UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_152441
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 323.1 / D 61 R. Accession No. 27810

Author Dingwall, E. J.

Title Racial - - prejudice

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below

RACIAL PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

The belief that mankind is divided into races of which some are intrinsically superior to others, and therefore destined to be their masters, is responsible for an appalling record of human misery and unhappiness—wholesale massacres, persecution, and enslavement.

False and fanatical notions of race and colour are chiefly associated, in the popular mind, with German Nazism. But in fact they have a longer history and are more widespread than is commonly supposed, and constitute one of our major post-War problems.

Dr. E. J. Dingwall here presents a study of the question from the point of view of the anthropologist and the psychologist, but written in a simple and interesting style, free of academic jargon, and eminently suited to the needs and tastes of the general reader.



THIS BOOK IS PRODUCED IN COMPLETE
CONFORMITY WITH THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS

RACIAL PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

BY
ERIC JOHN DINGWALL

LONDON:
WATTS & CO.,
5 & 6 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4

First published 1946

TO THE MEMORY OF

SIR HANNS VISCHER, C.M.G., C.B.E.

1876–1945

WITHOUT WHOSE INSPIRATION

THIS BOOK WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN WRITTEN

Printed and Published in Great Britain by C. A. Watts & Co. Limited,
5 & 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

FOREWORD

THIS book is not intended for the academic anthropologist or the learned exponent of the social sciences. It has been written primarily for the general reader—that is to say, for ordinary men and women who want to become acquainted with one of the most pressing problems of the day, and who are anxious to have the subject treated in rather greater detail than that which they are accustomed to find in their newspapers and magazines. Every effort has been made to exclude technical terms and expressions except when these have been considered absolutely necessary, and then I have tried to make the meaning clear. Similarly, references and footnotes have been cut down as far as is possible in a book of this kind. Were authority to be quoted for every statement, the bulk of the book would have been almost doubled, and its value would not have increased in proportion. Moreover, I have avoided any long discussions of matters which have been in the past and still are the subject of prolonged controversy, although their omission does not mean that I am unaware of them. The expert will, of course, know where to look for them, and the general reader, if he wishes to pursue the subject further, can easily discover where they are to be found.

Although the main sections of the book are largely factual, I have not hesitated to insert here and there short discussions of possible *reasons* behind customs and legislation associated with the colour bar, for it is here that the reader is introduced through actual examples to the psychology of colour prejudice and how it operates in different countries. In the chapter specifically devoted to this matter the threads are drawn together and presented in a way which, it is hoped, will make the student more fully aware of the way a psychologist approaches the problem of prejudices in general and colour prejudice in particular.

In conclusion I must thank all those who have so generously

allowed me to draw upon their knowledge and time during the preparation of the book. Above all, I am indebted to those who have pointed out my mistakes and criticized my conclusions. It has not been an easy task to compress within so narrow a compass a mass of material of which each section could form the subject of quite a large book. Most of the chapter dealing with the American Negro was written before I had had the opportunity of seeing Dr. Gunnar Myrdal's lengthy volume, *An American Dilemma*, and when I did so I was glad to find myself in substantial agreement with him as regards basic issues.

I hope that the reader may find the treatment here sufficiently interesting to make him wish to continue the inquiry by consulting the more detailed works of Dr. Myrdal and similar writers. For if the facts be known and their implications realized, then at least one barrier towards better understanding will be removed, and the writer will be rewarded for the amount of work that has been put into the making of this book.

E. J. DINGWALL.

CONTENTS

CHAP. PAGE

FOREWORD v

INTRODUCTION 1

I. RACE AND NATION. 7

What do we mean by Race?—The great divisions of mankind.—The White, Black, and Yellow Groups.—Physical characteristics.—The concept of race.—Race mixture.—Race and Nation.—What is meant by Nation?—National sentiment and the international ideal.—Nazi Germany and the racial phantasy.—Language and Race.—The Myth of the Aryan Race.—The Aryan languages and their distribution.

II. THE COLOURED PEOPLES 13

What do we mean by "colour"?—Skin pigmentation.—The word "Negro" and its meaning.—What is a Negro?—Legal definitions.—The Indian problem.—The Brown Race.—Black and white in South Africa.—Peoples of the Far East.—Chinese civilization.—The Ancient Egyptians.—The African Negro and his descendants.—Racial prejudice and anti-Semitism.—The Cagots.—Racial odour.—The skin and its secretions.—The odour of Negroes and Europeans.—The Ku Klux Klan.—Americans and mob violence.—Relations between white and coloured peoples.—The concept of the savage and the institution of slavery.

