that

superiorities might have some "minor" tendency to cluster around one race. We are then informed that race differences will probably be ultimately determined. In this connection, he refers to the differences as moderate or minimal.

After Kroeber's assertion that he is not arguing in favor of race equality we find that he leads us with finesse, by a series of suggestive statements, to the conclusion that discoverable racial differences will be inconsequential. No information is offered, no facts given to show that this will prove to be the case. Kroeber simply implants in our minds the thoughts which he wants us to accept; the conclusion he wishes us to hold. We could, with equal propriety, recast each statement to convey exactly the opposite impression. Kroeber's performance is that of a propagandist, in which capacity he pushes an arbitrary viewpoint.

In spite of the fact that Kroeber has dogmatically evaluated racial potentials for our benefit he tells us on page 205 that most existing evidence on race endowment is probably worthless. He does not give us the slightest hint of why this is the case, and it probably is worthless for his purposes. He then says that the remaining evidence might have some value but gives us to understand that no one can yet properly evaluate it. Here, we are confronted with assertions without value or significant meaning. First we are told that the existing evidence is probably worthless (an arbitrary position); then Kroeber proceeds to place *his* evaluation on evidence that he has told us no one can evaluate. In view of his assertion of the worthlessness of the evidence, where is his justification for leading us to believe that discoverable racial differences will turn out to be of little consequence?

Let us glance at the strategy just employed by Kroeber. First, he builds his case for racial equality. This is accomplished by employing dogmatic assertions, suggestions, and innuendo. But his play is so cleverly staged that we are not conscious of his method. After the performance, the settings are destroyed. Kroeber leads us to an island, then burns the bridge

by which we approached it. We become his permanent captives in this land of his choice; an area of make-believe and illusion.

Continuing on the same page, Kroeber gives us to understand that progress will be made by shifting our attention from the crude consideration of the comparative lump rating of races with respect to superiority or inferiority, to a consideration of the specific qualitative differences that they may show. By means of this statement Kroeber diverts our attention from over-all problems of racial superiority; such beliefs being obviously distasteful to him. Kroeber's employment of the term "crude" in the foregoing reference, while it is not an improper one, nevertheless leaves us with a rather unhappy impression of race appraisals.

Kroeber tells us that the question of finding the race where the greatest number of qualitative excellencies might be concentrated should follow the foregoing and is of less scientific importance. From this statement we gather that Kroeber wants us to concentrate on specific differences rather than gather them together for an evaluation of the whole. His emphasis is on procedure and method rather than conclusions. He would divert our attention from the whole to the parts. This again represents but an arbitrary position on Kroeber's part. He in common with other equalitarians offers us in extravagant profusion presumptive statements of their viewpoints as though these were established and generally accepted opinions. In connection with the statement just reviewed, let us show that there are thinkers who entertain other beliefs, and to them his position might not be acceptable. Thus, Gregory considers that it is the proper end of science to interpret and that measurement is but a means to that end (*Evolution Emerging*, p. 5). A thought that has a bearing on our discussion was known to Aristotle as well as in the Far East, and Lao-Tse said, "The sum of the parts is not the whole." The question of the relative importance of the parts or the whole has been one around which an age-old

controversy has revolved (*The Encyclopedia of Psychology*, pp. 239-240). However, we learn from Boring, Langfield, and Weld (*Psychology*, 1948) that Gestalt Psychology was dropped as an *ism*, for, after a battle, nearly everyone has accepted its basic tenet that we gain false results from too much analysis, and it is safer to study wholes than parts.

Kroeber, in guiding us to his evaluation of racial capacities, inserts a reference to *scientific importance*. His thought on what is scientifically important does not represent more than a personal attitude, opinion, or belief. However, it is not so presented. Rather, Kroeber would assign a function to science, it being to back his preferences. Kroeber has presented us with so many assertions that we hardly have time to sort them for separate consideration. A drag occurs between their presentation and their evaluation. Let us return to one of these ideas. It has to do with a scheme of procedure; a line to be followed in our attempt to evaluate races. Thus he would rate specific qualities rather than wholes. Why we should follow his plan rather than that of someone else, I do not know. In fact, my evidence indicates his method is unsound. However, if his scheme for procedure is put into effect it will help postpone attempts to evaluate races. His approach also tends to belittle the importance of this subject.

Davenport and Steggarda

Davenport and Steggarda, under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Institution, made a detailed study of race crossing in Jamaica. Kroeber refers to this as probably the most elaborate investigation of the relative capacity of hybrids. These writers also considered the different mental capacities of the Negroes and whites. Their findings are of great significance because the two groups were living under similar conditions. Thus, because of the general poverty little difference existed in their respective economic situations. They gave the several groups detailed tests, and though Kroeber employs the material of these writers quite extensively, he fails to show what is

without doubt their most important conclusion even though it is compassed within a few lines. Their statement is to the effect that their studies resulted in so clear a conclusion that it put the burden of proof on those who deny fundamental differences, on the average, in mental capacities between Gold Coast Negroes and Europeans.

Rating Kroeber

In spite of the sheer absurdities discoverable in Kroeber's arguments when they are analyzed, we should not under-rate his ability as a pleader for a special point of view. At times Kroeber can present his material with great subtlety. It is then that he relies on either a slanted offering or arbitrary statements. Notwithstanding such methods, he maintains with considerable success the pose of an impartial scientist objectively dealing with his subject. Your writer has gained the impression that a great deal of thought and ingenuity must have been expended in inventing his stratagems.

Let us take a brief glance at Kroeber's over-all method. He employs various devices to cause us to lose confidence in opinions founded on observations. Then he attempts to win us to a belief in his purity of purpose. Following this, he tries to impress us with his capacity for true judgments. The advantages given and the prestige acquired by these means is then employed to an insidious end, in that it perverts our understanding of facts and in such a way that they point to totally unjustified conclusions. From the evidence uncovered in our review, I feel entitled to the belief that Kroeber must be under the sway of a strong drive or compulsion which demands a defense of the theme of racial equality. Otherwise, how can we account for his desperate attempt to win us to such a distorted view of reality that it is tantamount to a delusion?

CHAPTER III

HOOTON

Ernest Hooton is Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University. This gives prestige to his utterances, and he has written extensively. He is witty and his ideals have commanded a wide audience.

Before attempting an analysis of Hooton's thoughts let me say that he so generously admits his fallibility that it is quite disarming. However, our criticism is of ideas, not of personalities. With this introduction, let us proceed. Our material will be drawn from his book, *The Twilight of Man*.

Hooton Inconsistent

Towards the subject of race equality, Hooton does so many flip-flops that I doubt if an acrobat could follow him without appearing static. Let us turn to page 60, where we find a section dealing with "The Making of Human Races," presumably from mixtures. He first roundly condemns racism because he considers it potentially dangerous. In fact, it has proved to be so in Germany. In a sense this is an indication of the importance of the subject, as we shall later see.

On page 61, Hooton tells us that no stain of guilt for propagating a religion of races adheres to any anthropologists except those of Germany, who have been intimidated. He thinks that theories of race superiority and inferiority have been inflated into a religion of racialism by men like Gobineau and Houston-Stewart Chamberlain, whom he refers to as "charlatans" and "crackpots." He tells us that Madison Grant also has similarly contributed and refers to him as a "snobbish amateur." Now I have read all of Grant, part of Chamberlain, and am acquainted with Gobineau's theories. I think that their reasoning is at least as sound as that of our present

crop of anthropologists who, it seems to me, have not shown genius in this respect. When confronted by an argument that cannot be answered, many people simply throw mud at their opponent. Hooton, by the use of such intemperate language against his opponents, lays himself open to the suspicion that he must resort to this method. Thus he smears them but does not answer them.

The Professional Anthropologists

Hooton tells us that professional anthropologists are guilty of very serious sins of omission. They have been, we are informed, too stupid or too cowardly to come to actual grips in a scientific manner with the problem of race. He admits that certain anthropologists have been an exception to this rule, and he cites Franz Boas as one of them. Boas, I might say, believes in race equality. Returning to Hooton, he next tells us that these anthropologists (such as Boas) have overcompensated in their desire to lay the axe at the root of racialism as a religion.

Let us review what we have been subjected to by Hooton. First, he denounces the idea of race inequality. Then he sarcastically criticizes writers who have backed up this idea. He then tells us that professional anthropologists (who presumably lean in the other direction) have been guilty of serious sins of omission with respect to the subject of race inequality and refers to them as being either stupid or cowardly. He then says that the Equalitarian, Franz Boas, has overcompensated in the direction of equalitarianism.

Based on Hooton's statements the reader by now should be completely confused on where Hooton is trying to take us. However, one thing emerges quite clear. Whatever has been going on, Hooton vigorously disapproves of it.

What Anthropologists Should Have Done

On pages 62 and 63 I find the following ideas expressed: Anthropologists should not have pretended that race is a

superstition lurking in the dark corners of ignorant minds. Rather, they should have gone to work to study the biological and sociological implications of race which, he adds, are not in themselves evil. Thus, we are urged to study race differences and given to understand that evil consequences need not follow. I presume from this that we are to show what race differences can be found but be careful not to place valuations on them or stay within the bounds of Hooton's values. Continuing, he tells us that because anthropologists have insisted that race is a figment of the imagination, or a combination without meaning of anatomical trivialities of an inheritable nature, or differences impressed by physical environment, they have left the house empty so that spirits more wicked than themselves could enter. Then, we are given to understand that the last state of race is worse than the first. Again, Hooton admits that anthropologists have ducked their responsibility. He says that if, rather than having haggled over definitions of race or debating the relative influence of heredity and environment in producing race, they had proceeded directly to classify groups according to combinations of physical variations, they would have helped a study of mental and cultural characteristics of groups by specialists in these fields. He then tells us that physical facts of race have been confused with ignorant fancies and that this has left the whole field open for exploitation by unscrupulous and fanatical laymen. Thus, we learn from Hooton that anthropologists have been cowardly while laymen, on the subject of race, have been fanatical and unscrupulous. Here, everyone is indicted. And though Hooton flays his horse with fury he fails to make progress toward any ascertainable objectives. Hooton next tells us that fanatics have utilized the vast potentialities of race for political and social injustice. We have just been urged to study race, but now we are confronted with an expose of the dangers inherent in such a study. Then the charge is made that the religion of race has obsessed the German people and that it has inspired them repeatedly to attempt the over-

throw of European civilization. This idea was exploited on a wholesale scale during World War II. Whatever part their race theories may have played in German culture, I think it impossible to trace the origin of the war to any single factor or even properly evaluate what part, if any, this one did play, and I hardly think Hooton sufficiently versed in the extremely complex subject of the origin of wars to qualify as a judge. However, by the device of identifying the origin of the war with theories of race inequality, Hooton gains an immense emotional advantage for his philosophy of equality. Though his theme remains unproved, he scores heavily on the side of propaganda.

Race and Survival

In the next paragraph we are told that physical groups of men are selected for survival under differing environments. Let me point out that this is an important concession by Hooton, for other equalitarian anthropologists are "playing down" the effects of environment in forming races. This, for the reason that they are belittling all race differences. May I add that, though there are other factors involved, the influence that environment has had in developing races has probably been extensive, or even profound, though this is generally an unwelcome subject to equalitarians. Continuing with Hooton, he gives us to understand that after proper studies we will be in a position to understand the different capacities of the groups (races) for fitting into a planned world of culture in which each will utilize its special abilities to its own best interests and promote the welfare of the whole. Here, as repeatedly with Hooton, we find a hopeless confusion of ideologies concerning race combined with a realization that race differences exist. Hooton continues with his philosophy. In case we follow his plan, special abilities will be exploited, rather than inferiorities and superiorities. From this we cannot escape the conclusion that Hooton realizes that races

differ in ability. Under his creed we may recognize these differences but must not refer to them as inequalities.

More of Hooton's philosophy. Race differences, it would appear, may be made the excuse for a political philosophy of domination, suppression, and extermination. Then another plea is made for an honest, thorough, and impartial study of race in all of its physical and cultural implications. He then tells us that a more important prerequisite is that the multiplication within each race of degenerates, the insane, the mental inferiors, should be checked. Then we are assured the mass of mankind can be sufficiently educated to profit from the findings of science as to the distribution of abilities in the human species.

A Summary

Let us pause for a summary and for a criticism of Hooton's philosophy. Hooton is convinced of the necessity of studying race differences. However, he wants this done under an over-all canopy of a philosophy of equality. Under this philosophy, it is all right to study such differences. However, should we place values on our findings they become a thing vile, pregnant with evil. I wonder if Hooton thinks that his ideas can be fostered under any other system than a totalitarian one where we have lurking about "thought police," such as are said to have existed in Japan. Nor could such policing do more than drive ideas of this nature underground. Certainly, in a society such as ours, where we value minor qualities such as the shape and size of an ankle or the form of a face and the contour of its features, does Hooton think that our minds can be strait jacketed within the confines of his philosophy where no values can be assigned? And, as I shall later show, it is possible that what I have termed "minor qualities" play a part in bettering the race.

Hooton Returns to the Attack

Maybe, by now, the reader has concluded that Hooton has had his say on the subject of race equality and will pass

on to some other subject where confusion need not reign. However, he again returns to the attack.

On page 63 he disclaims infallibility. On page 64 he tells us that he could not, even in the city of brotherly love, subscribe to the doctrine that all men (races) are created equal. He proposes that this should be amended to read, all men are created different. Then follow some metaphors which he says he is afraid are mixed and which I shall not try to analyze. Following this, he starts to build a case of equality, and ends with the conclusion that all races are equal. Thus, in the same paragraph, we are told that he cannot subscribe (under any circumstances, I take it) to the sentiment that all races are equal. Yet, within a few lines, he comes out with the conclusion that they are equal. What are we to believe? By now I think that we are justified in discarding all of Hooton's ideas on race equality for he reverses himself so often that we can be on either side of the question and find expressions by Hooton backing us. However, Hooton ends by giving us his reason for believing in equality, so we shall continue our critical examination.

Hooton's Proof

Hooton's reason would seem to be based on the statement that individual capacity within human races has never been proven to differ significantly. His "proof" is based on a negative statement and is therefore no proof at all. He simply offers us an assumption. Further, if he has any evidence in support of this assumption he does not share it with us. Nor are we given the key to what he might consider "significant" in this connection. Thus, if we are searching for the truth we have been given what, in final analysis, proves to be no more than a group of unfounded assertions. Hooton then assumes that each race has, in all probability, its points of strength, offset by weaknesses, and concludes that they therefore come out equal. Here, Hooton makes a final assumption, based on the two which precede it. A writer by following such methods

can lead to any preconceived conclusion he chooses, and that is obviously what has happened in this case.

Here we have a sample of the "reasoning," and I think a fair one, of those who would change our traditional attitude toward race problems.

Differences in the White Races

Now it is not my primary purpose to consider what racial differences exist among our white people. We have before us a subject of greater importance. On the other hand, I shall not entirely neglect this aspect of the problem, for some of the studies that have been made of this group throw light on whether or not race differences exist, other than those obvious to the eye.

On page 127 Hooton starts a discussion of the psychological and cultural implications of race. This is in preparation for some rather extensive studies of race differences among the white branch. On page 129, by way of introduction to the subject, Hooton attacks what he calls the malignant nonsense that has been preached to justify suppression of minorities. He tells us that this pseudo scientific stuff appeals to morons. Parenthetically, let me ask the reader to take special notice of the passages that immediately follow, for in them Hooton admits that anthropologists in following their equalitarian philosophy have been misleading us. Thus, he says (because of this pseudo scientific stuff) anthropologists and others have tended to go beyond a legitimate statement that racial psychological differences have not been demonstrated. He says that they have claimed that such differences do not, in fact, exist. He then gives us to understand that he doubts if the exigencies of democratic principle and humanitarianism justify such statements. We are told that where valid scientific knowledge is lacking, we must neither deny or assert. I am glad to find Hooton at last backing up this position, for we have found him over many pages following the opposite practice. We also discover that he realizes the

fundamentally weak position of equalitarian anthropologists. We find in Hooton's position a further instance of an almost unbelievable series of inconsistencies, for realizing this, he still remains an equalitarian. Evidently, with him, the position that he maintains is due to some other cause than reason.

Hooton Discovers Race Differences

On page 130 Hooton tells of studies made on white material in the United States and Ireland. He sorted out various races by means of physical differentia. We are given to understand that we can call these either races, breeds, or types. Hooton found that different types, breeds, or races differ from each other remarkably in education, marital status, and nature of criminal offense.

After reviewing Hooton's findings, and comparing them in my mind with the "findings" of Madison Grant as expressed in *The Passing of the Great Race*, let me say that it is my opinion that Hooton discovers greater differences than does Grant, and these are backed up by more evidence than Grant was able to accumulate. In his own summing up of these differences (page 131), Hooton tells us that if the physical groups, races, or subraces do not have either biological or statistical validity, the social differences found are nothing short of miracles. He says that this opinion is shared by his sociological friends. In connection with the differences found by Grant and Hooton, the reader is invited to read both of these books and come to his own conclusions.

This is the same Grant whom Hooton refers to as a "snobbish amateur." How can we reconcile this situation? I think on no other basis than the fact that Grant wants to assign *values* to the differences that he finds. Hooton wants to show the differences, then smother his findings in an embroidered creed so that we shall not attach any value to them. We are to accept the facts that he presents but not give thought to their implications.

Let us note that though Hooton deals extensively with crosses of whites with other races, he does not consider those that have occurred in this country, except for some general remarks. Thus, he escapes the difficulty in explaining the wide differences in capacity found in the dark and light-skinned Negroes.

In fairness to Hooton, I should point out that in other portions of his work where he is not discussing race equality we do not find such wholesale inconsistencies. Where found in such numbers, they are due to the fact that he is trying the impossible: to reconcile what he knows to be the facts with a philosophy that is inconsistent with them.

CHAPTER IV

GILLIN

The next writer whom we shall consider is John Gillin. I do not know anything of him other than that his book informs us that he is Professor of Anthropology at the University of North Carolina, and is Research Professor, Institute for Research in Social Sciences. He represents what appears to be a trend, and that is why he is considered here.

Though I have been employing the revised 1948 edition of Kroeber's book, it was first copyrighted in 1923; Hooton's work in 1939. The similar date for Gillin's book is 1948. Thus, if it is allowed that the earlier copyright of Kroeber, in spite of his later revision, gives the work an earlier date, I will be able to show what I think is the direction in which anthropology is trending. Kroeber goes to great lengths to "prove" the equality of races. He is careful to maintain the pose of a detached scientist, viewing his subject objectively. Hooton is not so careful in either of these respects, though his position is similar to that of Kroeber, in that they both adopt a philosophy of equality. Gillin shows a tendency to consider that the innate equality of races is, for practical purposes, established. However, when we analyze his statement on page 140 dealing with this question, we find that it is cautiously worded. Thus, he tells us that no conclusive evidence of significant intellectual differences between races has been scientifically demonstrated. This, as we have shown in our opening remarks, is true. However, what Gillin does not tell us is that the inconclusive situation which his statement points to would allow of another guarded statement, the implications of which would point in exactly the opposite direction. Here we uncover a classical example of a method at which equalitarians have become adept; that is, so slanting the presentation of material

that while they may be technically telling the truth, they nevertheless succeed in conveying a biased and one-sided impression. Also, Gillin's employment of the word "significant" leaves the question wide open, for anyone can interpret "significant" when used as here in connection with differentiation, to conform with his desires.

Continuing, Gillin asserts that we achieve the best results in interpreting and predicting culture by proceeding for the present on the assumption that the various varieties of mankind are equal. By interjecting "for the present" Gillin concedes that this question is not settled. Why, then, this attitude rather than an opposite one? While we are not at this point raising the question of motives, we can point out that he is arbitrarily favoring his equalitarian position. In the paragraph containing this statement I find a great excess of verbiage. I have repeatedly noticed this practice with the writers being reviewed when they are making statements of doubtful validity. I cannot say whether this is consciously employed as a device. However, by this means they convey the impression when the reading is superficial that they are elaborately qualifying their position as is sometimes necessary in scientific discourses. Thus, their utterances may seem impressive to the hasty reader, the uninitiated, the superficial, or the young. In this way they also throw obstacles in the way of those who would analyze their claims.

Gillin's Principal Reliance

After this digression, let me proceed. Gillin's principal reliance for building a case for equality is the different showings made by Negroes tested in different environments. He saves himself the embarrassment of trying to explain the relatively great differences found in mental tests of light and dark Negroes which show the lighter ones better endowed.

Let us return to Gillin's assertion that we achieve the best results by assuming the equality of races. What does he mean by best results? As he fails to inform us on this point,

we are left in doubt, both with respect to his real meaning and his reason for making this arbitrary statement. However, we can point out that it provides him with a "reason" or offers him an excuse for making an assumption of equality. We might add that this assumption is offered with such an air of authority that it might be mistaken for a statement of fact. Gillin, as a professor, may be able to "get away" with such dogmatic attitudes. However, his method, at once shoddy and designing, will be understood by the inquiring mind for what it is. It represents a device for imposing a viewpoint. No claim is made that the method in question will help us discover the truth or give us a clearer understanding of facts. We, of course, achieve the best results in this situation if we are propagandists; assuming we wish to further the creed of race equality. The reader will remember that Gillin is a Research Professor, Institute for Research in Social Sciences. I would like to know something of the aims of this institute. It seems to me that in his statements Gillin is acting from the force of some drive inspired by an emotional or philosophic concept that places some sociological aim above all else. I base this assumption upon his use of such illegitimate methods as we have been reviewing.

Gillin on Race Absorption

Gillin frankly favors race absorption by the whites of the blacks (pages 133, 134) though he admits that this would be impossible until attitudes are changed. Let me add that he is doing his best to change them.

Both Kroeber and Hooton seem more cautious with respect to race absorption than is Gillin. Thus we discover the direction in which our anthropologists, with increasing boldness, are leading us. By now the reader will have formed some opinion as to whether or not they are men of sufficiently good judgment, intellectual capacity, and honesty to make worthy leaders in this all-important field.

A few decades ago our country was often referred to as a

"melting pot" where all of the white races, at least, would eventually be mixed. This, as a project, became the darling of the sentimentalists who looked at the subject from an emotional point of view, rather than a biological one. Because the ideas that they fostered acquired a certain prevalence in this country, it is probably difficult for most of us to view problems in connection with this question objectively. However, as will be shown, I believe that the best biological thought is against such mixtures. At least, this would be the case with widely divergent races. However, Gillin has developed an enthusiasm for racial crossings, for from them he thinks he sees great benefits, and because of his belief in these, it is clear that he would have us absorb our Negro element. The information given here is simply in rebuttal to Gillin's position.