III. SLAVERY 34

Slavery and property.—Slavery in the ancient world.—Christianity and slave labour.—The African slave trade.—Savages and slaves.—The colour of the Negro and the badge of servitude.

IV. ANTI-SEMITISM 40

Dislike of the Jews and anti-Semitism.—What is anti-Semitism.—Jewish domination.—Who are "the Jews"?—The Hittites.—The "Jewish nose."—Hatred of the Jews in the early world.—The factor of difference.—Jewish exclusiveness.—Kosher food.—Jewish segregation and occupations.—Jews and the industrial system.—Frustration and its results.—The psychology of the subversive agent.—Theories relating to anti-Semitism.—Judaism and Christianity.—Prejudice and sex.—The Mormons.—Plural marriage.—Mormons and Negroes.—The breed of Canaan.—Jealousy.—The basis of anti-Semitism.

CHAP. PAGE

V. COLOUR PREJUDICE AND THE COLOUR BAR . . 57

Anti-Semitism and colour prejudice.—Dislike of Negroes.—Negroes in literature and on the screen.—Negro authors.—The word "black": its meaning and influence.—Blackness and dirt.—Colour prejudice in Great Britain, the United States and the Union of South Africa.

VI. THE COLOUR BAR IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . 64

Slavery and the colour question.—Emancipation.—Jefferson and Grégoire.—Early theories, Nott, Gliddon, and Gobineau.—The South.—Sex and the Negro.—The creed of the South.—Segregation.—Jim Crow.—Labour and the Negro.—The F.E.P.C.—Negroes and manpower.—Education and the Negro.—Negro poverty.—Housing.—Negroes and the Constitution.—The Negro in the professions.—The Negro Press.—The Churches and colour.—The Mexican Migrants.—Orientals in the United States.—Hawaii.—Puerto Rico.—Proposed solutions. — Southern Conferences. — Lynching. — *Strange Fruit* and Lillian Smith.—Outlook for the future.

VII. THE COLOUR BAR IN GREAT BRITAIN . . . 113

The Imperial ideal and the colour bar.—Colour prejudice in the Empire.—*I Go West*—The "s.s. Edinburgh Castle" case.—The colour bar in London.—The cases of Amelia King and L. N. Constantine.—The case of McGuire Roberts.—Coloured seamen in the ports.—The Labour Party and the colour bar.

VIII. THE COLOUR BAR IN AFRICA 123

Various aspects of the colour problem in Africa.—The British, French, Belgian, and Portuguese possessions.—The early settlers.—Christianity and the Brotherhood of Man.—The missionaries.—Official British policy.—The industrialization of Africa and the colour bar.

1. THE COLOUR BAR IN THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA . 125

South Africa and the colour question.—Early days.—The fatal dilemma.—South African policy—The population of South Africa.—The "Cape Coloured."—South African Government.—Education of the Bantu.—The colour bar and segregation.—Housing and health.—Taxation.—Native Labour.—The Mines.—Trade Unions.—The Poor Whites.—The Indians in Natal.—The "Pegging Act."—General Smuts and the colour problem.—The creed of South Africa.

CHAP. PAGE

2. THE COLOUR BAR IN BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES IN AFRICA 150

Attitude of the Colonial Office.—Law and the colour bar.—West Africa.—Northern Rhodesia.—The Copper Belt.—Trade Unions.—Southern Rhodesia.—Tanganyika.—The Protectorates.—Kenya.—General Smuts and "the root problem."—Lord Hailey and self-government.

3. THE COLOUR BAR IN FRENCH, BELGIAN, AND PORTUGUESE AFRICA 161

French possessions in Africa.—Colonial Administration.—Native Councils.—The colour bar in Dakar.—French Equatorial Africa.—Félix Eboué.—Belgian colonies.—The Belgian Congo.—Portuguese East Africa.—Cocoa scandals.—Summary of colour prejudice in Africa.—Attitude of the white settlers.

IX. THE COLOUR BAR IN THE WEST INDIES . . . 169

Class and colour.—Poverty the basic problem.—Recent disturbances.—Trade Unions in Jamaica and Trinidad.—Colour prejudice in Jamaica and elsewhere.—The colonial official and colour prejudice.—Clubs and the colour bar.—Barbados.—The French West Indies.—Cuba.—Haiti.—Status and colour.—Economic pattern of West Indian life.

X. THE COLOUR BAR IN INDIA AND THE EAST . . 177

Colour prejudice in India.—Its relation to status.—Position in the provinces.—The Dutch East Indies.—Caste and colour.—Brahmins and Untouchables.