A New Technique

In connection with this subject, Gillin invents a new method of disposing of antagonists. Thus he sets up as his opposition such a grossly exaggerated version of the opposing outlook that it has but a slight resemblance to the proper one. Then he arranges a sham battle in which he easily emerges the victor. The uninitiated spectator, not being allowed a sight of his real opponent, will probably conclude that Gillin has completely carried the field. Here we hope to show that his opposition is strongly entrenched and that Gillin has not even met it.

Gillin tells us that those untutored in the scientific findings regarding hybridization often conjure up imaginary horrors (in cases of race crossings) ranging from the production of monstrosities to feeble-mindedness. Let me point out that competent scientists do not see such evil consequence, though many of them consider that crosses of divergent lines are, for sufficient reasons, undesirable. I also wish to point out that Gillin, by his reference to those "untutored in the scientific findings," implies that those with views different from his

own are ignorant, while his own views have the backing of science. He apparently wishes to cash in on science's tremendous prestige. At the same time, he appears unwilling to subject his methods to her disciplines.

The Practical Breeder

The animal breeder has enough information to be able to achieve beneficial results. However, his methods cannot be applied to humans under prevailing social systems, for these do not allow of the elimination of undesirable strains, or unfavorable products from the crossing of divergent lines.

The Question of Hybrid Vigor

When two inbred strains of animals are crossed, there is usually a gain for the offspring in all-around vigor. This would not appear to be a permanent acquisition by the new strain; but the benefits, at least in the main, would seem to be confined to the first crossing. I have discussed with a practical chicken breeder the effects of such crossings. He greatly prefers "line breeding" in which "proved" inbred lines are maintained.¹ However, he told me that some breeders cross such lines but do not allow the crossed birds to continue their line. In case this is permitted, it has been found that the mixed breeds are apt to show undesirable qualities. I have also been told by a practical sheep breeder that he cross-breeds for one generation, but avoids inbreeding the crossed animals. These breeders did not claim, as Gillin says the uninitiated believe, that such crosses would result in feeble-minded or monstrous creatures. Still, they do not consider it desirable to continue the mixed lines.

Nature's Attitude Towards Divergent Lines

Now let us see Nature's attitude toward the question of crossing divergent lines. In the main she avoids such, for she

¹ V. A. Rice in his book, *Breeding and Improvement of Farm Animals*, refers to line breeding as breeding animals only of the same general descent (p. 514).

sees to it that like favors like. This fact is generally recognized, and is responsible for our saying: "Birds of a feather flock together." However, Darwin shows that in nature distinct species of birds do occasionally pair and produce hybrids. He believes that this is probably due to solitary birds not finding one of their own species to pair with.² Darwin also tells that it is true that domesticated fowls, particularly ducks and geese, may show a preference for those of another variety. He believes that this may be due to the artificial conditions under which they live. On the other hand, he shows that some female pigeons will not pair with varieties other than their own. However, in gauging nature's attitude with respect to this problem, it is your writer's opinion that we are justified in ignoring attitudes of domesticated animals, or confined wild ones. In the case of these latter, they often acquire perverted instincts. Thus, some may ignore or kill their young.

Though I do not have any references before me, a number of studies of humans have shown, when measured statistically, a sexual preference of similar types for each other. Judging from observation, it may be that the governing factor in these situations has to do with the over-all qualities reflected in body build rather than superficial criteria such as coloring, except where this quality is emblematic of widely diverging races. With whites, coloring varies extensively even with members of the same race. The generally found antipathy between widely divergent races will be further remarked on later.

Thus, nature reckons with the problem of dissimilar lines, and in the main solves the problem properly. She is the real instigator of discrimination, shocking as this thought may be to equalitarians. She also prevalingly practices it to the confusion of their claims. Gillin and his kind would flout her wisdom and ignore that of the animal breeder.

² Blumenback (1752-1840) also recognizes that such crosses almost never occur in a state of nature, and believes that this is a wise provision by which a confusion of forms is guarded against. (*Race*, p. 28)

Gillin thinks that no improvement can take place in "pure" lines, except by mutations. Sir Arthur Keith believes the opposite (*A New Theory of Human Evaluation*). It is Keith's conviction that crossing races slows down their rate of evolution, and that race prejudice serves the useful purpose of helping prevent the mixture of divergent races. It so happens that we are in a position to test Keith's judgment. For an interesting account of how Keith opposed his fellow anthropologists in determining from a fragment, the capacity of a skull, and later proved his method worked in a controlled case, see *Mankind So Far*, by William Howells. In this case, at least, Keith proved his ability. We are also told by Hooton (*Preface to Keith's Evolution and Ethics*) that while Keith's boldly original theories have sometimes been condemned as fantastic, he has been vindicated by subsequent discoveries far oftener than not. The other writer has only shown a capacity for spinning theories of questionable validity.

Gillin describes a number of crosses between whites and others which have occurred in various parts of the world, and as far as his discernment goes he sees no evil effects resulting therefrom, except that he admits that in studies by others (page 129), such crosses show a small percentage of disharmonies in limb proportion, teeth, and jaws. Although Gillin refers to the studies of Davenport and Steggarda in connection with race crossing, he omits one of their important findings. Thus (*Race*, p. 445) they gained the impression that while on the *average* the browns did not do so badly (in the tests which they administered) there were among them a greater number who were muddled than with either the whites or blacks. They considered that with the blacks their intelligence might be low, but with the browns they found five per cent who did not seem to be able to use their native endowment. However, they warn that their results were not conclusive in this respect.

These authors remark (*Race*, p. 444) that Davenport in 1917 discussed the subject at some length and concluded that

there is evidence of physical, mental, and instinct disharmony in hybrids. They found no evidence of hybrid vigor in the crosses studied in Jamaica.

On page 124 of *Negroes in Brazil*, Pierson tells us that there is some evidence that the Brazilian mixed blood has less resistance than either the black or white to certain diseases, and he cites tuberculosis as an example. Thus the percentage of mixed bloods in 1904 is given as 35.1 per cent, while the proportion of mixed bloods dying of tuberculosis in that year was 49 per cent of the total number dying of this disease. The whites, with 31.4 per cent of the population, showed but 21.4 per cent of such deaths. The blacks, being 26.3 per cent, accounted for 26.9 per cent.

A Polish Writer on Race Crossings

As further evidence that race crossings may have unfavorable effects, let us turn to a Polish anthropologist, Jan Chekanowski. If such are unsatisfactory, at least in the case of some of the offspring, I think that we would be justified in expecting this would be most evident in widely divergent races. The white inhabitants of Europe, while of different stocks, have not become greatly divergent. At the same time, differences can be discovered. Chekanowski believes that certain physical and mental disorders are disproportionately high in some of the mixed white forms found in his country (see *Race*, p. 606).

Professor Horatio Newman on Crossing

Now let us turn to a specialist in the field of eugenics, Horatio Newman, Professor of Zoology, University of Chicago. Our information is drawn from his book, *Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics*, third edition. On page 303 he introduces us to the subject of hybrid vigor. He remarks that this usually, though not always, results from crossings. He says further crossings of hybrids may produce weak forms. In connection with the question of whether or not hybridization in general

is advantageous, he tells us that, especially where the parent races are not too distantly related, the first generation is generally an improvement on either race. If we could stop at this first crossing, he thinks that the results would probably be good. Continuing on page 304, he shows that cross-breeding with man is sure to continue, which will entail all sorts of unfortunate combinations. He believes that hybridization, unless combined with rigid elimination of the less desirable combinations, is on the whole undesirable. He remarks that in nature this is automatically handled, though we cannot do this with man. Let me add that the opinions expressed by the foregoing writers are exactly in line with those given me by the livestock breeders cited.

In this writer's opinion, Gillin should be condemned; first, for trying to throw us onto a false track; secondly, for giving us to understand that his presentation of this matter is a scientific one, then foisting on us a personal viewpoint or preference. We find that he offers us a poorly considered, biased, and reckless approach to a question of fundamental human significance.

CHAPTER V

AN HISTORICAL NOTE

Bertrand Russell mentions a fact generally recognized: that is, as individuals we cannot be well posted in all directions. Therefore, we seek the advice of specialists in their respective fields. Our faith in this practice is probably justified in a majority of cases. However, begging the question of whether science can ever arrive at "ultimate" truth, we may point out that it has not even achieved a "workable" understanding of many situations. Therefore, specialists can be and often are wrong. In addition to the enumerated possibilities for error, anthropology is such a new science that it is not well seasoned. Also, it is a complex subject with many facets (Von Eickstedt, pp. 540, 541; and Karl Pearson, *Race* p. 295), and it is probable that some anthropologists who treat of psychic problems have little acquaintance with them. It should also be remarked that problems connected with the mind do not fall within the "exact" sciences.

Most of the writers whose works we review insert a guarded reference to the fact that relative racial capacities have not been determined. This would seem to call for a prudent handling of the problems involved. However, after this concession, they brashly push their equalitarian preference as though there were no doubt about its validity. I consider that others, particularly educators, are apt to be better informed on the subject of racial intelligence than are anthropologists, and many of them, as we shall see, do not agree with the equalitarian viewpoint.

Another factor can be mentioned. We are dealing with a subject highly charged with emotions. For this reason it becomes difficult for anyone to adopt an entirely objective viewpoint in connection with race problems. However, because

of reasons that we will later review, those with equalitarian views have for the time being gained the ascendancy. It is because anthropologists are impressing our young people with their opinions and are establishing their position, even though indirectly, with other groups that I have dealt with them first. With the exception of a few whom I shall presently mention, we have what I consider a fair sampling of their attitude towards the question of race equality.

Anthropologists With Other Views

Let us now glance at some anthropologists with different views. Carleton Coon, who was Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University at the time that he wrote *The Races of Europe*, apparently does not agree with equalitarians. In the introduction to his book he gives us to understand that he will not deal with racial intelligence, due to the fact that the question has not made sufficient progress and because the subject has been turned to political ends. Evidently he does not believe that equality of mental capacity has been proved, for had he believed such it is logical to think that he would have so stated.

In Coon's latest book (1950), written in association with Garn and Birdsell, we find a new basis suggested for evaluating the evolutionary rank of races. This, of course, implies inequality. However, their attack on equalitarian positions is not a frontal one and great care is exercised to preserve a circumspect attitude.

Earl Count, in the introduction to his excellent anthology entitled *This Is Race*, dodges the subject of racism and says that he is not including writings of Knox, Gobineau, Chamberlain, Grant, Stoddard, and Gunther, who of course believe that races differ in qualities and capacities. But to offset these we are informed that he has also omitted those who, though their motives have been laudatory, have been unscientific in their tactics of refuting racism. Clearly, Count has seen

through the false methods employed by equalitarian anthropologists to achieve their ends.

W. W. Howells seems dissatisfied with extreme views on either side of the question of mental equality. However, he falls back on a statement by Hooton that is not very clear. Fairchild differs with the equalitarians, and the reader is invited to review his statements in this connection, beginning on page 688 (*Race, by Count*).

The great English anthropologist, Sir Arthur Keith, is in entire disagreement with our equalitarian anthropologists. In his last book, *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, he refers to the *Bastards* (a group of African half-bloods) as inferior to whites in every respect. I think that much of Keith's writings in recent years represent an unavowed protest against the extreme views of racial equality that have been fostered in this country. However, I wish to treat further of Keith later in this writing.

Origin of Present Attitude

If American anthropologists are mistaken in the sentimental philosophy of equality which they are passing off on us as the findings of science, what has caused them to adopt this attitude? Psychological questions as well as motives will be dealt with in a later chapter. Here we shall sketch in the broadest of outlines some historical factors that played a part in determining their positions.

The French count, Gobineau, becomes a central figure in almost any racial theory. He wrote a book, the very title of which has a strange ring in our conditioned modern ears, for he called it *The Inequality of Races*. The nature of the origin of his book is given different interpretations by different factions. One would have us believe that it was founded on Gobineau's observations; for he was widely traveled. The other claims that it is a political effusion.

Gobineau developed the theory that Caucasians are superior to other races, and the northern Europeans, being the

“purest,” are the highest type. This idea, or variants of it, was pushed by Chamberlain and gained some headway in England; by Grant in this country; and it was responsible for the arising of a great vogue in Germany. Grant’s book, *The Passing of the Great Race*, has as its theme that north Europeans are superior, but that they are being crowded out in North America by the floods of immigrants from central, southern, and eastern Europe. He doubted the quality of some of the later arrivals. His book made a deep impression in America, and is said to have been responsible for the adoption of our law restricting immigration. However, with the passage of time, opposition to Grant’s views arose. His position was based largely on observations made by himself and others as to what they considered race qualities and characteristics. Let me point out that such observations may be correct, but they offer only a certain amount of evidence and cannot conclusively prove their point. For instance, those who do not like the results of such findings can claim that the findings are biased; that they themselves do not see the same qualities, and such situations can very well end in a battle of statements. Franz Boas was particularly offended by claims of race superiority, and probably had a great deal to do with starting the reaction against Grant’s position which ended in the avalanche of mud throwing, personal abuse, smearing, and belittling of Grant that was later witnessed. Thus, long before the Second World War, equalitarians had by means equally unscientific to his own, if not more so, “proved” to their own satisfaction that they had disproved Grant’s theories. Let me repeat, to their own satisfaction; even though I sometimes doubt that this was the case with all of them. For the touch of frenzy that animates some of these writers suggests an uneasiness that might be born of secret doubts of the validity of their position.

We still hear reverberations of this battle, if it can be called such, for the attacks were by now being made by the equalitarians alone, and we have found Hooton referring to

Grant as a "snobbish amateur." We shall later see him indicted as the high priest of racism. Chamberlain has been called a renegade Englishman, without any justification. The fact that he had adopted a continental domicile gave this opening, and by this personal smear it was hoped to discredit his ideas.

Hitler's Part

In the meantime, theories of race superiority were making headway in Germany. Anthropologists in America who had matured during the backwash from Grant's position became more and more offended by the ideas of the Germans. When Hitler started his verbal attacks on the Jews, this offense became intensified. To a certain extent the white communities around the world became aroused against Hitler, and this was partly due to his racial theories. However, because of a number of circumstances, including the fact that this country is kept well informed on current events, and that we tend to be a sentimental people, the feeling against Hitler on this score probably became more intense here than in other areas. We have, as everyone knows, a relatively large Jewish element, and many of these Jews were in positions of power. We may be sure that no opportunities were overlooked to attack Hitler's racial theories. They were made to appear ridiculous. It was part of this process to brand all ideas concerning race inequalities as vicious fallacies. Thus, during a veritable orgy of war hysteria and emotional outpourings, many in this country absorbed their ideas about race problems. However, the subject of propaganda in connection with race I wish to deal with later. I have carried the matter this far at this point because anthropologists being but human were caught in this tide, and were carried along with it, and many of them in their turn helped it along.

Jews Interested in Anthropology

The Jews, a people who have often been persecuted, have interested themselves in race questions, especially when

they have considered their position threatened, even indirectly. They cannot be criticized for their interest. Any intelligent people would have reacted strongly to the situation in which they found themselves at the time Hitler began his attacks on them. Even though they have never been in danger in this country, Jews, after witnessing what happened in Germany, were apprehensive. When gripped by fear, one largely loses his reason. Primitive man could run from what he feared, but mostly modern man must adopt some other means of dealing with dangerous situations. Thus the Jews have felt that they must counter any ideas of race inequalities lest they be caught by them and engulfed. Though I do not wish to imply that this was the only factor involved in forming the attitude of the Jews on race subjects, it can hardly be doubted that this was the principal one which stimulated them to adopt an extreme attitude.

Considering their peculiar position and their reaction, at times all but frantic, they are poor guides in this important field. Though sympathetic with their position, we need not follow their leadership, for it would place us in a position which I shall later show should be avoided.

In trying to gain an understanding of the attitude of our anthropologists on the subject of race we should not overlook a statement by Hooton (page 229) who tells us that the Jews have been actively interested in anthropology in this country, and that a high percentage of our leading anthropologists are of Jewish origin. Those who have come in contact with American Jews cannot escape the fact that they are interested in spreading a creed of equality between the whites and blacks. I think it safe deduction that they have had a profound effect on our anthropologists, and through them, on our country.

However, a broader look at the subject takes into consideration that where two possible viewpoints are involved attitudes are apt to move in cycles. Human nature being what it is, these could ordinarily be considered to be "normal." The particular point to be realized with the subject under con-

sideration is that circumstances have conspired in this country to carry us into a "wild" extreme where theories sponsored by equalitarians have been carried to unjustified lengths, as is amply proved by the absurdities they deal in.

CHAPTER VI
AN AMERICAN DILEMMA

Myrdal and Rose

We now turn from the writings of professional anthropologists to diverse works. These have in common a strong sociological bias, and we shall repeatedly see their authors attempting to convert a biological science into a subject for sociological evaluation. This as an aim is worthy, but in attempts to force the one science into the confines of the other they do violence to the facts of biology. Not only this, but the sociological "gains" which they envision are based on theoretical concepts, with no proof offered that these are workable. When we later deal with sociological conditions we shall show that there is evidence that their schemes are impractical.

The first book to be considered is *An American Dilemma*. This, including its index, is over 1400 pages long. It is doubtful if many, other than reasearch workers, will read it, even in part. It is therefore probable that its direct effect will be small. However, the work was financed by the Carnegie Corporation, and because of the immense prestige that this institution enjoys, the indirect influence of a book that has gained its sponsorship is apt to be great. Thus, those seeking financial aid for equalitarian projects can refer to it as being on their side as can anyone wishing justification for propaganada statements. Anthropologists, in common with others, borrow ideas, and unless those advanced in this book are exposed, it could become an all but inexhaustible source for equalitarian material. I have therefore decided to review its passages that deal with the question of race equality at considerable length.

The author of the book is Gunnar Myrdal, a Swede, who is referred to as a "social" economist, whatever that is. Myrdal wrote with the assistance of Richard Sterner, another Swede, and Arnold Rose whom I believe to be an American. *An American Dilemma* deals with the Negro problem in this country and with black and white relations. It is supposed to be entirely objective, and we are given to understand by F. P. Kepple, at the time head of the Corporation, that Myrdal was "imported" to further this end. Thus there would appear to be an advantage to a "neutral" approach to this subject. Both sides could presumably be confident in the result. Was Myrdal assigned this task to further the employment of a more objective outlook or as a means of window dressing to more successfully exploit a special point of view? Whatever the facts were in this connection, I do not hesitate to charge that this work rapidly degenerates into a one-sided presentation of a case for equalitarianism. Its method is utterly unscientific, for it offers us, as I shall show, simply statements of opinion as though these were proven facts. The work, where dealing with relationships between whites and Negroes, is supported by the unproven assumption that the differences in capacity shown by the two races are due entirely to the differences in their environments. As soon as this prop is removed, the vast and elaborate edifice which the authors have erected, collapses into all but worthless rubble. I say "all but," for even though it be inadvertently, a few statements based on an objective viewpoint have crept into the book. However, most of these appear to be included because they are so well known that they must be outlined before an attempt can be made to refute them. And other portions of the book, not reviewed, may have some value.

A Conducted Tour of Equalitarian Thought

We may consider *An American Dilemma* as a conducted tour that enables us to meet all equalitarian ideas that have

been advanced in this country. More than seventy people (author's preface) are listed as having done some work in connection with it.

Kepple's Foreword

Kepple, head of the Corporation, has written a *Foreword*. On the first page of this we are told that if the Foundation limits itself to its proper function it will make the facts available and let them speak for themselves; and providing it does not tell the public what to do about these facts the Corporation's funds will be properly used. In spite of this statement by Kepple, the book ignores facts but launches a crusade. Thus we are told on page 109 how to reduce white people's bias in racial beliefs concerning the Negro. This idea is elaborated on and we are given the lines of strategy that should be employed to this end. They largely consist of informing the white man of his mistakes in ascribing differences in the races to inborn racial traits. As the authors admit in another portion of the book that the question of racial mental capacity has not been settled, they are obviously here dealing in propaganda rather than facts. We are not going to press the point that in view of Kepple's statement the Corporation funds were apparently misused. I find no sign of embarrassment on the part of the authors, due to this maneuvering.

Continuing with Kepple and his Foreword, we are given to understand that Myrdal was to be free to employ his own staff and draw on the experience of scholars and experts, yet the final work should portray Myrdal's own viewpoint. Kepple also speaks of gathering and interpreting material, though he has just assured us that facts would be allowed to speak for themselves.

The last paragraph of Kepple's Foreword invites criticism of the work and ends with the statement that such should greatly add to the value of the undertaking. We shall not hesitate to accept his invitation to criticize and hope that the results will justify Kepple's expectations.

Author's Preface

We are now ready for the author's Preface. He tells us on its first page that the work is to be wholly objective and dispassionate.

In September of 1941 Myrdal was joined by Sterner and Rose. The latter apparently had a large say in the finished manuscript, for he prepared nine chapters in part four, and did other work. Rose prepared drafts of chapters V, VI, VII, and VIII, and helped with editing. He also checked inferences, viewpoints, and conclusions. Why should we need "inferences, viewpoints, and conclusions" in a book that promised to allow us to make our own deductions from facts that were to be presented? We are told that his criticisms and suggestions with few exceptions were adopted.

Myrdal also tells us (Author's Preface, XVI) that Rose's contributions on facts and values in social science were of great importance. He mentions that Rose had a wide acquaintanceship in this field. Myrdal refers to Sterner's criticism of *fundamental views* (Author's Preface, XV). In a book that promised to give us facts and allow us to make up our minds about them, there should be no need for fundamental views other than the single fundamental position that facts should be allowed to speak for themselves.

Rose's Viewpoint

Because of Rose's activities I feel that we are justified in assuming that he played an important part in developing attitudes assumed by the book; the "fundamental views" just discussed. We are therefore justified in asking who he is and the nature of his background. To such a question I must answer that I have been able to discover only the sociological references given. However, I believe that we can throw light on his viewpoint by reading the chapters prepared by him. As Chapters V and VI are two of these, and as they have more direct bearing on our problem than have the others, I shall limit myself to a consideration of them.

On page 114, Rose refers to Madison Grant, author of *The Passing of the Great Race*, as the high priest of racialism in America. We have already seen this book or its author serving us an object on which spleen could be vented. Thus Rose allies himself with the group, small though it may be, who have been caught in an emotional storm with respect to Grant's ideas. This particular expression sounds very much as though it has its roots in some sophisticated group of sociological theorists. It does not represent an attitude proper to a scientist. By employing such an expression Rose shows that race to him is a subject for emotional consideration rather than reason, and we find that this is the case even though he goes through elaborate forms of "reasoning." When Rose's bias is realized, it is possible to better evaluate the part he played in establishing the position adopted by *An American Dilemma*.

Rose on Race

Let us see what more we can learn of Rose's viewpoint. It is that psychic differences as a manifestation of race do not exist, practically speaking. He accounts for the differences that even he must admit have been found, as the outcome of environment. He is probably the most extreme writer from this particular point of view that I have encountered. Most of those who share his general views proceed with more caution. But Rose appears to have too much of the aggressive crusader in him to allow of this. Thus on page 115, Rose gives us to understand that the definition of the "Negro Race" is a social and not a biological concept. Such a view represents only a personal opinion, but is stated as though it were an accepted fact. Possibly it is in the circle that Rose travels in, though this thought has no general validity. We are also told by him that in modern biological research "race" as a scientific concept has lost sharpness in meaning, and is disappearing from sober writings. It is surprising that Rose should try to put over such an idea. Again this represents only a personal

view. Rose tells us further that the white American race is beginning to be merely a joke even among the populace, except in the South. Rose continues utterly free from hampering fetters of the scientific method to belittle the idea that race differences exist.

We could further analyze Chapter V. However, I think that we have had enough of it. Still, I will point out that in its last paragraph Rose repeats that the American Negro is a social and not a biological concept. It is not entirely clear what Rose wishes to accomplish through this statement, though I think its intent is to belittle the part played by race in the Negro problem. Thus, there are a few theorists who would have us all but believe that races do not exist. I will say something of their viewpoint in a later chapter. If Rose can convince us that race is a figment of our imagination, he will have furthered his equalitarian end. Let us see what some qualified biologists have to say on this subject. Julian Huxley (see *The Book of Naturalists*, Beebe, p. 398) tells us that *the human species is unique in certain purely biological attributes and these have not received enough attention from a zoological or sociological viewpoint.* (Italics, mine.) First, we are informed man is by far the most variable species known—domestic animals excepted. A similar idea is expressed by Hackel (*Race*, pp. 125, 127, 128) as well as by Fisher (*Race*, p. 282). Franz Weidenreich shows that race is purely a biological conception designating every subcategory of species (*Race*, p. 484). Hooton, in *Up From the Ape*, gives a similar opinion. Coon, whom I consider an authority in the field of physical anthropology, tells us in his latest book, written in association with Garn and Birdsell, that, while taxonomists argue about widely divergent groups such as species and genus, they agree on *race*. Count shows (Introduction, *This Is Race*) that human races have evolved by differentiation just as humanity itself has arisen as a differentiation of a primate stock. Is Rose ignorant of views differing from his own or is he unwilling to tell us of them? Whichever is the case, the

book must be ruled out as anything other than an expression of a personal viewpoint. If we are to adopt a minority view sponsored by an individual, why that of Rose rather than anyone else? Certainly his attitude, as we have seen and will further see, is not one that inspires confidence.

The Scientific Method

Chapter VI is also prepared by Rose. The scientific method calls for dealing in proven facts and drawing inferences from these. Rose's method is to make statements; then assume that they are proven; then draw conclusions based on his statements. Proceeding along this line, he makes great progress toward "proving" his theme of race equality. However, where he is facing a particularly difficult problem, that is, where the known facts do not fit in with his equalitarian ideas, Rose is capable of considerable subtlety. This shows in a number of places. We turn to a particular instance.

The Brain of the Negro

The Negro's brain is smaller on the average than that of white people. In this connection let me quote from Keith who says, "As regards cranial capacity, which may be accepted as an index of brain volume, the measurement which prevails in Africa is about 100 cc. less than is met with in Caucasia and Sinasia."

Let us see how Rose deals with the question of brain size. On page 139, he introduces us to it, but in a roundabout way. Thus, according to him, the white man might be aware of the differences (between the two races), but in his imagination he grossly exaggerates them. He has certain opportunistic beliefs which are fortified by hearsay testimony and occasional experiences which "happen" to confirm his beliefs. The white man is, we are assured, usually incorrect in his interpretation of his experiences. How Rose knows all of this to be true, we are not told. However, this attack may serve a purpose, this being to break down confidence in our position,

providing him with a prepared field for the emplanting of his ideas. Let us observe some more of his methods. Throughout the book we are constantly told that the white man is opportunistic in his attitude toward the Negro. Almost everything that Rose and the other authors do not like in racial attitudes is so branded. Also, Rose wants to belittle our observations of the Negro. Thus, his remark on observations that "happen" to confirm our beliefs. We have previously found Kroeber attempting to destroy our confidence in our observations of the Negro, but by a more elaborate device. Rose also tells us that our opinions are based on hearsay. We are not told how he was able to discover this. However, after this wholesale condemnation of our motives and our mental processes, he admits that the average Negro has a "slightly" smaller cranial capacity than has the white man. He then tells us that no connection has been proven between cranial capacity and mental capacity. Even if we concede that Rose's statement may be technically true it is based on but slight evidence and ignores other evidence that points towards an opposite conclusion. Certainly in an over-all biological view, increased intelligence is accompanied by a larger brain, and it seems to be based on the increased size, even though apparent individual exceptions to this generally valid rule may be found. This increase of size, it should be remarked, is in relationship to body size, or it may be, as some would have it, the relationship is with respect to the spinal cord. Also, there may be a number of other factors besides brain size that are in operation in this field. The organization of the brain; the proportions of its various parts might be of great significance, and it is conceivable that glandular functioning might influence its capacity. Also, its convolutions are of the utmost importance, for they add to the surface area of the cerebral cortex. William Howells (*Mankind So Far*) tells us, when dealing with *The Shape of Man to Come* and his brain, that improvement of this might be brought about through refinement of it, but that larger size is still the ultimate answer.

However, I will not carry this subject further because it becomes too speculative.¹

Part 3, Chapter VI, deals with psychic traits. Rose tells us in it that the differences, assumed or factual, as to the size and structure of the Negro's brain have been used for supporting beliefs as to the Negro's capacity for culture and morals. He says that this has been central to the justification for color caste.

Rose on Blacks and Browns

In the next paragraph we find Rose leading us, but again by a circuitous route, to a subject of the utmost importance. This is the difference between the dark and light skinned Negroes as shown by mental tests. On page 145 we are given to understand that among investigators few doubted that they would find psychic differences between the two races. We are then told that the history of the subject began with attempts to quantify these differences. He tells us that the scientists usually found what they were seeking. The reader will notice that the question involved is given such a turn that the writer simply assumes that the contrary has subsequently been proven. But in the next paragraphs (page 145) we find Rose at his subtlest. In them he tells of findings of Ferguson, who tested the differences in Negro intelligence, correlating performance with skin color. We have seen Kroeber dealing in mere fantasy, though in the name of science, when confronted with this subject. Hooton and Gillin skipped it. May I infer that they considered it beyond their ability to dispose of and continue with their equalitarian positions? However, Rose is not so easily abashed. He handles this weighty problem, pregnant as it is with the deepest significance, with such ease that it might suggest that he is the possessor of power, rather than

¹ A brief but comprehensive discussion of the brain is found in *Races* by Coon, Garn, and Birdsell, just published. One statement that they make is of particular interest to our discussion, for we learn from them that comparisons of brain size of various hominids are probably valid.

a mere bag of tricks as turns out to be the case. Thus Rose succeeds in conveying the impression that he has disposed of Ferguson successfully though he actually avoids grappling with him. To accomplish this end, he simply refers to Ferguson as one of those attempting to prove what they are looking for.

Ferguson's Conclusions

Ferguson's conclusions based on his findings were that pure Negroes, three-fourths pure, mulattoes and quadroons, have roughly 60, 70, 80, and 90 per cent respectively of white intellectual efficiency. Rose tells us that Ferguson dismisses the possibility that social differences could have had an effect here. To finally dispose of Ferguson, Rose turns to the consideration of what he calls another "example." Thus Ferguson is simply branded as a bad example and dropped. The reader will notice that no attempt is made to answer him. In this we find Rose clever, if you will, but in a superficial way. The price of trickery in connection with important problems is the loss of both the respect and confidence of sincere people. Possibly such devices might be embraced by the avowed propagandist in wartime, when means are not too closely inquired into, but such shoddy procedures are entirely out of place in a book purporting to be scientific. The obvious intention is to mislead or deceive. Could a better example be found of the sad state of affairs that the equalitarians have brought this subject to? Embracing such devices represents a degenerate viewpoint. If we wish to call on science to bolster our position we must respect her cardinal principle, which is that the truth must prevail. To deceive in the name of science is to prostitute science as well as its subject matter. We can show the seriousness of this situation by turning to another writer. William Beebe in his introduction to Part II of *The Book of Naturalists* tells us that the overstepping of the bounds of truth, any dalliance with a doubtful theory, no matter how attractive, automatically damns forever all the work of a naturalist. In short, Beebe correctly condemns, and this ab-

solutely, any form of deceit in connection with his subject. His condemnation is equally applicable to the field of our study. Rose's trickery is made the more deserving of condemnation because of the high promises made at the opening of the book. These have now all been flaunted, and the propaganda intent of the work is inescapable.

In fairness to Rose, I must say that on page 147 he admits that it has not been possible to prove beyond doubt that differences in innate intelligence exist between American Negroes and whites, and he admits that it has not been possible to prove that no difference exists. However, Rose introduces the paragraph in which this statement is made by another statement to the effect that the inferences from intelligence tests are, on the whole, negative as to differences between the two races. No evidence is offered in support of this statement. Rose has decided that the differences which are usually found in mental tests between the two races are due to environment, and he asks us to accept his version of this subject on faith. Most of the remaining material in Chapter VI deals with the statements by Rose as to his belief that environment is the controlling factor in these differences. However, they are not offered as opinions, but as if they were proven facts. We are led to believe that all authorities are on his side.

We now turn to a review of some ideas expressed by educators and others. They throw light on the effect of environment on the individual.

CHAPTER VII

A REBUTTAL

Nature or Nurture

As equalitarians must rest their case on the theory that ~~environment accounts for the difference in ability found in~~ races, we shall consider the question of environment at considerable length. Though much of the following does not treat the subject from a racial point of view, it nevertheless applies to our problem, but in this case we may be merely testing a principle involved.

The extent of the influence of environment in shaping the intelligence of the individual has been discussed by many, other than theorists on race questions. Two beliefs have arisen in this connection, and these are sometimes referred to as those of nature or nurture: beliefs respectively that inheritance or environment have the greater influence in developing mental capacity. However, I question if any really able thinkers in this field entertain such extreme views that they will not admit that there is an interacting of factors in this situation. Granting this, we still have a wide area of possible disagreement in interpreting the results of mental tests. Thus, debaters in this field are apt to express extreme views. In this connection, a sensible position is adopted by Frank Freeman, Dean of the School of Education, University of California (*Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*). He tells us that there is no logical reason why individual differences in intelligent behavior may not be found to be due to both organic (inborn) and to cultural factors. And yet, he adds, scientific writers and commentators frequently assume, without the slightest ground in either fact or logic, that to demonstrate the existence of one factor disproves the existence of the other.

The Author's Position

This portion of my writing is in the nature of a rebuttal. I am not claiming, as one of the writers reviewed does, and as others have implied, that our subject is treated from all viewpoints. This is a critique, not an anthology. I therefore feel entitled to give the one side, for the writers dealt with have simply given the other.

Ability — Inherited or Acquired

In an article dealing with deviates (those whose mental capacity deviates widely up or down from the average), Hollingsworth, Terman, and Oden tell that Prichard and others found no appreciable rise in I. Q. as a result of two years of special education (*Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*, 1940). We are told that this confirms the work of Lamson and others. Lewis Terman concludes (page 480) that the more carefully the irrelevant factors are controlled the weaker the evidence for large environmental influences. He shows, among other things, that the environmentalists in some of their articles are guilty of manipulating their evidence. Thus he says that results in line with their views are consistently played up, while contradictory results are played down or ignored. Favorable data are taken on their face value when alternative explanations are obviously possible. We are told that it appears characteristic of the Iowa group (a group of extreme environmentalists), that they often find difficulty in reporting accurately the data of others or their own.

I wish it were possible to summarize adequately Terman's criticism of the methods of the environmentalists. However, much of it is so technical that nothing but a full quotation would suffice, and it might be difficult for many readers to follow such because of these technicalities. Toward the end of his chapter, Terman tells us that some of the reasoning of the environmentalists may not have made sense, but they have at least opened for us an interesting wonderland. I take it that he feels that they have discovered what does not exist.

Terman correctly calls our attention to the fact that biographies show many men of notable or even prodigious achievement who in their childhood suffered from extreme deprivation.

I wish to cite one more case shown by Terman. Hildreth found that the Lincoln School of Teacher's College, in some experiments conducted with all the expertness that scientific pedagogy could bring to bear, was unable to lift above average the I. Q.s of foster children whom their wealthy and cultured parents had adopted as their own.

Let me add that this has great significance because it is in favored environments that we usually find better than average performance. If the claims of Rose and other environmentalists had been correct, these children should have shown above average. Not only this, but progress bordering on the phenomenal should have been made.

Pepono and Johnson

Now let us turn to a book written by specialists in the field of heredity. This is *Applied Eugenics*, by Pepono and Johnson. These authors stress the part that heredity plays in the development of mental capacity, though they recognize that environment also influences results. It is their belief, expressed on page 3, that 70 to 80% of the differences found among children can be accounted for by heredity. Let us review some of the evidence that they present.

A study was made in California by Barbara Burkes, who followed up 200 cases where children had been adopted soon after birth. The average age at adoption was three months, and none past one year was included. She matched the performance of these children with 100 children who lived with their own parents. The writer failed to find a similarity between the children of the foster parents such as is found between true children and parents. The differences in the contrasted cases are, of course, accounted for by differences in heredity.

As the authors remark, surroundings in an orphanage

are similar. They cite a study of more than 1,000 children in a Texas orphanage. Here the resemblance between siblings was similar to that found in ordinary homes. However, when unrelated orphans who had spent at least one fourth of their lives in orphanages were compared with each other, no such resemblance between pairs was found. The authors sum up as follows: the similarity of environment in the orphanage had not made any two orphans more alike than two children picked at random outside of the institution. Nor had it caused brothers or sisters to be more like each other than is ordinarily the case.

An English Study

Another instance was found in a study made in England. There illegitimate children given up soon after birth were reared in an institution and there studied. In this case, children of merchants and professional men averaged 101 I. Q., while those of laborers averaged 92 I. Q. The environment was uniform and none had contact with their parents. Children living with their parents at home were chosen as controls. Those from upper socio-economic levels averaged 105 I. Q. and those from lower, averaged 96 I. Q. Thus, the difference between these two groups, in the institution or out of it, is about the same.

Sir Francis Galton

The great English scientist, Sir Francis Galton, is credited with being the father of eugenics. It occurred to him to study identical twins brought up apart from each other. He reasoned that if environment were the controlling factor, they would become more unlike with time. With the same reasoning, ordinary twins brought up together should become similar. Before we proceed with the evidence that has been uncovered by this method, let me say that so-called identical twins, as is pointed out by Pepone and Johnson, do not have exactly the same inborn equipment. Also, they can have varying de-

degrees of differentiation. For technical reasons back of this situation, consult these authors (pp. 6 and 7). Where brought up together, as they show, there will be subtle differences in the influences to which they are subjected. For all of these reasons, there is a limit to what identical twins can settle with respect to the problems of nature and nurture. However, the so-called identical twins are sufficiently identical for our present purposes. The authors summarize the findings of studies in this connection, and tell us that in general they have shown that surroundings and training cannot be depended on to overcome differences in inheritance. They show that experiments indicate that ability develops about the time intended by nature, without much regard to special training.

Lang's Study of Criminals

The authors cite the case of thirty pairs of twins reported by Lang. His study was of criminals. It is of interest, as the authors point out, for qualities of this nature have been assumed to have but little hereditary basis. In each case studied one twin had been imprisoned. Then a follow-up was made to see how closely the career of the other paralleled this. In the case of the thirteen identical twins, a striking similarity was found. In only three instances had the co-twin not been convicted of a crime. The findings were quite different for the ordinary twins. In fifteen of seventeen instances the co-twin did not have a criminal record.

Adopted Twins

The authors show that if opportunity alone were the important factor then it should be pretty evenly distributed among persons favorably placed, providing a sufficiently large number is taken to allow the laws of probability to have play. They show that those who had attended Oxford and Cambridge have shown great differences in afterlife. They remark that eminence is apparently hereditary in nature, and runs in families. As shown by Galton, the son of an eminent

judge (as an example) has about one chance in four of becoming distinguished, while the son of a man picked at random has about one chance in 4,000 of becoming similarly distinguished.

Great Men Apt to Be Related

Galton found that in England about half of the great men had distinguished relatives. A study by Woods in this country shows a striking over-all similarity of findings, though the figures vary considerably in details.

It might be argued that family prestige and favorable environment had an undue bearing on this situation. The authors point out that if this were the case, we should expect royalty, where the environment is almost uniformly favorable, to show high ratios of ability. However, Woods shows that geniuses in royalty form little isolated groups of closely related individuals. One of these centers in Frederick the Great, another in Queen Isabella of Spain, a third in William the Silent, and a fourth in Gustavus Adolphus. On the other hand, those members of royal families who are conspicuously low in intellect and morality are similarly grouped.

Views of Educators.

Views critical of the equalitarian position follow. In *Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*, Part I, page 46, Hollingsworth, Terman, and Oden tell of a summary of the literature made by Garth which shows differences in origins of the stocks of those who contributed to the lower ranges in intelligence tests. They list the following who showed more than a chance share in inferior performance: The American Indian, the Sicilian (Southern Italian), the Negro (especially the Southern Negro), and the Mexican. The authors cautiously warn that these results bear only on the groups received in the United States. They also say that whether the differences are biologically inherent or are due to environment cannot be settled in the present state of our ignorance. However,

they cite Bere, who took eleven year-olds of three different immigrant groups and matched them with respect to factors often considered influential in test scores, and found significant differences.

Much has been made by some writers of studies by Klineberg, in which he showed Southern Negroes improving in I. Q. by longer residence in New York. The authors do not think that the differences shown by Klineberg are sufficient to be significant. They also criticize his methods on technical grounds. They show that in Klineberg's study, as in others, the median I. Q. of Negroes falls below 90, no matter how long they had been in "more favorable environment." The mean I. Q. for Southern Negroes in the samples studied falls at about 80. Negroes residing in the North for more than eight years, or born there, showed a mean I. Q. of only 87.

Environment Fails to Explain

These writers point out that if environment is the factor involved, this theory fails to explain why some of our ethnic groups contribute so much more heavily than do others to inferior deviation. Thus they show that Strong concludes from a survey of records that second generation Japanese on the Pacific Coast do not differ from the general American stock of the region. They ask if environment is the controlling factor why these Japanese of the second generation are not handicapped as are second generation Sicilians or Negroes. I might add that the Japanese have made their fine showing in spite of social handicaps. As we have seen in the case of the Negro, environmentalists have made a practice of claiming that it is our social attitudes which are responsible for his backwardness.

On page 56 the authors consider the ethnic stocks of superior deviates. According to tests, those who contributed few superior deviates are the American Indian, the Negro, the Mexican, and the Sicilian. Thus, this same group contributed a larger proportion of inferior and a smaller propor-

tion of superior deviates than the average. To these they add the Portuguese in California. The ethnic stocks which contributed more than their share of gifted children to the schools of the United States are Jews, Chinese, Danes, Swedes, Norwegians, Germans, English, and Scotch. In connection with the foregoing, the authors mention that a number of stocks were not surveyed, particularly children of Irish descent, because they were largely in parochial schools. There were other groups not studied, including the Welsh.

We are told (*Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*, p. 58) that Aretz, Guthrie, and Wadman found a steady northern trend of nativity of the notable persons included in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. This fact is not commented upon.

Those who would attribute all differences to environment have failed to show why in Brazil the Indian could not be enslaved though the Negro could. This difference is remarkable, for in this case they were both inhabitants of tropical lands. The immediate effect of environment should be similar. However, it is probable that the relative length of time that the two races had spent under tropical conditions differed widely. As the matter stands, the evidence indicates that the differences in these two groups has a racial basis. The burden of proof should be on those who claim otherwise. In connection with this subject I believe that it can be shown how such differences could be innate. Sargent (*The Basic Teachings of the Great Psychologists*, p. 77) tells us that a distinction is usually made between attitudes, tastes, and interests, on the one hand, and temperament on the other. He tells us that temperament has to do with qualities such as energy level and mood which are rooted in endocrine glands. Might I add that differences in the structure of the nervous system, particularly the central nervous system, might also influence these qualities, and all of these differences might have a basis of heredity.

I believe that it was Herbert Spencer who remarked that the best study of mankind is man. And certainly this is true so far as it goes. However, someone else has shown that man

objects to studying himself. Why should this be? I believe that it is because of a fear, such as Spencer also remarked on, that the truth will be bad, which he tells us is the profoundest of all infidelities.

Experiments With Rats

Due to the foregoing reasons we feel justified in turning to some animal experiments. These were made on rats and are described by Tryon (*Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*, pp. 111 to 119). He tells us that the results should apply also to man.

The experiments were with respect to "maze ability": in other words, the ability of the rats to solve complex maze problems. The experimenters selected the brightest rats from litters of bright rats and mated them. A similar process was followed with the dullest. In this way extremes of ability were developed, as is shown by a glance at the chart accompanying the article. This is so clear a case of the inheritance of capacity, or its lack, as to be of the utmost interest.

The following experiment was described: 107 rats were measured as to maze ability when they were young. Then after about two thirds of their life span, they were re-measured. They showed a correlation of .80, which, as Tryon points out, showed that environment plays a negligible part in this ability.