XI. THE COLOUR PROBLEM IN BRAZIL 181

The population of Brazil.—History of Brazilian colonization.—Portugal and Spain.—The concept of "race" in Brazil.—Negroes in Brazil.—"Improving the blood."—Social position of Negroes.—Colour prejudice and the concept of class.—The colour problem in Brazil.—Immigration to Brazil.—Oliveira Vianna and his theories.

XII. THE COLOUR BAR IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND . 188

Immigration to Australia.—White Australia.—Chinese labour.—Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and a White Australia.—The Japanese racial equality clause.—Mr. Hughes and Australian policy.—The Australian aborigines.—Half-castes.—Race prejudice in New Zealand.—Chinese immigrants.—The Maoris.—The treaty of Waitangi.—The Maoris to-day.—Colour prejudice in New Zealand.—The racial problem in the Pacific.

CHAP. PAGE

XIII. RACE AND NATIONALITY IN THE U.S.S.R. . . 200

Racial prejudice in Russia.—Persecution of the Jews.—The minorities in the U.S.S.R.—Soviet administration.—Legal decrees on racial hostility.—The Soviet Constitution.—A Negro Soviet.—Moslems in the U.S.S.R.—The Tatar A.S.S.R.—Tajikstan.—The Kasakh S.S.R.

XIV. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RACIAL AND COLOUR PREJUDICE . 209

The meaning of the word "prejudice."—Earlier meanings.—Examples of its use.—Prejudice in the law courts.—Prejudice in science and politics.—The development of prejudice.—Prejudice in children.—Negro stereotypes.—The concept of "the unconscious."—Rationalization.—Measuring emotion.—Lack of colour prejudice in early times.—The age of discovery.—Slavery.—Its effect in the United States.—The Churches and Slavery.—Abolition and its results.—The dilemma in American society.—Race teaching in schools.—Tests for prejudice.—Difference as between nations.—The Southern States and sex.—Sex and fear.—Effect of a Puritan heritage.—Black man and white woman.—Conflict of ideals.—The dilemma in Africa.—Colour prejudice in Brazil.—Reasons for its weakness.—Catholics and Protestants.—The future of colour prejudice.

INDEX 242

INTRODUCTION

IF a list were to be made of the major questions which now face humanity after the conclusion of the Second World War, it is probable that the problem of race and colour would be one which would be included by anyone acquainted with the present social, economic, and industrial conditions of mankind. The unity of the world is becoming increasingly obvious: messages which used to take weeks to travel from distant countries now take seconds; travellers will be able to have breakfast in London and lunch in New York, even if they do not do so already; the emergence of Japan in but a few years as a formidable military and industrial Power is merely the beginning of the awakening of the whole of Asia, with its obvious and incalculable results; and the enormous and increasing power of the Soviet Union must inevitably affect both the ideas and activity of those capitalist societies which still cling to ideas regarding colonial exploitation which are now being increasingly resented not only in Asia, but also in Africa.

Were a visitor from another planet to visit the earth he might well be appalled by what he would find. Not only would he see nation ranged against nation and people against people, but whole sections of the human family holding in contempt, and often in subjection, other sections which happen to have skins of a colour different from their own.

Some years before the outbreak of the Second World War the present author, along with other anthropologists, was favoured with pamphlets, leaflets, and advertisements emanating from Germany that professed to give an account of the new racial science as developed by the Nazis, but which to many, on even hasty examination, seemed to proceed from a fantasia that could only be the product of disordered brains. The views of the older anthropologists were denounced as " materialistic ": the new conception demanded a more mystical approach. It was as though the whole theory arose from the depths of the unconscious mind, and was thereupon crystallized into a form which expressed the secret desires of its inventors and exponents. Science gave way to intuition: just as in military affairs Hitler acted upon " his intuitions," so in the sphere of anthropology

German students and scholars forsook the paths of science to wander in the fields of transcendental mysticism, and then proceeded to act upon their crazy theories in a way that has shocked the conscience of the whole of the civilized world.