The following remarks by Tryon are of particular interest. He shows that large groups of bright and dull animals have been measured as to brain size and weight, body weight and fertility. The bright animals showed physical superiority throughout, except as to fertility. Similar results as to the superiority of the organism have been found in the case of highly intelligent humans (*Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*, p. 60). However, so far as I know, such tests have been confined to our white group.

CHAPTER VIII

MORE OF MYRDAL

An American Creed

Having discussed Rose's position and given some information in rebuttal, we return to a consideration of other portions of *An American Dilemma*, presumably written by Myrdal. He occasionally gives us a peek behind the scenes. Whether this is due to a slip or is a bit of stage play to throw us off guard, I cannot say. However, we are about to catch a revealing view. On the sixth page of the author's introduction, the statement is made that there is pragmatic common sense in the ideas of people about themselves and their worries. This is indeed surprising, for other portions of the book are devoted to belittling the ideas of the common man. We are informed that this wisdom should not be missed in an exploration of social reality. Then we are allowed more revealing views. Otherwise, it is stated we (Myrdal, Rose, etc.) are too often distracted by our learned arbitrariness and pet theories, concepts, and hypotheses. The insight of these authors with respect to their faults is quite remarkable. At the same time, their capacity for ignoring their program is unlimited. They give themselves this bit of sage advice, only to carry on without ever paying the slightest attention to it.

Chapter I is headed "American Ideals and the American Conscience." It starts with a mild tone. So much so that it is difficult at first to discover exactly what the writer is aiming at, though it eventually becomes clear that its intent is to cause the reader to believe that we, the majority, are handling the Negro problem in an un-American way. It would appear that we are not living up to the American credo as these writers conceive it. I might say in passing that the intent to

give the American people a bad conscience over their handling of the Negro problem is even clearer in other portions of the book, the Introduction being one.

A wide diversity of ideologies is touched upon. I find references made to Protestant Christianity (page 10). Some thoughts by former Vice-President Henry A. Wallace are given. The charge is made that ministers have often been reactionary in America, and they are accused of being organizers of the Ku Klux Klan in some regions. I do not wish to convey the impression that all of the material presented is critical, and the writer says that foreigners have always noted that Americans are generous. A nice little pat on the back. At times a fatherly attitude is assumed, and we are given to understand that it is perfectly natural for us to have made the mistakes we have. Thus, we are led to believe that though our understanding of the Negro *appears* to be the right one, it really is not.

Myrdal Annoyed by our Conservatism

On page 12 we find a subheading called "American Conservatism." While considering this subject Myrdal becomes quite put out with us, and we are accused of conservatism in fundamental principles, and of nearly converting the cult of the Constitution into a fetish. On page 13 the charge is made that until recently the Constitution has been used to block the will of the majority. Later in the book, on pp. 68 and 69, the author leans rather heavily on Marx, and a reference is made to the Marxian theory of class solidarity. On page 73 the possibility is considered that the lower classes might take a broad point of view toward all "disadvantaged" groups. But then the authors warn themselves that they must guard against superficial bias, *probably of Marxian origin*.

What We Learn of the Authors

What can we learn about *An American Dilemma* from the foregoing? It seems to me that its authors have brought it

in line with thoughts apt to be pleasing to social and political radicals. I have touched but lightly on this portion of the book, although I feel that the reader is entitled to this much insight into the methods of its authors.

If my assumption, which I offer only as such, is correct, it might help account for the extreme position taken by those writers that environment, rather than heredity, controls development in biological fields. This is the position adopted by the Soviets (*Time*, August 15, 1949). The idea that the genes control heredity has been formally denounced by Soviet officialdom as unscientific and un-Marxist.

In this connection, the following Associated Press Dispatch is of interest:

From The Salt Lake Tribune, August 28, 1948: "Moscow, Aug. 27 — Soviet scientists have agreed to make their views on heredity and environment conform with those of the central committee of the Communist party.

"The committee, which has cracked down previously on Soviet composers and dramatists for 'bourgeois' leanings, has now turned its attention to the field of science.

"This became apparent Friday when the Soviet Academy of Sciences promised Prime Minister Josef Stalin it would correct its mistakes in the field of biology and pursue a course dedicated to the 'victory of Communism.'

"The academy backed up its pledge by firing two noted biologists and liquidating a biological laboratory whose director took 'antiscientific' positions.

"By 'antiscientific' the academy meant views contrary to those held by Prof. T. D. Lysenko, whose approach to biology has been endorsed by the central committee of the Communist party as correct.

"Lysenko argues that environment is the prime factor in determining the characteristic of an individual. This is contrary to the position held by scientists who go along with the Mendelian theory of inherited characteristics.

"Friday, Pravda published a decree from the academy saying L. A. Orbell and I. I. Shmalgausen, two noted Soviet biologists, were 'free from their duties.'

"Orbell was secretary of the section of biological sciences for the academy and Shmalgausen was director of the institution of evolutionary morphology."

While many environmentalists in this country may not have red leanings, it is probable that others have. At the same time the evidence against the Soviet question is so strong that it seems to me that only fanatics could go all of the way with them. It may be that the extreme views of the authors of *An American Dilemma* just happened to have a similarity to those of the Soviets.

Racial Beliefs

Chapter IV deals with "racial beliefs." Before taking up in detail some of the views expressed, let us glance at the overall methods employed in this section. One of these is Myrdal's practice of stating his opinions as though they were facts. The other is in slanting the presentation of material. This is done in such a way that the white man is either put on the defensive or made to appear unworthy of Myrdal's interpretation of the American Creed, the subject of the previous chapter. Thus, on page 96, we are led to believe that the spread of the conclusions of "modern research" has had one most important result, for it is becoming difficult for popular writers to express anything but views of racial equality and retain intellectual respect.

On page 97, those of us who do not agree with the author are referred to as "unsophisticated." It is strange that Myrdal has chosen this word to apply to us. It is probable that but few people wish to be considered "sophisticated"; for the implications of this term, in the main, are unfavorable. I presume, from the way it is employed, that the author considers himself a sophisticate. We find this word defined as one who misleads by false arguments, or falsifies by deceptive

alterations. This once Myrdal gives a true impression, though inadvertently. The meaning I believe he intended to convey is that those with contrary beliefs to his own are ignorant. Again, on this page we are referred to as ordinary white people, meaning, of course, those of us who do not agree with him. Occasionally Myrdal wishes to give a stronger slant to his presentation of material, and we find him, on page 99, referring to vulgarized pre-Darwin evolution. This term is employed in connection with applying evolution to the race rather than to the individual. On page 102 we are accused of self-interest in the caste system. We are said to rationalize our beliefs about it (page 104), and on the same page we are accused of being opportunists in our attitude toward the Negro.

Further Accusations

Chapter IV makes many other accusations; deals all but lavishly in unproved statements, a few of which I shall presently discuss. But after hammering at us until our senses are benumbed, we are treated to a surprise. In the last paragraph of Chapter IV, page 112, the admission is made that the whole has been a "conjectural discussion" of racial beliefs. Up to this point not even a hint has been given that this was the plan being followed.

Also in the final paragraph, Myrdal tells us that a set of fascinating research problems of great practical and theoretical importance awaits investigation. Such studies, we are told, will demonstrate the extent to which the hypothesis developed in this chapter will hold true. Have we been subjected to the lavish array of statements composing this chapter and submitted to indignities—all but abusive—only to discover that they represent the antics of a light-minded adventurer in the realm of ideas? Certainly from the wording of these passages we might gain such an impression. And it would be true to the extent that it shows a lack of proper responsibility. However, under this all but flippant attitude we may be sure a spirit prevails, deadly in earnest in its designs on us.

What has become of the promise given by Kepple in his Foreword that we were to be given facts and allowed to build our own conclusions from them? Did the plan of the book misfire, or was this a bit of sly deception placed at the opening of the book to create a sympathetic atmosphere for it? Instead of facts, the author has been spinning what he admits are hypotheses, though the previous presentation of them would indicate that they were facts.

Environment and Evolution

It is believed by the majority of biologists of standing that acquired characteristics are not inherited. From this particular point of view it should be as easy for a child, all of whose ancestors were savages, to acquire an education as though these ancestors had been college graduates. The only immediate effect that environment could have would be to provide a favorable or unfavorable atmosphere for the acquisition of knowledge. This principle is not always understood by the public, and they may blame the backwardness of the Negro on the fact that his ancestors have been for a long time uneducated.

However, there is another aspect of this matter which has probably had a tremendous effect on the development of race characteristics, capacities, and qualities; which, however, has not been always understood. This is the indirect effect of environment working through selection.¹ Thus, where conditions are too easy, no tendency operates to eliminate the dull or the lazy. They leave descendants to the same extent as the more able members of the groups. On the other hand, in more difficult environments the more energetic and intelligent will be the most successful in this respect. Difficult conditions work toward the betterment of the race. In this connection it is not necessary for this principle to operate on a

¹ This subject is discussed at considerable length by Coon, Garn, and Birdsell in *Races*.

wholesale scale. It has been calculated that if a type has a one per cent advantage in leaving progeny, this will transform the group in short order. That is, when comparisons are made with the life span of the species.

Myrdal on Environment

Myrdal should be familiar with the effect that environment has on races through natural selection. However, he ignores this aspect of the problem. Thus he tells us that he repeatedly ran across the "odd" idea that the Negro is hundreds of thousands of years behind the white man in "development." He criticises this idea on the ground that acquired characteristics are not inherited, though his presentation of the matter is much more involved than I have made it. Myrdal totally ignores the possibility that the tropical environment in which the Negro acquired his racial characteristics might not have been a favorable one for the development of higher qualities. Let us therefore see what some other writers think about this subject.

Huntington on the Effects of a Tropical Environment

Ellsworth Huntington has specialized on the effects of climate on civilization. In the writing we are about to review he treats of the probable effects of climate in developing species of man.

Huntington shows that all other forms of life are subject to the effects of environment and that man also should be. He tells us that this idea is accepted by the majority of unprejudiced scientific observers, though it conflicts strongly with many of the ideas fostered by religion, philanthropy, and sociology. Huntington shows that the most primitive forms of life are apt to be found either in tropical areas where conditions of life are easy, or in places of refuge where they will find few enemies, such as in mountain areas or at the end of peninsulas.

Huntington shows that primitive man must have been

greatly affected by the glacial epochs that he encountered. Each epoch must have had a strong selective effect in certain regions, but very little in others. Where conditions were rigorous, this would help to advance the race. On the other hand, where a group found refuge in tropical lands, especially where forests abounded, there would be more edible fruits, nuts, and roots, and game could be captured with comparative ease. Huntington believes that the net effect of tropical lands, particularly tropical lowlands, would be to retard evolution, and in some cases possibly even reverse it.

The ideas expressed by Huntington are at least as strong as those of writers usually branded "racist." Why does Huntington escape the wrath of equalitarians? I think it probable that there is no other reason than that the so-called racists employ names while Huntington prefers to speak of tropical people or of those who migrated north. I will later show that some people have developed what amounts to a phobia with respect to race names. Thus, they will tolerate a fairly broad-minded consideration of the subject as long as these are excluded, but their wrath is immediately aroused where names are employed, unless the conclusion is offered that all races are equal.

Taylor on the Effects of a Tropical Environment

Another writer who views the problem in question in a similar light to that of Huntington is Taylor (see Count, *This Is Race*, p. 554). He believes that because the Negro was thrust into the stagnant environment of the tropics he has kept many primitive features.

His opinion is that the Negro has evolved some in the 100,000 years since he has been there, but that meanwhile in other stimulating environments racial evolution has been more striking, and has left him far behind. Sir Arthur Keith tells us (*A New Theory of Human Evolution*, p. 227) that "an early Pleistocene people living in the temperate climate of

North China had made an evolutionary advance on their contemporaries living in the tropical climate of Asia."

Coon *et al.* show (*Races*, p. 86) that it is one of the basic principles of evolution that it proceeds at different rates in different areas or environments. This is certainly a characteristic of the operation of evolution, as should be known to any qualified biologist. These writers come to a clear conclusion, and it is to the effect that backward or archaic forms of humanity may survive in different localities. (Also see p. 88, *Races*.)

Myrdal's Evaluation of the Negro

On page 97 Myrdal starts an appraisal of the Negro as he is actually found to be, and carrying over to the next page, we find him trying to account for his backwardness. Now to his appraisal: we find from Myrdal that the white man believes from his everyday experience that the Negro is inferior. Myrdal then admits that this is actually the case and that it is shown by scientific study. He tells us that the Negro is, on the average, poorer; that his body is more often deformed; his health more precarious, and his mortality rate higher; his performance, intelligence, manners, and morals are lower. In connection with the foregoing Myrdal tries to put over two points, though his presentation of them is confused. The first of these is that though this is the true showing of the Negro, the white man really misunderstands the situation. Thus he tells us that the *correct* observation that the Negro is inferior is tied in with the *correct* belief that man belongs to the biological universe. Then we are accused, by means of twisted logic (the nature of which is not explained), of coming out with the incorrect deduction that the inferiority is biological in nature. Possibly the next paragraph is supposed to explain the nature of this "twisted logic." Anyhow, we shall proceed with it. In it we are given to understand that race is a comparatively simple idea which easily becomes the outward sign of "social visibility," such as physiognomy.

Then we are told that explanations of environment, on the other hand, tax knowledge and imagination heavily. Myrdal continues, stating that it is difficult for the ordinary man to see how such factors as malnutrition, bad housing, and lack of schooling actually deform the body and soul of a people. Let us interrupt this impassioned flow of words to test the ideas advanced. Myrdal's case and that of the whole book, on last analysis, must rest on these and the few ideas that immediately follow, and which we shall treat later.

Pepone and Johnson on Environmental Factors

Pepone and Johnson deal with such environmental factors, beginning on page 9 and extending to page 10. They first tell us that there is a widespread belief on the part of parents and teachers that the intelligence of children is closely related to physical defects and that improvement of health, correction of malnutrition, removal of infected tonsils, and the like will improve a child's school work and general behavior.

They tell us that there is an association between mental deficiency and physical defects, but that these are largely hereditary in nature, being largely the outcome of the same unfavorable genetic constitution. We are informed that some careful studies have shown surprisingly little association between a child's condition, whether physical or mental.

They show that this is true of malnutrition during the war. A comparison of English children born in 1914 with those born in 1915 and 1918, which were particularly bad years, showed no falling off of height or weight of the latter. Eight thousand children in Vancouver, B. C., were divided into two groups, the well nourished and those who were poorly nourished. In the case of infectious disease such as scarlet fever, diphtheria, measles, whooping cough, chicken pox, and smallpox, both groups showed about the same.

Again, 404 school children in Manitowoc, Wisconsin, were divided into three groups. Group A was of children not needing medical attention. Group B needed immediate at-

tention. Group C were those with minor defects. No important differences were found in the groups, either in intelligence scores or school achievement. Retests were made later and showed that those needing medical care, where this had been given, had not improved in standing or in other respects.

It was also found that the extreme conditions of malnutrition in Germany during the war did not affect the I. Q.s in 95% of the cases studied. Pepone and Johnson tell us further that a long series of studies shows little relation between thyroid difficulties and intelligence, bad tonsils and intelligence, adenoids and intelligence, or such a thoroughgoing physical impairment as accompanies hookworm infection and intelligence. They tell us that naturally diseases of the central nervous system are more serious, but that congenital syphilis apparently has but little effect on intellectual capacity.

These writers show that within limits the evidence is overwhelming that the types of physical disabilities found among school children are not factors in differences found in intellectual capacity and school achievement in school children. And while good health is desirable, the frequent idea that the correction of physical defects will turn dullards into bright children is wholly unwarranted except possibly for defects of eyesight or hearing.

Myrdal Mistaken in His Evaluation

I hope that the foregoing has sufficiently disposed of Myrdal's theory that malnutrition has incapacitated the Negro. As for bad housing, it would presumably work to the physical disadvantage of those living under such conditions. If this does follow, it should not affect performance, as is sufficiently shown by Pepone and Johnson. If bad housing were a controlling factor, the world would have lost many of the finest flowerings of the human mind and spirit. As an example, Abraham Lincoln was raised in a log cabin, which could hardly be called good housing. In the case of lack of schooling, this is a more serious charge. However, in many parts of

the country no distinction is made between the Negro and white in this respect.

Myrdal's remaining ideas as to why the white man fails to understand the Negro are that he can hardly be expected to be aware of such subtle influences as the denial of certain outlets for ambition, cultural isolation, social disparagement, conditioning of the child's mind by the caste situation, as being factors in moulding the Negro's behavior and personality. Myrdal himself does not tell us how these factors work to stultify the Negro. Rather, he attacks us ordinary men; at the same time implying that he, in his superior wisdom, does understand this situation and its operation. Obviously when we are denied access to the source of his wisdom we cannot directly test its validity. However, we have at our disposal other means of throwing light on this situation.

During the centuries of the persecution of the Jews, at which time they suffered from all of the disadvantages which Myrdal mentions in connection with the Negro, no one charged them with lack of mental capacity. On the contrary, their ability was generally acknowledged. The Japanese in California have suffered from many of the social handicaps cited by Myrdal as bearing on the backwardness of Negroes. However, this has not stultified them as has been shown. But a still cleaner case will develop when we come to a consideration of the social system prevailing in Brazil where the Negro is given every opportunity to rise, but seldom is able to do so. In fact, as we shall see, the browns probably make a better showing here than there.

Just as we saw Kroeber's explanation of the Negro's inferior showing break down when subjected to critical analysis, so do we find a similar breakdown of Myrdal's position.

CHAPTER IX

PIERSON

Negroes in Brazil

We next turn to a book dealing with blacks and whites in Brazil. Its author is Donald Pierson, Professor of Sociology, University of Santa Paula, Brazil. From the book's jacket we learn that it is based on two years' field work in Bahia for the Social Science Research Committee of the University of Chicago, and that it was the winner of the 1943 John Ansfield Award for the best book of the year on race relations. We also find from an opening page that it is one of a series of books devoted to the publication of results of "newer developments" of sociological study in America. Apparently this Chicago group has been won over to the creed of equality. At the same time sponsorship by a University committee gives it prestige.

I wish to call the reader's attention to the "sociological" connection which again is apparent. This work is designed for popular reading and has a purpose. It is to promulgate a creed of race relationships, rather than tell the truth about race. However, it does not make the false claims of objectivity such as opened "*An American Dilemma*," nor does its author pose as a dispenser of scientific truths, as does Kroeber and some of the other writers reviewed. For these reasons, we may somewhat soften our condemnation of the work. Also, its author adopts a slightly more objective viewpoint than do the others. Nevertheless, we are dealing with what is in many respects but a typical equalitarian blurb; full of inconsistencies. But before launching into this aspect of the matter, I want to call the reader's attention to the fact that money, apparently in unlimited amounts, is available for the preparation and publication of propaganda effusions of this nature.

The Assumptions of the Book

Negroes in Brazil is built around the assumption that the Negro and whites are of the same intelligence. This proposition is not specifically stated, but it is implied in nearly every line. At the same time the author admits that the blacks make a poor showing. In his attempt to account for their lack of standing we find glaring inconsistencies.

Reviewing the Book

The study is based principally on conditions at the seaport of Bahia and its surroundings. This locale is in the northern part of Brazil, near the tropics, and since early colonial times has been heavily populated with Negroes. Just how valid Pierson's findings are for the rest of Brazil is in some doubt, though the author, towards the end of the book, says that he believes that they will largely apply to the rest of the country.

Absorption of the Negroes

The Portuguese were the first to become well established in Brazil. African slaves were soon brought over. In these early times there was a shortage of white women. It would appear that the Portuguese originally objected to marriage with Negroes (p. 326). However, sexual relations with them were extensively maintained, and the church brought its influence to bear to place these unions on a more permanent basis. I think that this fact should not be overlooked in comparison of the different attitudes toward race relations in Brazil and in this country. However, Pierson plays this angle down in favor of a theory which he has developed and which is more acceptable to the equalitarian viewpoint. Thus, he would have us believe that this was a more or less "natural" relationship to the Portuguese. We are given to understand (p. 117) that they, because of association with the dark Moors, had become used to the idea of absorbing a dark-skinned race. I might also add that the Portuguese had previously incorporated some Negro blood in

their veins in their home country, apparently also under church sponsorship.

The present attitude of Bahia Brazilians towards the Negro problem has many of the attributes of making the best of a bad situation — for they have become so mongrolized that it would be difficult to reverse the process.

The Author's Dilemma

The author of *Negroes in Brazil* has set himself two tasks, as soon becomes apparent. One of these is to show us that the system of amalgamation practiced in Brazil is better than ours. We sense, however, that he realizes that such will not appeal to us unless we become convinced that the two races are equal. In this chapter we will deal with Pierson's attempt to make a show of equality for the two races.

Pierson admits that the whites occupy a much better social and economic position than do the blacks, with the mixed bloods finding a place between the two extremes. At the same time, the underlying theme of the book is that race prejudice does not exist in Brazil. Thus these differences are, according to Pierson, due entirely to social status. To show us that race feeling does not exist, he cites (p. 134) a case of a married couple, both of whom showed slight traces of African blood, who had nine children. Of these, all but three or possibly four could pass as white. He tells us that the father playfully caressed one of his small daughters and remarked that she was a typical "mulata." Pierson tells us that the sense of this seemed similar to someone in North America saying, "This is my little blue-eyed daughter," or "Here is a brunette." Apparently no stigma is attached to the Negro blood.

Now let us contrast this situation with other facts shown by the author. Throughout the book he shows that mulattoes have been much more progressive than blacks. However, he tells us that that progress has not been exclusively monopolized by them as against the blacks, and he cites the case of three dark individuals who have gained prominence. Then he adds that

the appearance of a black person among the upper classes is quite rare. Thus we find that the relative standing of the two races in North and South America is strikingly similar. How is Pierson going to account for this fact? He tries to do it by stating that the blacks still have to contend with the badge of their slave ancestry. Thus, in one place we understand that prejudice does not exist. Still the black man does not rise. Here we have an entirely favorable atmosphere for his doing so, and Pierson has shown that three of them did meet with success. But this is such a weak showing that he suddenly has to interject prejudice. Strange, in this land which till now has been ruled by brotherly love, prejudice must be called upon to pull a chestnut out of the fire.

Pierson on Bahia Social Classes

On page 204, Pierson returns to the question of the classes. He tells us that the upper social class of Bahia is today predominantly white, and that only the lighter mixed bloods with few exceptions have succeeded in gaining entrance to their circle. Occasionally the darker mulattoes, and rarely the blacks, have succeeded.

In the next paragraph he attempts to explain this situation, and tells us that the fact that an occasional black and a few dark mulattoes together with numerous light mixed bloods succeed in penetrating the upper circles conclusively points to the fact that if a person has ability and competence the handicap of color can be overcome. Obviously, according to Pierson, the Negro is not held down if he has ability and general competence. Why, then, is he able to rise so seldom? To admit that this could have a basis in race would destroy the theme of his book. In getting out of this dilemma, Pierson shows himself a magician of no mean ability. Thus, there is no prejudice in Brazil until such time as it becomes necessary to introduce it to account for the backward state of the Negro. Then it suddenly emerges in just the right amount to account for this backwardness; finally, with a wave of Pierson's magic wand, it

disappears and we are back in a charmed land, in which sweetness prevails.

In the second section I will show that while the Brazilians of Bahia do not have a caste system such as we have, they have a considerable appreciation of the Negro's qualities or shortcomings, and these are reflected in social attitudes apt to influence sexual selection. Let us say then that prejudice doesn't exist in Brazil, but understanding does. The results are remarkably similar, and we will analyze them in a later chapter. When it is simply a case of appreciating facts in relation to race, this should not be considered as a form of prejudice either here or in Brazil.

Brazilian Writers on the Negro

Before closing this subject, let us turn to some Brazilian writers who do not believe in race equality, as these are quoted by Pierson. Here I introduce only the negative opinions. He quotes from a number with opposite views.

Pierson has a chapter called "Racial Ideologies and Racial Attitudes." It is largely devoted to Brazilian writers who consider the part played by the Africans in Brazil. Apparently they are mostly either neutral or favorable towards the Negroes. However, on page 211, Pierson tells us of three papers presented to the *Congressos Afro-Brasileiras*, with titles that suggest either an unfavorable attitude or a doubt as to the wisdom of race mixture. The titles of these papers, he says, would seem to indicate at first glance an interest in race relations in the North American sense. We are informed, however, that the question turns out largely to be an academic one, and Pierson gives us to understand that the attitudes are perhaps evoked by foreign literature concerned with arguments supporting white superiority and Negro inferiority. He believes that such arguments must have had their origin in Europe or the United States. After the remarkably poor showing made by Negroes in Brazil, as Pierson himself admits, why does he feel it necessary to go so far afield to explain expressions of doubt about their capacity?

Certainly these writers could have found evidence for their supporting arguments all about them. Pierson is apparently not entirely satisfied with his own explanation of this situation, for he adds that at any rate certain scholars, at a loss to account for the persistence in modern Brazil of African cultural forms, have come to question seriously the cultural capacities of the blacks, and believe the future of Brazil prejudiced by the infusion of African blood. Thus Pierson tells us that Nina Rodrigues, who was intimately acquainted with the Africans of Bahia, was impressed with the slow rate at which they and their descendants were throwing off African cultural forms and being assimilated into the white world; and very seriously raised the question of the capacity of the Negro to adjust himself to the civilization of the superior races. He particularly doubted the capacity of the Negro to acquire European civilization. A further train of doubts was raised in Rodrigues' mind, which, however, we need not discuss.

Pierson tells us that the theme of Negro inferiority is today probably most forcefully defended by Oliveira Vianna, an able sociologist. Vianna's conclusions are that the pure Negroes will never be able, not even in the case of their most able representatives to be completely assimilated into white culture. Vianna doubts their capacity for civilization, and believes that it does not extend beyond the mere imitation (more or less imperfect) of the habits and customs of the whites. He thinks that this difference will never be overcome except when the Negro loses his race purity and is mixed with whites. It is interesting to note that Vianna is himself a mixed-blood. At the same time, two of those who take issue with him are of white ancestry.

More references to this book will be found in the last section of this writing where we are considering sociological aspects of this situation.

PART II

CHAPTER X

SOME GENERAL IDEAS

In this second section greater leeway for speculation will be allowed. Something of our philosophy bearing on race problems will be presented. And while our whole subject is on the speculative side in that evidence rather than proof must be offered; still, fallacies in the methods of those whose work we are criticizing have been shown, and to this extent our critical method has been scientific. We will be able to continue with this more rigorous method in portions only of what follows. In this chapter we deal with beliefs often expressed by equalitarians and many of these we shall not try to trace to their original source. We also advance some new thoughts of our own.

No Pure Races

One idea made much of by equalitarians is that there are no "pure" races. Whether true or not, this is of no consequence. I think it is inspired by those over-sensitive to expressions of Adolf Hitler. If the suggestion is that all races are related, it is true. However, we are also related, though more distantly, to the apes, probably to all mammals; possibly to all vertebrates, and it may be to all forms having life.

Possibly equalitarians mean that all groups, after developing sufficiently as races to be recognized as such, have subsequently been crossed. While this may have been the case, such an assumption cannot be proved, for the early history of race formations remains in the realm of speculation (Jankowsky, *Race*, pp. 471, 472). In this connection it has been shown that Neanderthals were probably in Europe either before or at the same time with the ancestors of modern man. Now it seems

probable that our ancestors practiced race discrimination, for it is believed by many anthropologists that the two races never mixed. Others think that Neanderthals, because of certain structural peculiarities occasionally found in a few individuals, but in restricted regions, may have been absorbed in small part in these areas. Before turning away from this subject I would like to give two references, and will first quote from Sir Arthur Keith's *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, page 263. He says: "Before attempting to unravel the evolution of Caucasian peoples, there is a preliminary matter that I must deal with. Down to a point in the last period of glaciation Europe was inhabited by Neanderthals. Then quite suddenly some 100,000 years ago, in the Zeuner scale of time, they were replaced by men of the Caucasian type. In the Europe of that remote date a racial transformation of the kind which is now being enacted on the continent of Australia had taken place; a more energetic and better equipped race replaced one which was more backward in these respects. The racial differences between the Neanderthal and Caucasian types are too great to suppose the older and more primitive type had been transformed into the newer and more evolved type. We must explain the event by supposing that the Caucasian invaders had come from a home outside the bounds of Europe and exterminated the older race." However, Easley (*Scientific American*, July, 1948) in an article entitled "Antiquity of Modern Man" considers, from what appears to be good evidence, that man of modern type must have been in Europe before the Neanderthals were. My point is that the more evolved type avoided any wholesale absorption of the more primitive Neanderthals.

A Fear of Race Names

Some are willing to admit of physical differences in various peoples providing the groups in question are not designated by race names. In connection with these, they have developed an emotional state; a blend, with some of the characteristics of a neurosis, or even psychosis, combined with other elements

common to phobias. Ashley Montague is a case in point. His book, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, tells us on page 5 that the truth will not be advanced by denying that large groups of mankind exist, characterized more or less by distinctive physical traits. To anyone but Montague, such constitutes racial differences. After this, Montague belittles the idea of race. Thus, his position boils down to the idea that differences exist, but as race differences they don't. So determined is this author to do away with any conception of race as such that I could not find in a hasty glance to cover the point where he employs the term race, except in quotes.

Do Races Exist?

One means of belittling race differences is to claim or imply that there are no such things as races. However, as race is based on differences of a visible or measurable nature, and as we can all recognize widely divergent peoples, we are, in such cases, simply recognizing races.

Races may be considered as either primary or secondary. The primary ones are sometimes enumerated as White, Mongolian, and Negroid. Such is the division which I, myself, prefer. However, Howells says that to these are commonly added the Australian and the American Indian. Secondary races would be subdivisions as well as mixtures of the primary races. And for convenience, we might consider any group not large enough for special classification, even though it has distinct features, as falling under this latter heading. Our white stock is made up of a number of secondary races, and these variations are sometimes called varieties, subraces, types, strains, or may even be referred to as groups. Still other more technical names have been suggested, such as those of Keith (*Race*, p. 656). Thus the reader will see that when classifying secondary races, differences of opinion may easily arise. Certain equalitarians have picked on this situation as an excuse to make extravagant claims as to the unreality of the conception of race itself. The validity of this conception is not at stake. When

dealing with closely related subraces, the question becomes one of proper classification. Von Eikstedt tells us that it is the ever present transitional forms that deceive the casual observer (*Race*, p. 494).

It is sometimes difficult to frame racial differences in words that appropriately cover the differentiations. Differences of opinion often can be resolved into questions of proper wording. Similar difficulties are encountered in other fields of biology when classifications of closely related groups or subraces are made.

Mental Tests

When the results of mental tests have not borne out the theories of equalitarians, we have noticed a tendency with some of them to doubt the value of such tests. While it is not claimed that these have been perfected, their practical value in their present form has been sufficiently demonstrated, for follow-up studies of students doing well in such tests have shown that in the majority of cases, they have done better than average in the world of affairs. When subjected to the touchstone of reality, these tests, though born of theory, have proved their worth. (See: *Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*, and many other studies.)

More Alike Than Different

An argument often encountered is that races are more alike than different. I am simply adopting Fairchild's reply (*Race*, p. 688). He says that this is true, but for the purpose at hand, meaningless. He tells us that we choose our friends upon minute, subtle, and elusive differences of personality, as well as our business and marital partners. He shows that a Packard sedan is much more like a General Motors ten-ton truck than it is different.

Dealing in Striking Exceptions

I have noticed that equalitarians have often tried to build up their case by dealing in "striking" exceptions. Such methods

are faulty. The general validity in human affairs of measurements that are preponderantly true is demonstrated by the successful employment of such a method by insurance companies who are guided by averages. Biological understandings based on majorities may be valid, even when exceptions to them occur. We may have workable knowledge without it having that degree of certainty found in the law of gravity.

Race, An Adaptation to Environment

A tendency appears to be arising in equalitarian circles to adopt the idea that there are no race inequalities, for each race has become adapted to a different set of conditions. This idea departs from the characteristic equalitarian position of the past, for this group formerly, as we have seen, played down all race differences, however brought about. After remarking on this change of position, let us examine the new idea. It has been our contention that one of the main factors in bringing about race differences has been the effect of environments. Races have tended to become adjusted to the situations in which they found themselves. Thus, if we are considering tropical lands, or at least tropical lowlands with inhabitants living under primitive conditions, we might find the Negro better adapted to life under these conditions than is the white man. His limitations in other environments have been brought about by his adjustment to the tropics. However, we are interested in other parts of the world than the tropics and other conditions than primitive ones.

To consider an adjustment to environment, important as it is, as a final measure of value, is absurd. No doubt the pig in his pen is well adjusted to the situation in which he finds himself.

Races Need Not Be Equal

This writer knows of no reason why two races need be equal in any respect, except that in the functioning of the body necessary to the maintenance of life, little leeway for variation is allowed. Some equalitarians have attempted to account for

this fact through a theory that humanity holds the bulk of its genes in common. As this theory can neither be proved or disproved it is amenable to extravagant claims. However, a mere glance at living races shows the great variations that have arisen in outward forms. But the greatest possibilities for variation occur in the realm of the mind. For its capacity varies so greatly that selection could transform a race in this respect. As environment is the active force in this field it could lead to similarities or wide differences in racial capacities.

No end of illustrations could be called upon to show the power of environment in shaping living forms. Sometimes, under such an influence, species but distantly related acquire a considerable similarity of form. Biologists refer to such as *convergence*. An obvious case is the mammals who returned to the sea and who have reacquired a fish-like form.

Havelock Ellis in his interesting book on English geniuses considers their qualities, characters, and attributes from many points of view. One of these is in connection with the subraces into which they fall. He employs an objective viewpoint, and interest is imparted through these sidelights. However, under the existing equalitarian viewpoint, such ideas could not be tolerated. We must appear as drab units of an identical nature, for equalitarians have planned it that way. Much of life's color, sparkle, and variety is lost, for it is impossible to deal in subtleties when obviously gross differences in values are not allowed.

On the other hand, we may consider the attributes of breeds of cows, horses, dogs, and chickens to our hearts' content. It matters not to equalitarians that Jerseys and Guernseys give richer milk than Holsteins, though the latter give more of it. That some breeds of cows are so poor as milk producers that the dairy industry does not consider it practical to maintain them. That Herefords have driven most other cattle off the ranges. That a good strain of white Leghorn hens may be expected to lay more eggs than mongrels or other breeds. Equalitarians have not yet decided that the disposition of the

German Shepherd and the Collie are identical. However, we must be prepared for them to take over this field, and evaluate these subjects by decree should they promise to throw any light on human differences.

The Nordics

I cannot close this chapter without making a few remarks about that group of white peoples referred to as Nordic. As shown by Coon (*The Races of Europe*, p. 65), by the end of the nineteenth century North America had become the greatest Nordic reservoir in the world. He also points out that because of a shift in immigration the beginning of a change started at that time. However, we remain principally of North European descent. Therefore, any information relative to Nordics should be of interest to the majority of Americans. But aside from such a natural interest we find in this subject many implications which we must regard as either strange or significant. In the remarks that follow no attempt will be made to give a "final" solution to the questions that are raised. Rather they will be set forth in the form in which your author thinks a broader minded age might approach them.

In this writing, we shall consider Nordics as a single group, though such writers as Coon (*The Races of Europe*) have shown that the north Europeans probably represent a complex of races or subraces. Nevertheless, they have certain attributes in common, which fact becomes apparent when they are compared with Alpines.¹

The Idea of Nordic Superiority

Why has the idea of Nordic superiority met with such extremes of feeling? The Germans embraced it while they are by no means preponderantly Nordic, and in fact are composed

¹ In his last book (1950) written with Garn and Birdsell, Coon refers to the Northwest Europeans; this to cover the inhabitants of that area. In this case the Nordic might be considered as a *type* found in this group.

of varieties of white groups with the Nordic types actually in the minority (see Coon, *The Races of Europe*).

A number of years ago I met a Russian who had spent some time in America and spoke English with but a slight accent. Because of his Nordic type, I had concluded that he was probably a Swede. When I told him so he seemed greatly flattered and remarked that in his part of Russia Nordic types are common. Another, a cultured Russian, himself of an intermediate type, told me with considerable feeling that the Russians are not preponderantly Slavs, and are, in fact, as Nordic as most other European countries. A blond, but round-headed Pole of my acquaintance claims he is Nordic in type.

The Nordic is considered fair game by equalitarians, and we find Hooton taking an occasional slap at him. Coon (*The Races of Europe*) in a footnote denies that they are superior. As we have seen, Grant's book, *The Passing of the Great Race*, based on an assumption of Nordic superiority, at first met with great favor in this country, till minorities became so aroused against it that their emotionally inspired storm fairly swept its ideas out of existence. Had Grant's claims been extreme ones we could understand such a reaction. However, though he stresses what he considers certain superior qualities in Nordics, his claims of superiority are quite modest. On the other hand, when Dickson advanced a theory of Alpine superiority it passed all but unnoticed. How are we to account for this situation? Apparently, either in the historical ideas concerning Nordics or in their physical makeup there are qualities that arouse emotions. Let us explore these thoughts.

(1) Possibly equalitarians consider that Gobenau, being first on the scene with claims of superiority for a race, and having fastened on the Northerners, gave them an unfair advantage which later comers have felt they must break down.

(2) The Nordic type, on the basis of social selection, may have an advantage which equalitarians consider "unfair" or unjustified. This group may have such an advantage based on

a principle understood by Darwin. Thus he has pointed out that breeders of fancy pigeons wish to produce birds that do not violently depart from characteristics, but heighten them. These breeders may express a characteristic innate with humans, or at least a quality apt to crop up in society as we now know it. For possibly Nordics as a type have just enough heightened qualities in a direction that gives them an advantage. They may represent a physical ideal for the white race. If this is so, it would cause them to be admired, though the advantage this gave them would be resented.

(3) Lastly, we have the possibility yet to be evaluated that Nordics have the qualities that Grant ascribed to them. As these have more to do with questions of temperament than capacity, we shall not consider that they impart superiority or inferiority. At the same time it is the Alpines or "round heads" who seem to be getting the better of the argument as far as survival goes. Grant's book is based partly on the fear that if immigration were allowed a free course other elements would, with time, become so established in this country as to allow them to breed out the Nordics. This apparently has been happening over most of Continental Europe and a transformation of this kind has been occurring, though the reasons back of it are not understood with certainty. In this, the broader or rounder-headed appear to be transforming or replacing the longer-headed. As the Nordics belong to this latter group, judging from present evidence, they are losing in the battle for survival. If they have an advantage as to social selection it nevertheless is not insuring their perpetuation. This may be due to a social stratification, such as Coon remarks upon, where those on the higher levels tend to die out because of restricted birth rates. However, this whole question is beyond any but a speculative evaluation at this time.

Grant Shouted Down

That Grant's conception has been shouted down, rather than critically evaluated, I believe can be shown by the follow-

ing. It was his belief that the Nordics are superior in what I might term "a spirit of adventure." He considered this to be an important attribute, though handicapping them for city life under slum conditions, or for becoming peasants "fastened to the soil." He believed that Alpines (round heads) had better survival values under these conditions. Now Coon has shown (pp. 7 and 8) that the Poles who have immigrated to this country are taller, blonder, and longer headed than the general run of Polish population. This would both seem to bear out Grant's contention and show that, contrary to all equalitarian claims, subtle racial differences *do* exist. Here I am not trying to evaluate what importance, if any, should be attached to these characteristics. Rather, I wish to show that equalitarians in making us appear as identical in nature and claiming, as they do, that race does not influence our qualities, are simply misleading us.

This thought is further borne out by studies of different body types found in our white groups. These show that differences in both mental capacity and bodily functioning are discovered associated with types. (*Varieties of Human Physique*, Sheldon, p. 14.) Such studies have not so far aroused the ire of equalitarians, for the claim is usually advanced that the types cut across racial barriers. However, granting this, it by no means precludes the possibility that if statistically evaluated the differences might be found to be preponderantly racial.

The reader is also reminded of the wide differences found by the equalitarian Hooton between the different subraces of whites.

CHAPTER XI

RACE, A SUBJECT OF PROPAGANDA

How Widespread Has This Movement Been

At one time I considered the possibility that the emergence of the creed of race equality might be but a part of a general social upheaval, world-wide in scope. However, accounts appearing in current periodicals have caused me to doubt this. Thus, in South Africa the white inhabitants have continued or intensified their determination to keep their race pure. I am therefore forced to the conclusion that it is the minority elements in this country who are attempting to force the opposite attitude upon us.

Propaganda Emanates From New York

When David Lilienthal was head of the Atomic Commission, he was quoted as referring to New York City as a "propaganda factory"; this, in connection with an expression that displeased him. Here we find such an apt term and it is so applicable to the situation that we are dealing with that I also will employ it; for New York has been the source of much equalitarian propaganda. Many publishers have their headquarters there, and head offices of radio concerns are located in that city. New York is well entrenched in wealth, and several groups interested in this subject are found there in numbers.

In spite of the fact that the authors of *An American Dilemma*, as we have seen, promised at the opening of their book to deal only in facts and not tell us what to do about them, we soon discovered this group of propagandaists following the reverse of this policy. Not only this but they go so far as to suggest the following connections for spreading "scientific knowledge" concerning race, or let me say more correctly, propaganda: popular literature, the press, radio, school, and church. No

doubt, in most cases these have been well worked especially in the big cities, except for the South. I might add that equalitarians have gained as converts those in control of the production of moving pictures.

The Extent of the Propaganda

It will be difficult, if not impossible, for the historian to gauge the full extent or intensity of the propaganda favoring race equality, as this was experienced for a period before, during, and for a time after the Second World War. Much of the material used will no doubt be lost, it being in pamphlet form or having come over the radio. Verbal expressions have now passed into limbo. For these and other reasons I cannot document my own experience with it. However, I have not known anything of similar magnitude except the propaganda that helped carry us into the war.

A clever tie-in was often made between Hitler's racial ideas and our own. Thus, they were lumped together and condemned together. Sometimes it was inferred by the race equality extremists that we were fighting the war to establish race equality. The subject was so shaped that it was made to appear that if we criticized equalitarian viewpoints we were criticizing war aims. This for a time completely stopped any public evaluation of equalitarian attitudes.

Though I shall speak of this propaganda in the past tense, this is because having passed its peak, some of the assertions that I make are no longer applicable. The propagandists are still active, however, but they are now more subtle. At the same time this group is in command of the stronger position as far as outlets for its effusions go, and I think that we may be sure that as long as this situation lasts all information or expressions favorable to equalitarian attitudes will be placed before the public, while those of an opposite nature will largely be suppressed.

The Term — "Discrimination"

Much equalitarian propaganda has revolved around a few terms. Most of these, apparently, have been chosen by those with equalitarian leanings, and with the object in view of smearing the opposition, or at least putting them on the defensive. However, in the case of *discrimination* it has acquired its evil connotation through a powerful propaganda buildup. Although most of this was directed against social practices, equalitarians tried for deeper effects. We should neither discriminate in practice nor in thought. An attempt was made to paralyze our critical faculties. We must accept a philosophy of equalitarianism on faith. As a creed, its truth or virtue must not be questioned. Here in free America, we scarcely dared think in terms of racial inequality so conditioned had we become, lest we brand ourselves as vicious and wicked. It became impossible to raise the question of racial inequality in public.

Another term which has done yeoman service for equalitarians is "intolerance." Strangely, equalitarians would not tolerate any opinions but their own. This is clearly a case of what psychologists refer to as projection. Thus, equalitarians attribute their own faults to others. Tolerance turns out to be a one-way street where everything must run in the direction favorable to equalitarian concepts.

Still another term which has all but worn itself out from overuse is "prejudice." I have spoken of this before. Any attempt to evaluate race qualities, except where they came out equal, has been branded as prejudiced.

Equalitarians have endeavored to smother opposition by the volume and intensity of their propaganda. Both the aim and techniques have been totalitarian. Under their scheme all of our attitudes on this subject would be dictated by decree from above. The sponsors of this movement took to themselves all virtues and branded their opponents with most of the vices. Their output has varied from subtleties so finely arranged that we would not be conscious of their purport to expressions of the fiercest denunciation. Equalitarians held themselves ever

in readiness to turn their wrath against anyone who dared oppose their views.

Though equalitarian propaganda has been carried on by minorities, the aim has been to gain a universal acceptance for it. It has undoubtedly met with some success. On the other hand, there are those who will not accept it, and with them I have discovered a growing resentment towards it and the groups responsible for it.

Also the beginning of an open reaction against the extreme claims of equalitarians has set in among a few writers, as we have seen. Here I particularly wish to mention *This is Race* by Count, who has allowed material critical of equalitarian ideas to creep into his anthology. Reading this after having been immersed in such books as *An American Dilemma* is like emerging from the stagnant air of a dungeon to the open countryside where the breezes of freedom are playing.

White Skin Belittled

Equalitarian propaganda belittles all race differences. As the white and black differ most conspicuously in skin color, much of the radio propaganda has tried to convey the impression that all race differences are but skin deep. That those with light and dark skin differ only in this respect. The attempt has been to make the whole appear ridiculous by limiting attention to such superficialities.

Propadangists Stress Hate

The foulest move by equalitarians has been to convey the impression that anyone who did not agree with their position, those who suggested the possibility that races differed in capacities, was guilty of spreading a doctrine of hate. It will be fortunate if this attitude does not backfire on them. For it is equalitarians who have identified hate with this subject. Again, we discover equalitarians attributing their own faults to others. I do not recall any believer in race inequality of the least responsibility who approaches this question with even the

slightest suggestion of such a nature. I, myself, get along well with all races, and a former teacher for whom I have a high regard is of Japanese descent. Stewart Landry, in the preface to the first edition of his book, *The Cult of Equality*, in which equalitarian ideas are criticized, states that he had qualms about writing it, partly because of the fear of hurting the feelings of his friends of the Negro race. This is not the expression of a man who hates. I might mention in passing that he is a Southerner. Nevertheless, both of us have felt the need of rising above personal and sentimental feelings for the benefit of higher aims.

As colonists, it is the English who practice the most discrimination. At the same time their record with respect to humanitarian treatment of natives has been infinitely better than that of Spaniards who are not nearly so apt to practice discrimination. If discrimination is tied in with hate, as the race propagandists would have us believe, the records of these two nations as colonizers would be the reverse of what they prove to be.

All sciences that could conceivably be called upon to back their theme have been prostituted by equalitarians. Thus, we have been led to believe that the findings of biology are with them. They have, as we have shown, largely captured anthropology. The impression has been conveyed that eugenics and genetics are on their side. Psychology has been employed, and those who did so agree with the extremists of race equality have been said to be suffering from a psychosis or neurosis. History has been altered to help with their aims as in an article claiming three great Negro civilizations of the past (*Reader's Digest*, September, 1946).¹ I have not been able to authenticate the existence of such civilizations. Thus, Arnold Toynbee (*A Study of History*, p. 54) tells of the contributions of the various races to civilization, but admits that the Negroes have not as yet

¹ This article contained a number of "mistakes" with respect to established facts. All of these favored the equalitarian viewpoint.

contributed anything. This statement by Toynbee is particularly significant, for he is obviously an equalitarian. From my viewpoint, it is quite remarkable that Africans could remain so backward, having been in touch with civilization for centuries.

Science, from its very nature, is based upon the truth. To the extent that our anthropologists have used anthropology to other ends than discovering and revealing facts, they have caused it to degenerate. Much of the criticism that they made of German anthropologists could be turned against our own for this reason. Even if some of them may have believed that they were doing good by misleading, this is not a proper excuse for their behavior. The Germans were also convinced of the righteousness of their cause. In the case of many of both of these groups they have allowed their emotions to govern their "reasoning."

Propaganda, Sentimental or Maudlin

When the propagandists ran out of "scientific" references, they often fell back on sentimentality, which at times was so extreme as to be all but maudlin. If they could not reason with us they would play on our emotions. An attempt has been made to convince us that our children are wiser than we, and much emphasis has been laid on the fact that the very young do not discriminate socially. Those who care to look deeper into this subject should note that the change in attitude that is usually observed to occur, happens at about the time of puberty, or when the young become potential guardians of the future of their race.¹ However, equalitarians paint this change as the "acquiring" of ignorance, speaking paradoxically.

We have discovered two classes of equalitarian propagandists. One of these pretends to deal scientifically with facts. However, when the methods employed by this group are evalu-

¹ The average "remembered" age when prejudice develops on the part of whites towards blacks in a group studied is given as 12.6 years. (*Psychology*, Boring, Langfield, and Weld. 1948, p. 604.)

ated we discover that they would either lead us away from a consideration of facts or so manipulate or distort our understanding of them that the facts lose their validity. The other class of propagandists, while they wish to have us believe that their position is founded on the truth, usually convey such an impression by inference or implication. Their main activities are aimed at influencing us emotionally. To this end they would create a mental or emotional climate where it would be "bad form" to admit of any differences in racial capacities. Thus they are trying to give this subject a privileged position where it can escape proper scrutiny. Both of these groups, by different methods, are trying to lead us away from reality.

William Graham Sumner, author of *Folkways*, was Professor of Political and Social Sciences at Yale University. As he died in 1910, he could not have known of the situation we have been dealing with. However, because of his keen mind, deep insight, and great knowledge he was able to formulate principles which have so clear an application to our field as to be amazing.

We have seen that in the opening chapters of *An American Dilemma* much was made of the theme of democracy, and the idea of an American creed in connection with our race problem was stressed. Thus the thought was conveyed that those who disagreed with the authors were guilty of failure to live up to the ideals that these writers claimed represented democracy and Americanism.

The Tyranny of Words

Sumner tells of the tyranny that certain words can obtain (p. 176). "Democracy" is one of these, "Americanism" is another. Thus he points out that no one dare repudiate what is declared to be American (p. 177). He tells us that if anything is base or bogus, it is always labeled "American" by those wishing to push or foster it. He further tells us that any recommendation that cannot be justified is put under the heading of "Americanism."

He shows us that "democracy" is now a word to conjure with, and that it is used to prejudice discussions.

On page 180 Sumner tells us that suggestion is powerfully aided by "pathos." On page 181 we learn that where pathos is active, the subject is privileged and is protected from severe examination. It introduces elements that corrupt judgment. He further tells us that it continues the notion that there are edifying falsehoods and useful deceptions.

On page 195 Sumner brings out that the opponent of the notions that are current cannot gain a hearing. Let us see how true this is. Stewart Landry's book, *The Cult of Equality*, was copyrighted in 1945; at the height of the propaganda drive by equalitarians. Landry views his subject objectively, which is not the case with the writers whose works we have reviewed. He does not find that races are equal in capacity. Thus, as Sumner might put it, he is an opponent of the notions that are current. And as Sumner would realize, he could not get a hearing except in the South. Let us turn to Landry's account of this. In the preface to the second edition he tells us that the press practically ignored his book, though copies were sent to newspapers and magazines for review. He thinks no Northern publisher would have dared accept it.

According to Landry, his book was well received in Harlem until it was banned, due to a crusade by a newspaper.

I am not considering the Negro press in connection with racial propaganda, because I am not directly acquainted with this field. The reader who wishes to pursue this subject is referred to Landry's book.

CHAPTER XII

A FURTHER LOOK AT BRAZIL, WITH SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter we further review Pierson's book, *Negroes in Brazil*, concentrating, however, on the discoverable sociological implications.

Is the Negro better off in Brazil than he is here? He obviously has not advanced himself further economically, as was brought out. Does the greater social acceptance accorded him there cause him to be happier? No proof is offered that it does, and I will show that it is quite conceivable that the Brazilian Negro may be worse off in this respect. Thus, we are told that he is not penalized for being a Negro. Pierson makes much of the point, and we are assured that the Brazilians are proud of this situation. However, on page 148 Pierson tells us that a definite line is drawn at intermarriage between the extreme darks and lights. In the case of a group of students, he tells that two thirds objected to dancing with blacks.

On pages 149 and 150 we are told that when a dark and light person marry, the lighter one is usually benefited financially by the arrangement. On pages 150 and 151 Pierson shows that when intermarriage (dark and light) does occur in upper society, the social world does not completely close its doors on the couple. Thus, he quotes from an upper class individual who says that some people feel sorry for the newlyweds, but try to treat them as usual. He gives other evidence that marriage with a person much darker is frowned upon. Thus, in Brazil there occur tensions which, under our system, are automatically avoided.

Pierson shows that there is little opposition to marriage of light mixed bloods even into the upper class where their features or color do not too obviously show evidences of Negro

blood. Apparently fine discriminations are practiced. On page 154 we are told of a seventeen-year-old girl of good family who was asked how dark a man she would be willing to marry. She named a certain light mixed blood with "good" hair as embodying the limit.

Pierson does his best to convince us that these differences can be accounted for on the basis of "class" rather than "race." However, this thought is inconsistent with his own presentation of the facts. Analysis of his statement shows that Brazilians are conscious of race in choosing their marital partners.

No doubt life's most poignant experiences are tied in with sex, either directly or indirectly. In this all-important field the Negro of Bahia finds himself handicapped. However, according to other evidence presented, he has the idea that he is equal dangled before him. Then, when he comes to choose a partner in marriage, this equality disappears. The Brazilians' handling of this situation might cause more unhappiness than does ours.

Race Gradually Being Changed

I believe that most people will agree that the discriminations practiced in Brazil are serving a useful purpose. In this connection I take it, on *a priori* grounds, that the preferences shown will gradually lighten the race. As we shall presently see, the Brazilians believe that such a change is taking place, and obviously favor it. In this connection, Pierson quotes from Varella who shows a figure of a Negro woman carrying a child on her back by means of a wide cloth. If, however, the child is lighter (the expression being literally, "cleaner") he is carried in front, so that he may more readily be seen.

Pierson shows that Negro men and women in Brazil, as in the United States and Haiti, wish to marry lighter, their expression for this being to the effect that they do not want to go back to Africa (pp. 121, 122). On page 121 Pierson tells that the majority of illegitimate children of Negro and mulatto mothers in the case of a group of twenty-four observed show a

strong tendency to lightness. One of these was proud of the fact that she had five "other" children, comparatively white.

On page 123 we are told that there is a tendency for the European population to absorb the lighter mixed bloods, while the mulattoes absorb the blacks. This means that the population, we are assured, is becoming more European and less Negroid in appearance. This is referred to as progressive Aryanization. It is believed (footnote) that the population is progressively whitening, and that the proportion of white blood is constantly increasing.

On page 125 we are again shown that the Brazilians believe that they are becoming lighter. We are told that the mixed bloods consider themselves as transition points in an inevitable process of whitening. Pierson points out (p. 126) that it is difficult to determine, because of a lack of reliable statistics, if the population is becoming more European in features. It is possible, of course, that this may be but a case of wishful thinking.

The Economic Field

On page 222 Pierson shows that there are Brazilian blacks who are dissatisfied with their lot. He would have us believe that this is simply a case of class struggle, and that race has nothing to do with it. This on its face is an absurdity, for most of Pierson's book is devoted to showing that the Negro is accorded equal opportunities with the white man — the exception being in the selection of a sexual mate. However, let us continue with his line of thought. He finds the Brazilian Negro in an unhappy position. Now the theme of Pierson's book is that Brazilians have found a better solution for the race problem than we have. Why, then, this dissatisfaction on the part of the Negro?

The Negro's Struggle for Position

On page 222 Pierson tells us that the struggle for position in Brazil (because of the failure of the Negro to rise) takes on

the character of a class struggle in the Marxian sense. He gives portions of the writing of a young journalist under leftist influence who is impressed with the low economic level of the Bahia poorer classes which, as we have seen, are composed almost entirely of Negroes.

This journalist tells that the black continues to be a being apart, almost an animal. He further informs us that the "authorities" merely permit him to have access to the streets and work for the whites. I wish the reader to note that this Brazilian writer blames the authorities. "In this country equalitarians would place the responsibility upon our system of discrimination. Apparently any one or every one is to blame for the Negro's poor showing except the Negro himself. The writer in question continues that for this reason (the authorities) the black can never hope to improve himself or rise very high in intellectual or moral level, and this failure is responsible for his continuing animalism and criminality.

The Afro-Brazilian Congress

Let us see something more of conditions in Brazil. On page 223 Pierson tells of some suggestions to the second Afro-Brazilian Congress. It was said that the Congress ought to point out the following, which I have paraphrased:

The deplorable position of the black man in Brazil.

The Congress should break the chains of oppression.

The Congress should tell that the black man is dying of tuberculosis, of his heavy labor, of lack of necessities, and of sorrow.

The Congress should remind the black man that he is selected for, and preferred in, lower occupations.

The Congress should ask the black man how long he wants to be a slave.

Now this is the situation that prevails in the land that gives the African every chance to rise, and where race preju-

dice does not exist. For proof of this latter fact let me cite Pierson (p. 225). He quotes a black of some standing, and the statement is to the effect that here (in Brazil) we are all equal, whether black or white or mixed blood. He further states that no position is closed to the black man, nor is any profession. We are assured that he can reach any position for which he shows himself fit.

The Mixed Bloods

On page 349 Pierson considers the relative positions of the mixed bloods of Brazil and North America. If the concept sponsored by equalitarians is true, we should find the Brazilian mixed bloods far ahead of those in this country. It is therefore surprising to discover that Pierson admits that those in Brazil are probably somewhat backward. He blames this on the fact that they lack the incentive of North American Negroes; because this latter group, we are told, feel themselves under a necessity to demonstrate to a hostile white world their individual abilities and talents. For Pierson's purposes the "hostile" white world of North America advances the Negro. With Myrdal it is this factor, designated as "social disparagement," that is responsible for retarding him. We may admire the singlemindedness of purpose of equalitarians, for they exhibit an amazing capacity for discovering arguments in any situation to advance their concept. However, when they develop opposite conclusions from the same fact their thoughts become devoid of reason. They employ arguments, not to help but to confound understanding.

Now let us come to some further conclusions based on Pierson's observations: (1) Our system has allowed the Negro to find a relatively advanced position for himself. (2) It overthrows the claims of equalitarian theorists that we are holding Negroes down. (3) It again shows that under neither system has the Negro been able to rise.

Pierson, as we have seen, admits that the mixed bloods in North America are probably somewhat better off than are

those of Brazil. At the same time, he ties this statement in with a reference to a hostile white world, this being the stimulus that places the mixed bloods ahead. However, on page 230 he shows that the mixed blood in Brazil is considered to be exceedingly ambitious. The following facts emerge:

This ambitious group in Brazil, where they are not being held down, have not been able to do so well (probably) as they have in this country, where they are supposed to be held down. We of the majority nevertheless have been subjected to all manner of abuse for oppressing them.

Race Problems and Democracy

Under democratic institutions we ordinarily find a variety of opinions with respect to economic and social situations. Groups may be formed of those holding similar views. These may then be advanced in public debates. However, in the field of racial relations or understanding we discover a different situation. Here, a minority with extreme equalitarian views, by means of methods previously considered, have succeeded in capturing the exclusive right to place their opinions before the public. This is out of line with all of our traditions and is responsible for an unwholesome and dangerous situation. Let us glance at what develops.

North American equalitarians have had to admit the backward position of the Negro. However, they cannot concede that this has any basis in race. Therefore, they must place all of the blame for his backwardness on the attitude of our white majority. This theory has been elaborately developed and widely expounded. However, when it is put to test as it has been in Brazil we find the two races in essentially the same relative positions. Basic conditions are not altered. Thus, equalitarians are leading the Negro to believe in an unworkable theory and promising him benefits that cannot be realized. If this practice is continued, it is impossible to say what the outcome may be. That it is damaging rather than helping race relations, should be obvious. Even though it may be impossible to assess the full

extent of the harm being done, I can point to a situation that it might be influencing. The well-known Negro, White, wrote an article which appeared in a magazine of national circulation. In it he declares that there are times when he has been swept with fears that the patience of the colored man is close to an end.

Radical equalitarians are denying the American people access to reality. Thus, in this all-important field we lose the benefit of constructive criticism. Therefore the subject becomes one in which delusions and superstitions must hold sway. This cannot lead to permanent benefits, but it could lead to disaster.

In this chapter we have limited our appraisal to social values. However, there are still higher ones involved, as we shall see in a later chapter.

CHAPTER XIII

SOCIAL PREFERENCES

Beauty, the Expression of an Ideal

Schopenhauer said: "The final aim of all love intrigues, be they comic or tragic, is really of more import than all other ends in human life. What it all turns upon is nothing less than the composition of the next generation. It is not the weal or woe of any one individual, but that of the human race to come which is here at stake." With these words in mind let us see what light we can throw on this subject through a consideration of certain social preferences.

I believe that it can be shown that courtship serves a purpose of great value to the race. It represents a search not only for a mate, but for the embodiment of ideals. These have to do with physical makeup as well as what I will call spiritual attributes, for want of a better name. By this I mean the totality of psychic and emotional qualities closely associated with personality. When these are found embodied in the individual's ideal of physical beauty, love is apt to bloom. However, for obvious reasons our consideration will be mostly confined to physical qualities as these are manifested in appearances. Nevertheless, we shall point to the fact that a preference in marriage by the highly intelligent for their own kind has been discovered.

Anticipating a later conclusion, social preferences, as far as these lead to sexual selection, may be considered as a function of a drive away from the inferior, towards the superior. This drive, as we shall see, appears to be an integral part of our natures.

As proof that an ideal is involved, some will not marry unless they can at least partially realize it. Occasionally we see this principle miscarry, and the highly romantic may falsely

invest the person to be accepted with the qualities they deem the person should have.

Every nation has developed an ideal of beauty; or in our country, composed as it is of a variety of ethnic groups, we could no doubt find several such even if we confine ourselves to whites. However, it is probable that these closely approximate each other in what we might consider as the "basic ingredients" of beauty, allowing, however, leeway for types. Darwin says (footnote), "An ingenious writer argues from a comparison of the pictures of Raphael, Rubens, and modern French artists that the ideal of beauty is not absolutely the same even throughout Europe." As these ideals help to form the race by giving sexual preferment to the types in question, let us inquire into their nature. Several publications have tried to determine if our sense of beauty guides us to higher qualities, but I have not been able to see all of these. And this subject could easily lead us from our field and into the more general one of eugenics. However, as equalitarians have spent much energy in belittling such ideals, for some of them have a racial basis, we are justified in pursuing the subject further. They would do away with all racial pride, and a part of their propaganda has been aimed at gaining standing for the nondescript and the mongrel.

Ziegfeld's Beauties

When Ziegfeld was in the show business, I read an article based on an interview with his famous beauties. The writer said that he came to the interview prepared to find the girls beautiful but "dumb." However, he discovered that several were college graduates and most of these had remarkably good scholastic records. At the time it occurred to me that the article might have been inspired as a piece of publicity. However, subsequent observations have led me to believe that these findings were probably true. The embodiment of our ideals of beauty may very well be the possessor of superior qualities.

Darwin on Beauty

Darwin became interested in the standards of beauty that man sets for himself, for these have a bearing on his theory of sexual selection. He approaches the subject with characteristic thoroughness, and quotes from many observers. Thus, in parts of the world, ideals of beauty apparently differ widely from our own. On the other hand, he shows that some travelers found their tastes in agreement with tribal standards. A possible explanation of this situation might be that when tastes differ the observers were concentrating on facial characteristics. Where there was agreement, it seems probable that the organism as a whole was being judged. In all such ratings I believe that these two understandings of beauty should be kept in mind. Even if we allow for certain exceptions, particularly with some African races or tribes, possibly something resembling a general agreement might be reached as to good physique or figure. However, with facial characteristics, each group has its own standard which it prefers. In connection with such a standard let me quote from Darwin: "It has been argued that ugliness consists in an approach to the structure of lower animals, and no doubt this is partly true with the more civilized nations, in which intellect is highly appreciated." Our sense of beauty is to a certain extent simply a reaction against or away from primitive characteristics. From this particular point of view, beauty is a quality found in the highly evolved. With these thoughts in mind the following acquires added interest.

Through a study of photographs, facial beauty was observed by Hollingsworth (*Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*), who concluded that adolescents of from 135 to 200 I. Q. have greater beauty than average individuals. My own experience is confined to two pictures: one of a child prodigy at the time in her teens and strikingly beautiful; the other, an exceptionally outstanding student also of outstanding beauty.

Qualities Correlated With Superior Intelligence

Under the heading of "Qualities Correlated With Superior Intelligence," Hollingsworth, Terman, and Oden found that while inferior deviates were lacking in vitality, superior deviates were conversely characterized. Thus they say that all studies of highly intelligent individuals show a general high quality of the organism.

A number of theories have been advanced to account for a generally found preference for such qualities as "a nicely turned ankle." Possibly exceptionally heavy bones might be considered to be the retention of a primitive character, as Coon (*The Races of Europe*) seems to think is the case. Other evidence, even though it be slight, could be given indicating that our social preferences are guiding us correctly.

Source of Preferences

Qualities deemed desirable are the sum total of the feelings, preferences, and opinions of the individual and the group; the few and the many. While the individual has his own preferences, he likes to see these meet with general approval, and is influenced by generally accepted standards. The resulting complex, though abstract, nonetheless is real in its effects for it is helping to shape future generations. These preferences are a case of nature expressing herself within us, and should be respected. She is trying through these channels to advance the best interests of humanity.

The profound effect that such preferences have is generally realized. Let us turn to Czenkanowski (*Race*, p. 605), who believes that social selection plays the major part in forming the composition of groups, it taking precedence, in his opinion, over natural selection. Such selection is not only operative within racial groups but also between them. In this latter case, amalgamation may be mutually avoided, or one group may discriminate against the other.

The Necessity for Selection

Cooke and Burkes point out that "mathematical studies of evolution" show that changes in genetic constitutions of groups of creatures, be they fruit flies or men, will inevitably decrease the fitness of the group unless selection takes place to offset "gene erosion." Muller is my authority (press interview) for stating that the great majority of mutations are harmful. I take it that he was not considering those simply neutral in effect.

In the case of wild life not only does nature ruthlessly eliminate the unfit, thus helping to maintain the quality of the species, but she may work in other ways to improve the line. Thus, often only the more vigorous males can secure mates. Birds are apt to practice elaborate courtships. Though no way has been found to assess exactly the value of these latter practices to the species, it is generally assumed that they work for its betterment, through selection. Darwin believes that the more vigorous males are chosen as mates by the females of many species. However, it is quite conceivable that where decoration alone is involved in sexual selection, it might be so overdone as eventually to be damaging from the point of view of survival. Darwin realizes this possibility, and refers to the plumes of certain birds, the horns of certain stags, as becoming slightly injurious. Thus, we must recognize that while nature, in the main, is apt to be right in her management of affairs, she can go wrong.¹

In the case of domestic animals we not only practice selection, but the value of this is recognized on all sides. However, if we turn an appraising eye on our human elements, we hear screams of disapproval from equalitarians.

As modern society is constituted, little thought is given to

¹ I think that Darwin's understanding of this situation is still essentially correct even though today's biologists are able to elaborate on it. Thus we learn from Huxley (*Evolution*, pp. 35-36) that bright colors in the case of birds may act as a "threat" toward territorial rivals. For an interesting and elaborate discussion of the effect of antlers on the Irish deer, see Temple and Mode in *Evolution*, Simpson, pp. 173, 174.

methods for the improvement of our human stock. The only active force operating in this field is that of sexual selection, and this should be encouraged to help perpetuate our better elements. So far as equalitarian propaganda and attitudes are working against this conception they should be condemned in the severest terms.

In connection with values let us see what a specialist in the field of animal breeding has to say (J. L. Lush, *Animal Breeding Plans*, pp. 93-94). We are told that in animal husbandry the interaction between heredity and environment is a problem of major economic importance. Lush remarks: "Improvements in heredity are permanent and each generation stands on the shoulders of the preceding one. On the other hand, improvements in environment produce almost their full effect when made. Each new generation must again receive the improved environment or the gain will be lost."

Three Alternatives

As I see it, we are facing three alternatives: (1) To continue our present sentimentally conditioned attitude where the strong support the weak. Unless social preference leading to sexual selection is able to offset the evil effect of this practice, it will lead to race deterioration. (2) An alternative would be to carry out an educational program which will spread knowledge of eugenics. Such would require more courage than our generation has shown. We live in a twilight land of unreality as far as this problem is concerned, and I think that I have sufficiently shown that a "last ditch" fight will be put up by equalitarians to prevent any light being thrown on values if race is in any way involved. (3) The belief has been expressed by Bertrand Russell (*The Scientific Outlook*) that the future will see the state control the breeding of man. Under such a plan the great majority of males would be sterilized and a large percentage of females. Shocking as such an idea is, can it be doubted that the drift toward turning the control of all activities over to the state will end otherwise? If the state assumes

responsibility for us from birth to death, it is probable that its rulers will want to decide on the stocks that are to compose it. This could easily be worked out with the help of modern methods of sterilization. Such need not affect the individual in any other respect than that he will fail to beget progeny. A further indication that the totalitarian state might not be adverse to such an idea is the low regard that many radicals have for the family as we know it today, for some of them consider it but a property holding and are opposed to it for that reason. An all powerful state of the future would probably find the breeding of its human stock a tempting field for exploitation. How would racial minorities fare under such an undertaking? This would depend on the feeling of the ruling individual or clique. Such, of course, could not be foreseen with accuracy. However, there is no reason to believe that such rulers would feel themselves bound by expressions of today's radical theorists and agitators. Thus, if such rulers should wish to eliminate a minority race, this could be done without the necessity for spilling blood. In the next chapter I shall introduce additional evidence to that previously given, showing that there is a normal preference of like for like. In the following appraisal I assume that representatives of the majority group will remain in power. Should this prove to be the case, I believe it probable that they might decide on eliminating "discordant" minorities. Coon and associates tell that in primitive societies troublemakers are apt to be killed. In totalitarian societies troublemaking groups are apt to be exterminated. In this fashion leaders of the new order could solve problems where groups fail to fit into over-all plans. Also, I think that nature would always be at work within the controlling element, with her insistence that they favor their own kind. This alone might prove to be a determining factor. Under such a plan a minority race might be gradually eliminated, or this end could be accomplished in one generation. We have had ample proof that totalitarian governments are willing to sacrifice not only individuals but groups. Those in control of

such states place their own aims above humanitarian considerations.

Improvement Under Democracy

If we wish to see our citizenry improve under democracy let us take thought of rational means of self-improvement. This should apply to all elements in our population. What part would the Negro play in such a plan? Though we have shown doubts as to the advisability of race mixtures, these are already largely in effect as far as he is concerned. He can further his own improvement by continuing the process of selection now in operation, the lighter elements being favored. It goes without saying that such an idea is opposed by most of our so-called liberals, or at least the vocal element among them. This group wish to see social equality established within the Negro race. A magazine of national circulation has but recently criticized discrimination practiced in a Negro University, it being based on a preference for those of light complexion.

CHAPTER XIV

THE BASIS FOR A CONCLUSION

A Case of Chaos

Let us partially summarize our findings, these being discovered in some or all of the writers reviewed, or else found in the propaganda touched upon. We started with an attempt to evaluate the soundness of equalitarian arguments bearing on racial intelligence. This subject is amenable to scientific consideration. However, we find that the authors reviewed employ methods that allow them to avoid such. Thus we are led into other fields and discover that we must consider a great roster of subjects, these having little or no bearing on the issue. We become immersed in theories of sociology, deal with rhetoric, logic, propaganda, philosophy, ethics, individual psychology, and the theory of knowledge.

We find that equalitarians have prostituted the sciences of biology, eugenics, and genetics to their own ends. We learn that they have all but completely captured anthropology. They invent history.

While this group have usually ignored facts not favorable to their position they occasionally take notice of these. We then find them either embracing fantastic theories to explain them to their own liking or else resorting to downright deception. They are either unaware of or are unconcerned with gross inconsistencies in their arguments. We point to attempts by them to implant ideas subtly by means of suggestions. They slant their presentation of facts so that these will mislead. They lean heavily upon the propagandists' method of dogmatic statements. We find equalitarians accusing us of acting from low motives; of being undemocratic and un-American. We discover that they have appointed themselves guardians of our manners, morals, modes of thinking; all in the light of their preference.

We see them pleading a special case while claiming to be impartial. They assume an air of superior wisdom and would put others on the defensive by implying that they are ignorant. They do not allow of the possibility of errors in their own conclusions.

When the ideas that equalitarians would foster are given a test, as in Brazil, we learn that these prove ineffective. They fail to improve the Negro's lot, and indicate a failure in his capacity. We discover that equalitarians have usually not even bothered to look to conditions in this Southern Republic or, where they have considered this area, as with Pierson, they employ flimsy excuses for not believing what they see. Had not our reason previously told us so, we would have found after reviewing his book that equalitarians are trying to further a creed which obviously cannot alter basic conditions. In the light of the foregoing we properly conclude that their outlook is unsound; that it is based upon shallow and sentimental considerations. Further, we find that because equalitarians ignore or fail to grasp the fact of the Negro's limitations, they must falsely blame the majority when trying to account for his backwardness. Such an attitude, as we have seen, is unjustified. It is responsible for worsening race relations.

Equalitarian values, we discover, could they gain an ascendancy, would be of a temporary nature. At the same time this group ignores or overlooks the possibility that the viewpoint they foster might be responsible for irreparable damage to basic values. We find equalitarians accusing us of intolerance while they themselves are absolutely intolerant of any views opposed to their own. We find them, or many of them, lacking in the fundamental morality of honesty. They resort to personal abuse. Equalitarians live in a mythical land of their own creating, and insist that we also take up our abode there.

A Conception Fundamentally Mistaken

We feel justified in concluding that there is something fundamentally wrong with a conception that must call upon

such methods to win converts, and where even these drastic measures largely fail in their aims. As previously mentioned and as our evidence shows, equalitarians do not deal scientifically with their subject. Based on this failure, we formulate a thought or principle that can be expressed in a generalization. Thus we state: *emotion is apt to be the dominating factor in racial attitudes*. With the majority, their response leads them in one direction, while it moves equalitarians in a different and quite opposite direction.

Before we can make further progress in this field we must find a rational explanation for the fact that it is dominated by emotion. and show why opposite attitudes and beliefs spring from it. Your writer feels that the explanation found in the two following chapters will lay the basis for such understanding. Towards this end we must probe deep within the secret fastnesses of human nature to discover the sources from which primitive emotions spring. From our findings I believe we can build a strong case for the explanation we offer.

CHAPTER XV

RACE ATTITUDES BASED ON EMOTIONS

Though we have sufficiently shown that emotions govern attitudes in race questions, we are left with the problem of discovering their nature. In this connection we cannot precisely determine the elements involved. However, as pointed out by Munn (*Psychology*, p. 227) motives may be inferred from behavior. Emotions seek goals and we can learn something of what is prompting action by the direction taken.

We shall not attempt to list all discoverable emotions in this field. Rather, we concentrate on those that evidence indicates are capable of arousing the extreme states that we have witnessed.

Feeling Connected With Prestige

We start with equalitarians. When reference is made to minorities we mean groups, whether they be a branch of the whites or belong to some other race, if they feel they are set aside, or are not fully accepted by the majority.

Most people expend energy to gain standing with those about them, as is known to psychologists. We wish to be accepted by our fellows, be a part of their group, be one of their kind; acquire a "sense of belonging." However, if we are members of a minority lacking prestige, or if our kind are not readily accepted by the majority, our standing is, to a certain extent, undermined. Here the individual's aspirations clash with the attitudes of those about him. He becomes incensed against these attitudes. When he believes that race plays a part in the situation, and it sometimes does, we are apt to see the start of a chain of reactions that carries on until the individual becomes a full-fledged equalitarian. His indignation is aroused by the very conception of racial inequality. Soon he rationalizes his atti-

tude. He acquires a drive that favors his viewpoint. To bolster his position he must win converts. Though his creed developed from an emotional bias this fact must be concealed and he must make it appear that his position is based on reason. He tries to win others to his viewpoint by the force and logic of his arguments. When he considers this end achieved he may re-invest his subject with emotion. However, this will not be the one that originally moved him. Its nature will be determined by a calculated attempt to sway the majority in a direction favorable to his position.

A Flight From Reality

The extreme attitude adopted by some equalitarians obviously represents a flight from reality. And this movement as a whole appears to be at least tinged with this quality. Some of the participants are probably definitely abnormal while others are, no doubt, on the borderland of abnormality.¹ Most may properly be considered to be psychoneurotics. At best, this group have failed to achieve a mature outlook. Obviously, they cannot or will not deal objectively with facts that throw an unfavorable light on the position which they favor.

An Inferiority Complex

Attitudes adopted by equalitarians indicate that they are suffering from an inferiority complex. In the drama which they enact for our benefit, the strong (the majority) play the part of the villain. The weak (minorities) simply because of their weakness, are endowed with the virtues. It is well known that those afflicted with feelings of inferiority may become very aggressive (*The Basic Teachings of the Great Psychologists*, p. 196). Malamud shows that such a person may so wish to gain the limelight that it may become his sole interest in life. We have had ample evidence of aggressiveness, as well as intensity

¹ Overstreet, *About Ourselves*, p. 77, tells us that a few steps further on from wishful thinking and we are in the realm of insane delusions. Rationalization (Hart) plays a prominent part in fostering delusions.

of interest on the part of equalitarians. Incidentally, I may remark that the false posturings that are apt to accompany these situations, whether they be for the benefit of an individual or a group, become disagreeable to normal people. In either case the hope is to gain an advantage or acquire prestige without bothering to earn these through accepted channels.

Not only does the existence of such a complex offer us a reasonable explanation of the probable source of the drive in the case of many equalitarians, but it provides us with a clue to the behavior of some members of this group who are not directly affected by race attitudes. Thus, those with feelings of inferiority are apt to be found joining "protest groups" (*Psychology*, Dockeray and Lane, pp. 312, 313). Let me add that though equalitarianism is the result of a complex of factors, the nature of one of these is essentially that of a protest. And this "protest" has precisely the quality that should make it attractive to those suffering from an inferiority complex. They must feel a kinship for those who, like themselves, lack prestige.

The Desire to Survive

The individual sees beyond himself, but a limiting horizon is apt to be that of his own kind. He wishes them to be successful, as has been sufficiently shown by Sir Arthur Keith (*A New Theory of Human Evolution*). In case their success or survival is threatened, we find strong reactions from groups. Should they be subjected to an armed attack we would expect such. But society can operate through other channels. One of these, though it does not endanger the life of the individual, may threaten the survival of his line or that of his kind. This is sexual selection, expressed in social attitudes. Few will fail to grasp the significance of this power. Though the threat to survival is but one factor stimulating equalitarians, it is an extremely important one. For, due to adverse selection, an individual's line might fail to find a place in the stream of the future. The emotions aroused by this "threat" become asso-

ciated with others more directly involving the individual's ego. In combination they develop a force that seeks an outlet against the conception of race inequality. Under this prompting the individual's emotions may be so deeply stirred that he wishes to blast out of existence the very idea that has so aggravated him. He feels a compulsion to rush to the aid of any minority "threatened" by the idea of race inequality.

The Desire of Groups to Survive

With the exception of Sir Arthur Keith, psychologists and anthropologists have failed to realize the extent of the desire of the individual to see his own line survive or that of his own kind. It is true that some evidence has been mustered indicating such a concern might be acquired through the force of custom. Thus, among the Murray Islanders in the Torres Straits, Rivers found that the inhabitants are indifferent to the real parentage of a child. However, I think this but a striking exception, such as has been previously commented upon, to an otherwise valid rule. The great bulk of humanity does not follow any such custom. On the other hand, most members of most societies proceed in an opposite direction and with such intensity that we may be certain that the attitude is more deeply imbedded in human nature than is mere custom. Let us gather some evidence in this connection. When a stepparent prevailingly accords the same treatment to his stepchildren as to his own, this is considered an indication of fine character. The sacrifices entailed in rearing a family suggest that parental attitudes are basic to our natures. Otherwise these sacrifices would not be made.

Psychologists have become cautious about employing the word "instinct" (*The Basic Teachings of the Great Psychologists*, p. 113). At one time this term became a catch-all for explaining behavior. Since then a proper reaction has set in against this excess, and we shall use it with care. However, in the attitude that we prevailingly find, it being the response of most humans towards their own young, we discover, in spite

of certain failures, an all but universal occurrence. Nor is it confined to humanity, where "learned" responses are more apt to prevail. In a state of nature ostriches mate, and I understand from a naturalist that if the female is killed the male rears their young. I have been told by cattle raisers that the great majority of cows will nurse only their own offspring, though there are rare exceptions to this rule. A similar preference for its own is found among sheep. In nature those who tend their young usually greatly or exclusively favor their own. Such has a sufficient applicability to be reckoned as a dominant, inborn trait, if not an instinct. Here is a quality associated with the "higher" forms of life. This becomes apparent in the prevailingly different attitude of mammals towards their young as contrasted with reptiles. These attitudes throw a strong light, even though it be an indirect one, on racial problems. First, the individual develops a feeling for his own, then for the larger element of which they are a part.

Human Nature

Let us further review the attitude of people towards their own kind. It is emotionally inspired and favors those like themselves. However, as we are dealing with an all but universal manifestation we shall consider the behavior normal. At the same time, due to circumstances yet to be dealt with, whenever groups openly favor their kind in this country they hide their motives. Let us cite an example.

Questions connected with immigration deeply arouse feelings. One reason *The Passing of the Great Race* so stirred minorities is that it laid the foundation for our law restricting immigration. This is resented by minorities because of the limitation placed on their kind. At the same time groups never admit that they are influenced by such considerations. Equalitarians have led us to believe that it is wicked for the majority to favor their own in any respect. This idea has been developed into a minor creed. As such, it has been employed by minorities for their benefit. Therefore, minorities cannot openly go counter

to this attitude. Still, they wish to advance the interests of their group. Let us see what happens in connection with immigration questions. Here minorities face a dilemma that calls for deception. Thus, groups tell us that they are working only for the good of our people as a whole. It matters not if rank inconsistencies are implicit in their arguments. They continue to advance these and hide their motives. Yet it always develops that they are favoring their own kind and sometimes very aggressively. Politicians are familiar with this preference and in attempts to capture the votes of minorities promise to work for the allowance of more immigrants of the kind represented by the minorities. The reason the majority is more complacent in the face of this situation is that restrictive immigration laws are still in effect.

Sometimes the preference of like for like is very obvious; sometimes it is expressed subtly. A well conducted agency for placing orphaned children looks not only for physical similarities between the children and foster parents, but also for a similarity in the family backgrounds.

Like Favors Like

Though the feelings involved will be most pronounced in connection with questions of prestige or survival, the fact that like favors like is operating in all directions at all times.¹ I have been reading an editorial by the columnist Sokolsky in which he shows that in a coming election in New York City, party strategists planned to nominate a candidate of Italian descent to help capture the Italian vote. However, he happened to be a Protestant. They therefore wished to find an Irish Catholic for another office. This would help capture the votes of both Catholics and those of Irish descent. As they needed still another candidate they decided that he should be a Jew for the appeal he would have for the voters belonging to this latter group. Sokolsky points out that it would not be necessary to resort to

¹ I am aware that this situation points to a possible conflict of interests. Presumably in such cases the value most cherished will prevail.

such methods, for we all are Americans and the best man for the office should be chosen. I might add that, as voters, these groups should have been sufficiently subjected to American doctrines to have become Americanized.

Several Conclusions

The foregoing situation points to several interesting conclusions. It is probable that most of those who read Sokolsky's column will simply be amused by his findings. Here they see human nature as it actually is, for they also have discovered that it operates in this manner. Possibly a few will resent this fact. However, their ruffled feelings will soon be soothed. Such situations cause no great or lasting drives. Yet we find like favoring like in a very "un-American" fashion. But this situation is not based on factors that bear on the prestige of individuals or the survival of groups. We learn from the foregoing that those who profess to be concerned with American Ideals are not so much interested in the ideal concept of Americanism as they are in the benefits that this conception can offer themselves or their group. Thus, if the majority does not accept a minority at their own evaluation of themselves or fail to accept that of equalitarian theorists, their attitude is at once branded as un-American. By means of propaganda this thought is constantly kept before us. Yet that which is "un-American" in other directions, as we have just seen, passes practically unnoticed.

Heredity and Environment Again

We not only favor our own kind, our own young, but we are interested in the prestige of what I shall refer to as our "line." By this I mean the elements involved in our descent and in its continuation. Such prestige is probably as important to us as is our personal prestige, though the two of course are inter-related. People of "good family" are sometimes very conscious of this fact, and wish to see their children marry into families of equal endowment. Prestige in this direction is sometimes

falsely courted. However, such attempts are so apt to be ridiculed that most people have become cautious in this direction. Even when those of genuinely superior endowment show concern for their line this fact is apt to be resented by those who fear that they might not be so judged.

We have shown in earlier chapters that questions of heredity or environment as determiners of capacity arouse a great deal of feeling. According to Munn (*Psychology*) this subject has been responsible for the most heated controversies in psychology. Those who no doubt consider that they are of superior endowment, insist that this quality is of an hereditary nature. Others, who fear that they may fail to be so judged, deeply resent this idea. Thus, with small groups as well as large racial ones we see a factor emerging around which heated and continuous controversies revolve. This is the idea of superior hereditary endowment.

Let us throw more light on the question of superiority. Adler believes we have a basic urge, a striving towards superiority (*The Basic Teachings of the Great Psychologists*, p. 187). In earlier chapters we discovered a number of equalitarian writers conceding the superiority of whites compared with Negroes. At the same time they claim that this superiority is not innate. Thus the area of contention is reduced and revolves about the question of whether or not superiority is inherited.

Let us gather together for a brief review the principal factors that stir emotions with racial problems. We have discovered that antipathies arise between divergent races. Your writer believes that these are basically sexual. It is also his belief that, other things being equal, the amount of antipathy will be a reflection of the extent of the divergence of the races. Thus, wider apart, more antipathy. This emotion may or may not involve questions of superiority. If a race believes another inferior, its feeling of antipathy towards the inferior group becomes intensified. On the other hand, members of a race believing themselves inferior may, because of their innate drive towards superiority, overcome their racial antipathy and wish

to amalgamate with the superior race. Thus the evidence indicates that the drive towards superiority is more basic than the one that has to do with racial antipathies.

Interlaced with the problem of superiority is that of survival. To a certain extent these are but two facets of the same problem, involving the drive towards superiority. Thus, the main ingredients in racial problems are few and simple in nature. However, their outer manifestations may become varied and complex, as circumstances play on them.

Our Esteem for Superiority

Let us try to discover how nature has been able to create within us an esteem for superiority. I advance the following as an hypothesis. Keith, following Darwin's lead, has considered how various innate qualities have come to reside in humanity. During tribal life, certain attributes were needed by groups to insure their survival. We shall follow the method of Darwin and Keith, applying it to our problem.

It is probable that when groups failed to develop a desire to maintain superior quality they failed to survive. Such a failure might result from the cumulative effects of physical or mental deterioration, or from an inability to compete with other groups or tribes better endowed. These latter, we shall assume, acquired an innate esteem for superiority as a price of their survival. This quality would, first with a small unit or tribe, then in later consolidations of these, and finally with humanity as a whole, become a racial heritage. We discover that with humanity an esteem for superiority serves a similar end to nature's more direct and ruthless elimination of the unfit in the animal kingdom. However, in the case of humanity we find a higher principle. If it operates successfully it will not only eliminate the unfit but should lead us on to heights as yet unscaled.

Feelings of the Majority

Though minorities are stirred by the drive towards superiority, it, in the case of equalitarians, has become perverted. This

group would bolster their position by doing away with the conception of superiority. They would level all down to the lowest. Thus, the attitude which they foster is a destructive one. A constructive position calls for building all towards the highest. In spite of equalitarian propaganda the bulk of our people are in harmony with this principle.

Now we may be certain that the drive of the majority towards superiority is firmly implanted within us and cannot be eradicated. Further, it is serving a proper purpose and should be respected. We have seen that it is often operating in the field of race. We also discovered that in this case it may be subtly blended with a racial antipathy, which also serves a proper purpose. Therefore, when these racial interests are challenged, feelings are deeply stirred. This is particularly true where the drive towards superiority is involved. Nature has so constituted us that this is a realm in which we find some of life's most cherished values; where our deepest and most precious hopes are centered. Therefore, equalitarian propaganda has often assumed aspects offensive to the majority. From their point of view the attitude which equalitarians would force on them passes beyond the bounds of decency or good taste. We discover that we must tread lightly for fear of bruising equalitarian feelings, though they trample roughshod over ours. A situation of this kind will not be permanently endured.

I think that we have offered a reasonable explanation for the occurrence within us of a drive towards superiority. However, when we try to discover a plausible explanation of how nature implanted racial antipathies within us, no such simple explanation offers itself. However, there is no gainsaying that she did succeed in this end. Even if we cannot explain the origin of this quality a speculative approach may throw further light on its nature and extent. In an earlier chapter we saw that, confining our observations to states of nature, different breeds or species of birds capable of interbreeding almost never do. Somehow, nature has developed devices for preponderantly keeping them sexually apart. I have understood that differen-

tiated monkeys found to be fertile in crosses nevertheless in nature keep within their own group. Keith offers other evidence with similar implications. A great deal more evidence showing that nature tends to prevent the crossbreeding of divergent lines can be found in *Genetics and The Origin of Species*, by T. Dobzhansky, (second edition). All of this suggests to me that the emotional state, now referred to in humans as race prejudice, is vastly ancient and universal and was thoroughly established within our ancestors in prehuman days.

Quandary of Equalitarians

As we have previously seen, equalitarians have been in a quandary to know how best (in the light of their interests) to account for the phenomena of race prejudice. Thus, they have usually fostered the idea that we acquire such an attitude from ignorant parents or from other uninformed people. Still, with them, a minority recognizes that this is not an adequate explanation, though they appear unwilling to look deeper. The attitude that ignorance is responsible for race prejudice is repeatedly and forcefully pushed by the author of *An American Dilemma*. However, on page 57 we find him admitting that his widening experience with white Americans had driven home more strongly the conviction that the idea is held more commonly, absolutely, and intensely, that the amalgamation of the Negro is undesirable than his previous acquaintanceship with American "thoughtways" would have indicated. He tells us further that one rarely meets an American who does not feel this way about the matter. He makes an exception in the case of a handful of "rational intellectual liberals," but adds that many of them who accept the principle of amalgamation, admit that they feel an irrational emotional inhibition against it.

Here we have a pure and vivid expression of the ingredients of racial prejudice which has found its way into an equalitarian book. Obviously the so-called "rational intellectual liberals" had attempted to overcome their racial antipathies,

but could not. We discover further proof that "race prejudice" is fundamental to us. The reference to an irrational inhibition against amalgamation bolsters my conviction that the antipathies involved are basically sexual. Myrdal and his co-authors admit that most of the taboos enforced in this country are aimed at keeping the two groups apart sexually.

Sir Arthur Keith has had the clearest comprehension of the problem that we have been discussing and sums it up in this broad generalized statement: "All of the processes concerned in human evolution are attended by highly charged emotions and often bellicose behavior."

Such feelings are found wherever widely divergent races are so placed that they come into contact with each other continually and in numbers. So-called race prejudice is not confined to the attitudes of whites towards darker peoples, as some equalitarians would have us believe. A year or so ago there were extensive riots in Africa between a group whose ancestors came from India and a tribe of nearby Negroes. Students of India believe that its caste system has its real basis in race, though the racial aspect may have become somewhat disguised. However, equalitarians have provided us with the best proof of the discriminatory or "prejudiced" attitude of divergent races towards each other by the extent of their propaganda against it. In this connection I will cite the title of a book, the very name of which sums up their position: It is, *Racism: A World Issue* (Sopher). We properly conclude that racial antipathies are found all around the world.

Equalitarians are attempting to rebuild humanity in line with their desires, these being based ostensibly on sociological theories. These in their turn may be no more than their own rationalized emotional states. When this is the case we find fanatical crusaders for this cause. However, this group have been singularly successful in imbuing a similar crusading spirit in converts, for their propaganda is designed for that end. They place a trap for idealists and the emotionally unstable and often capture them. There can be no doubt but that

our country has been subjected to an "emotional epidemic." Other ones have been known to history, the Crusades and the "Mississippi Bubble," being instances. However, in the case of the latest of them it has been spread skillfully with the aid of modern techniques. In defense of lasting values equalitarian activities should be seen in their true light.

CHAPTER XVI

OTHER MOTIVES

We now consider equalitarian attitudes that appear to be acquired through the force of events. Thus, their nature is less permanent than those shown in the last chapter.

We have previously pointed to the fact that fears, stimulated by Hitler's racial attitudes greatly stimulated certain groups. We think that this has been of particular importance with Jewish propagandists. At the same time such an attitude is largely based upon a misconception of the forces at play. What was responsible for the slaughter of the Jews in Germany? Was it a racial theory? Was Hitler alone to blame? What part did a philosophy or system of Government have? I believe that it can be shown that it was this latter, the totalitarian concept, no matter what name it goes by, which in final analysis must bear the brunt of the odium. Thus in Russia a class was exterminated because they were not in sympathy with the economic theory of those in power; another group because they had their ideas on how the Government should be run. Sokolsky tells of some ten thousand Polish officers being shot with Russian sanction, after the Second World War. Apparently, as a group, they had offended someone. Similar situations appear to be developing in Communist China today. No doubt many equalitarians with totalitarian leanings, believe that the "ism" which they happen to favor will protect them. They overlook the fact that no individual or group is safe under any of these. For willful exterminations with the sanction of the state occur only when unlimited power falls into the hands of the few. When such power has been acquired no one can predict the direction in which it will be exercised. That remains the prerogative of the power wielders.

The Communists and Race

The part played by communist ideology in connection with theories of race equality is difficult to evaluate, particularly with respect to its extent. However, I believe from the evidence I have been able to accumulate that it represents one of the major forces operating in this field. Motives in their case appear to be artificially implanted in the individual and are not natural to him. In its present phase communist ideology seems to have the power of making fanatics out of converts. Thus, as far as race is concerned, one emotion supplants another. The acceptance of this ideology entails a willingness to embrace the thoughts of its leaders. I do not know what line of reasoning caused communists originally to adopt the idea of racial equality. However, it is easy to see the advantages that this attitude offers this group. It ties in with their theme of social equality to which they continue to do lip service though it is well known that in Russia this idea is not put into practice. As a slogan it is calculated to gain converts to the cause. It is also designed to appeal to dissatisfied minority racial elements. It helps disrupt the existing order. Communists may believe that a creed of race equality must be accepted before their theories can be made to work, or possibly, they consider it a prerequisite to the spreading of their creed. With any of these situations the compulsive attitudes of this group towards race questions might be explained.

Communists Not Concerned With Quality

Communist ideologies run deeper than a simple change of economic setup. They would force a new social concept on us. I have not seen where they are concerned with the quality of the human elements making up their society.

Other Reasons for Equalitarian Behavior

Let us see if we can find other reasons for equalitarians' attitudes. It is probable that many writers have been inspired by considerations of prestige and finance. Material claiming

racial equality has found ready publishers. It has been able to count on favorable reviews. Certain religious groups foster this idea and no doubt, many remain in line with it because of such a connection. Strangely, we find Catholics in this case on the same side with their arch enemies, the communists. Other individuals or groups appear to be happy only when leading crusades. It matters not that it may be apparent to the careful observer that the crusade will do more harm than good. If it has a plausible ring and claims a virtuous cause, that, together with the excitement that a new cause engenders, is all that such people need to throw their enthusiasm into it. Such is applicable to the publishers of some of our periodicals who have taken the creed of race equality under their wing. And while we consider that self-interest is a sufficient explanation of the activities of the great majority of men, inevitable exceptions to this rule will be found. This may account for some activity in this field. The ideas dealt with in this chapter are artificially promulgated. Ideas, we might remark, are infectious. It is much easier to accept them than it is to appraise them critically. This is particularly true where ideas are aggressively pushed.

CHAPTER XVII

IN CONCLUSION

We have remarked that with controversial subjects opinions are apt to swing from extreme to extreme, these occurring in cycles. In addition we have shown that historical circumstances have unduly stimulated advocates of the creed of race equality. We now deal with another factor bearing on this situation.

Our age has been characterized by revolutions. Not all have been confined to political fields, for there has been a flux and flow in man's thoughts about himself and about the world in which he lives. Doubts have arisen with respect to beliefs formerly held sacred. Possibly humanity needs such periods, for in them the deadwood of decadent ideas may be disposed of. However, in the turmoil that inevitably accompanies such times, worthwhile values may be submerged, and enduring ones temporarily eclipsed. Critical thought is well spent in determining if the new values are true ones.

A Word About Ethics

The last resort of equalitarians, whether it be expressed or implied, is to ethical values. We therefore deal with this subject, though but briefly, for reasons that will soon become apparent. One of these is that those without scruples are as apt to seek justification for their projects in this field as are the virtuous. Thus, we have observed equalitarians employing methods, deeply impregnated with fraud, to further a conception for which they claim ethical values. They would convert ethics into an instrumentality for the imposition of their will. Under their scheme ethics becomes the flaying arm to enforce a tyranny over our minds and spirits.

Questions connected with ethics finally resolve themselves

into personal preferences. There is a basic reason for this. For it will never be possible to speak with certainty in this field until or unless we are able to grasp or learn life's ultimate or "final" aim. Could this be discovered, we might properly conclude that whatever is in harmony with it is ethical. Without such insight each falls back on his own values, for to him they are the important or true ones.

An Inconclusive Field

Let us see how inconclusive a field ethics is by a reference to the conclusions of an able thinker. Sir Arthur Keith tells us that Herbert Spencer studied evolution for a lifetime with the hope of finding an absolute standard for judging what must be considered virtue or what must be regarded as vice. Keith further tells us that in his seventy-third year Spencer had to confess that his search had been in vain (Spencer's Preface, second volume, *Principles of Ethics*).

However, before dropping this subject entirely, I will give a thought of my own, for whatever it may be worth. In simple relations of person-to-person the great majority of us are apt to agree on what is right or wrong. In such situations it is easy to determine what is workable. Based on such, a limited system of ethics can be endorsed. However, when this subject is called upon to justify grandiose or theoretical schemes, they may be properly repudiated, for they may do more harm than good.

Sir Arthur Keith's Point of View

Sir Arthur Keith approaches the subject of man's ethical outlook from a different direction than is customary. He shows the part evolution has played in shaping man's nature. His is an attempt to understand man's normal behavior, rather than to regulate attitudes by means of theoretical conceptions. Keith recognizes that nature has so formed man that his attitude in connection with race is apt to differ from what ethical theorists would like to see. His thoughts in this connection are controversial and Keith's handling of them is subtle. However, I take

it that Keith, after weighing values, is in favor of letting nature have a proper place in solving problems of racial relations. He sees her values as the higher ones.

In connection with so-called race prejudice, equalitarians are apt to adopt one or the other of two attitudes. They may assume that it is unethical for man to have such feelings. On the other hand, as we have seen, they may take the position that this quality is not natural to man and where found has been artificially implanted within him. Keith recognizes that race prejudice is a natural phenomenon, and his evidence, together with what I have given, should, I believe, be sufficient to establish this fact. In case this is so, then, if we adopt the attitudes that equalitarians would force on us, we must carry on a constant war within ourselves. Nature tells us one thing; equalitarians another, and the two are incompatible. However, I do not believe that our people are going to endure permanently a situation of this kind. With the help of such men as Keith, harmony within ourselves can be established, and that is no doubt what will happen. The conception ultimately embraced will not be the one favored by equalitarians.

This writer is against extreme attitudes in connection with race problems, and while he considers that there are proper aims in this field, improper ones can grow out of these. In connection with extremes we might remark that whatever they contribute to their cause must be temporary. For each extreme invites its opposite. We may go further and say that it lays the foundation for the emergence of its opposite, for extremes are apt to deal in absurdities, which are easily fastened on in rebuttal.

Equalitarians have failed to see this point and have completely overlooked a fact of social reality, for when a pressure such as they have exerted is kept up too long and too intensely there is danger that the situation may end in explosive outbursts or carry over to an equally absurd extreme of an opposite nature. I have talked with many people who believe that they have had a false doctrine forced on them but have felt power-

- Herskovits, M. *The Anthropometry of the American Negro*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1930.
- Hooton, E. *Twilight of Man*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1939.
- Howells, W. *Mankind So Far*. Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1944.
- Haldane, J. *Adventures of a Biologist*. Harper & Bros., New York, 1940.
- Huxley, J. *Evolution, the Modern Synthesis*. Harper & Bros., New York, 1942.
- Hollingsworth L. *Children Above 180 I. Q.* World Book Co., New York.
- Harriman, P. *Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Psychological Library, New York.
- Halstead, W. *Brain and Intelligence*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Hunt, J., Editor. *Personality and Behavior Disorders*. 2 volumes). Ronald Press Co., New York, 1944.
- Jepsen, G., Mayr, E., and Simpson, G. *Genetics, Paleontology, and Evolution*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Jaffe, B. *Men of Science in America*. Simon & Schuster, New York, 1944.
- Keith, A. *A New Theory of Human Evolution*. Philosophical Library, New York, 1949.
- Kohler, W. *Gestalt Psychology*. Liveright Publishing Corporation, New York, 1947.
- Kennedy, L. *The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1930.
- Kahn, F. *Man in Structure and Function*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1943.
- Kroeber, A. *Anthropology*. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1948.

- Keith, A. *Evolution and Ethics*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.
- Keith, A. *The Place of Prejudice in Modern Civilization*. John Day Company, New York.
- Klineberg, O. *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1935.
- Kraines, S. *The Therapy of the Neuroses and Psychoses*. Lea and Febiger, Philadelphia, 1943.
- Landry, S. *The Cult of Equality*. Pelican Publishing Co., New Orleans, 1945, second edition.
- Lucas, M. *Elements of Human Physiology*. Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia, 1940.
- Linton, R. and A. *Man's Way*. Harper & Bros., New York, 1947.
- Myrdal, G. *An American Dilemma*. Harper & Bros., New York, 1944.
- Mace, C. *The Principles of Logic*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1933.
- Murphy, G. *Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology*. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1950.
- Montagu, A. *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (Second edition). Columbia University Press, New York.
- Munn, N. *Psychology*. Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston, New York.
- Murray, R. *Man's Unknown Ancestors*. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee.
- Muller, H., Little, C., and Snyder, L. *Genetics, Medicine, and Man*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1947.
- Merz, J. *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (4 volumes). University of Chicago Press.
- Newman, H. *Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics* (Third Edition). University of Chicago Press.

- Neal and Rand. *Comparative Anatomy*. P. Blackston's Son & Co., Philadelphia, 1936.
- Nordenskiold, E. *The History of Biology*. Tudor Publishing Co., New York, 1928.
- Overstreet, H. *About Ourselves*. W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., New York.
- Pierson, D. *Negroes in Brazil*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1942.
- Popenoe, P. & Johnson, R. *Applied Eugenics* (Revised). The Macmillan Company, New York, 1933.
- Preston, G. *Psychiatry for the Curious*. Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., New York.
- Pillsbury, W. *The History of Psychology* (Second Edition). George Wahr, Publisher, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Pinter, R. *Intelligence Testing*. Henry Holt & Co., 1945.
- Pinter, R. and Patterson, D. *A Scale of Performance Tests*. D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1947.
- Powdermaker, H. *Probing Our Prejudices*. Harper & Bros., New York, 1944.
- Pittard, E. *Race and History*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1926.
- Russell, B. *The Scientific Outlook*. W. W. Norton Co., 1931.
- Russell, B. *A History of Western Philosophy*. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Rice, V. *Breeding and Improvement of Farm Animals*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1942.
- Ripley, W. *The Races of Europe*. Appleton, New York, 1891.
- Russell, B. *Human Knowledge*. Simon & Schuster, New York, 1948.
- Rice, J. *Crossroads of Mankind*. Esquire, June, 1949.
- Romer, A. *The Color Line in Fraternities*. The Atlantic Monthly, June, 1949.

- Romer, A. *Man and the Vertebrates*. University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Sumner, W. *Folkways*. Ginn & Co., New York, 1940.
- Sargent, S. *The Basic Teachings of the Great Psychologists*. Perma Giants, New York.
- Sargent, W. *Teach Yourself Psychology*. David McKay Co., Philadelphia.
- Sheldon, W. *Varieties of Human Physique*. Harper & Bros., New York, 1940.
- Schopenhauer, A. *Essays*. Wiley Book Co., New York.
- Simpson, G. *The Meaning of Evolution*. Yale University Press, 1949.
- Stern, C. *Human Genetics*. W. H. Freeman & Co., San Francisco, 1950.
- Spearman, C. and Jones, W. *Human Ability*. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London, 1950.
- Sopher, E. *Racism, A World Issue*. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York.
- Simpson, G. *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*. Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Sheldon, W. *Varieties of Human Physique*. Harper & Bros., New York, 1940.
- Scheinfeld, A. *You and Heredity*. Garden City Publishing Co., Garden City, New York, 1939.
- Thompson, J. *The System of Animate Nature*. Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1920.
- Toynbee, A. *A Study of History*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1947.
- Thurston, L. *The Nature of Intelligence*. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1926.
- Taylor, E. *Men Are Brothers*. The Viking Press, New York, 1937.

- von Koenigswald, G. *Search For Early Man*. Natural History, January, 1947.
- Walter, H. *Biology of the Vertebrates*. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1939.
- Wells, Huxley, and Wells. *The Science of Life*. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Weidenreich, F. *Apes, Giants, and Man*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1946.
- Walsh, W. *Reason and Experience*. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1947.
- Whitehead, A. *Science and the Modern World*. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1941.
- White, W. *Why I Remain a Negro*. Reader's Digest, January, 1948.
- Whipple, G. *Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*. Public School Publishing Co., Bloomington, Illinois, 1940.
- Wilson, G. *Great Men of Science*. New Home Library, New York, 1942.
- Zilboorg, G. *A History of Medical Psychology*. W. W. Norton & Co., New York, 1941.

INDEX

<i>About Ourselves</i>	127
Afro-Brazilian Congress	111
<i>American Dilemma, An</i>	12, 52 passim, 72 passim, 84, 100 103, 136
<i>Animal Breeding Plans</i>	120
<i>Anthropology</i>	13
<i>Antiquity of Modern Man</i>	91
<i>Applied Eugenics</i>	12, 65, 67
Aretz	70
<i>Basic Teachings of Great Psychologists</i>	70, 127, 133
Beebe, W.	57, 61
Bere	69
Birdsell	12, 46, 57, 60, 77
Blumenback	41
<i>Book of Naturalists</i>	57, 61
Boring	105
<i>Breeding and Improvement of Farm Animals</i>	40
Burkes, Barbara	65, 119
Carnegie Corporation	52, 53
Carnegie Institution	25
Chamberlain, Houston-Stewart	27, 46, 49
Chekanowski, Ian	43
Cooke	119
Coon	12, 18, 46, 60, 77, 96, 97, 99
Count, Earl	12, 46, 57, 79, 103
<i>Cult of Equality</i>	20, 104, 107
Czenkanovski	118
Darwin, C.	41, 98, 117, 119
Davenport	25, 42
Dickson	97

Eisley	91
Ellis, H.	95
<i>Evolution</i>	119
<i>Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics</i>	43
Fairchild	93
Ferguson	60, 61
Fisher	57
<i>Folkways</i>	106
Freeman, F.	63
Galton, F.	66, 68
Garn	12, 46, 57, 60, 77
Garth	68
Gillin, J.	12, 36 passim, 60
Gobineau	27, 46, 47
Grant, M.	27, 34, 46, 49, 56, 97, 98, 99
Gunther	46
Gutherie	70
Hackel	57
Harvard University	27, 46
Hildreth	65
Hitler, A.	49, 50
Hollingsworth	64, 68, 117
Hooton, E.	12, 27 passim, 36, 50, 60, 99
Howells, W. W.	42, 47, 59
Huntington, E.	78, 79
Huxley, T.	119
<i>Inequality of Races</i>	47
<i>Intelligence, Its Nature and Nurture</i>	11, 12, 63, 68, 70, 71
Jankowsky	90
Jews	49
Johnson, R.	12, 65, 66, 82

Keith, A.	12, 42, 79, 91, 128, 143, 144
Kepple, F. P.	53, 54, 77
Klineberg	69
Knox	46
Kroeber, A. L.	12, 13 passim, 36, 83, 84
Landry, S.	20, 104, 107
Lang	67
Langfield	105
Lilienthal, D.	100
Lincoln School	65
Lush, G. L.	120
Lysenko, T. D.	74
<i>Mankind So Far</i>	42, 59
<i>Man's Most Dangerous Myth</i>	92
Marx, K.	73
Montague, A.	92
Muller	119
Munn	126, 133
Myrdal, G.	11, 12, 52 passim, 73 passim
National Society for the Study of Education	12
<i>Negros in Brazil</i>	12, 43, 84 passim, 108 passim
<i>New Theory of Human Evolution, A</i>	12, 42, 79, 91, 128
Newman, H.	43
Oden	64, 68, 118
Orbell, L. A.	75
Overstreet	127
<i>Passing of the Great Race, The</i>	34, 56, 97, 130
Pearson, K.	45
Pierson, Donald	12, 84 passim, 108 passim, 124
Popenoe, P.	12, 65, 66, 82
Prichard	64
<i>Principles of Ethics</i>	143
<i>Psychology</i>	105, 126, 133

<i>Race</i>	18, 45, 47, 57, 90, 93, 118
<i>Races</i>	12, 18, 60, 77, 79
<i>Races of Europe</i>	46, 96, 97, 118
<i>Reason and Experience</i>	14
Rice, V. A.	40
Rodrigues, Nina	89
Rose	55 passim, 65, 72
Russell, B.	19, 45, 120
<i>Salt Lake Tribune</i>	74
Sargent	70
Schmalgunsen	75
Schopenhauer, A.	115
<i>Scientific American</i>	91
<i>Scientific Outlook</i>	19
Sheldon	99
Spencer, H.	143
Stalin, J.	74
Steggarda	25, 42
Sterner	55
Stoddard	11, 46
<i>Study of History, A</i>	104
Sumner, W. G.	106
Taylor	18, 79
Terman, L.	64, 65, 68, 118
<i>Theory of Knowledge</i>	14
<i>This Is Race</i>	12, 46, 57, 79, 103
<i>Time</i>	74
Toynbee, A.	104
Tryon	71
<i>Twilight of Man</i>	12, 27
<i>Up From the Ape</i>	57
University of California	13, 63
University of Chicago	43, 84
University of North Carolina	36

<i>Varieties of Human Physique</i>	99
Vianna, Oliveira	89
Von Eickstedt	45, 93
Wadman	70
Wallace, H. A.	73
Walsh, W. E.	14
<i>Ways of Men</i>	12
Weidenreich, F.	57
Weld	105
Woods	68
Yale University	106
Ziegfeld, F.	116