It may be asked at this point whether it is really of any great importance what the Nazis have thought or written about " race," and whether other nations need bother about it now that the Nazis have been overthrown and the murders and massacres arising from their doctrines have been brought to an end. This would be a reasonable enough attitude were it not for the fact that the Nazis are not the only people who have crazy ideas about race, but that there are others who, if the real facts be not constantly emphasized and made known, are likely to spread their own ideas and thus perpetuate a system of thought which has caused untold misery in the past and will continue to do so unless checked by a better understanding of the points at issue. It must be remembered that the " racial " science of Nazi Germany was not merely a kind of pseudo-scientific fad which was forgotten when the student left the lecture-hall. It was closely linked with political and nationalist aspirations. The idea of the big blond Nordic was not merely a portrait of a human type: it was a portrait of a *superior* type of person with characteristics which, as *The Nazi Primer* puts it, predisposed him to leadership by nature. Here is the core of the racial doctrine. It is the idea that mankind is divided into races of which some are innately superior to others, and thus are destined to be their masters. To Hitler it was monstrous to try to make educated citizens of the world out of coloured Africans, or, as he calls them, " half apes." According to Nazi doctrine it was " the blood " that mattered: environment could not create what was not there in the first place; all that it could do was to determine the course of natural development.

When we look at the Nazi doctrine in this way, and strip off the extravagances and absurdities with which it was surrounded, we shall see that similar ideas are held—passionately in some cases and more or less half-heartedly in others—and in places far removed from Germany and as far apart as Malaya is from the Southern States of America. When we hear people, for example, talking about " Niggers " and " Chinks," then we should realize that, behind the half-friendly attitude which sometimes accompanies the use of these words, there is often

a veiled belief that Negroes and Chinese are inferior to people who have been born with white skins and who, it is believed, belong to what is called a " superior race."

It is this belief and the results which lead from it that we are going to discuss in the following pages. We have already seen some of these consequences in the case of Germany. Millions of Jews have been murdered and tens of thousands of peoples from other countries reduced to slavery. Yet the persecution of the Jews is only one example, even if an extreme one, of the terrible misery that can be inflicted upon one human group by another when animated by racial ideas and dogmas, and having in addition the power to put its theories into effect. We cannot forget the history of the enslavement of the coloured peoples, of the horror of the slave trade, and, even when slavery itself was abolished, the imposition upon helpless peoples of forced labour such as that which led to the scandals in the Belgian Congo. Much of this unhappy chapter in the history of human relations might have been avoided had it not been believed, as the Nazis asserted, that some peoples were intrinsically inferior to others, and could never attain to the level of the group which dominated them. Every effort had to be made to preserve and continue this idea, and, since members of the dominant group had pale skins, the coloured people who were subject to it suffered the results of that prejudice which is now associated with race and colour.

With regard to our own times, there seems little doubt that this problem of racial and colour prejudice is, as has been said, one of the most important questions that will have to be faced in the post-war years. It is clear that an increasing interest is being taken in it, and, as regards this country, there is little doubt that with the coming of the American Negro troops many people found themselves in a position which forced them to take stock of the situation and decide for themselves what their attitude should be. It was natural that on this question opinions differed widely, and occasionally incidents occurred which showed how violent were the emotions which could be aroused if the situation were allowed to get out of hand. Generally speaking, the attitude of both the British and the American authorities was a wise one. Every effort was made to prevent minor incidents from assuming major proportions. On the one hand it was suggested to American white troops that the conditions in Great Britain were quite different from

those in the United States, and that therefore their attitude towards the Negroes should be as restrained as possible. On the other hand, it was made clear to the British that the attitude of the white Americans had deep traditional and historical roots, and that open criticism or disapproval should be avoided as far as possible in view of the necessity of preserving friendly relations between two great Allies. The result of this policy would seem to have been fairly successful, since violent controversy and clashes were avoided and a fuller understanding thereby achieved. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that many people in Great Britain, especially among those who came into close contact with the Negro troops, were awakened to a wider appreciation of a problem which up to that time few of them had ever considered seriously. Many people living in rural districts had never seen Negroes before, and in some places, not excluding the large towns, the coloured troops became very popular, especially among those at the lower income levels. People began to realize that the questions of race and colour were not such as had merely an academic interest, but were closely bound up with moral and political problems of the first magnitude. They saw that here was something which was of interest not only to the United States. Even though they soon found that many white Americans regarded it as probably *the* most important domestic American problem, they also realized that it was one which deeply affected many sections of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Moreover, it was perhaps with surprise that some of them made the discovery that the population of the world was not mainly composed of white people, for they found—if they took the trouble to look up the figures—that the white peoples of the world were outnumbered by the non-white population by about 2 to 1; and if they had pursued their researches yet farther they would have discovered that, out of perhaps every seven members of the British Empire, five or six do not have white skins. The British Empire is a coloured Empire; and thus the problem of race and colour must be important to all those who wish the Empire to be an influence for good in the years to come. It is possible also that some people who had not previously thought much about it began to wonder upon what basis the white population had erected its claim for superiority over the darker peoples; and thus curiosity was aroused as to the meaning of colour prejudice and how it originated and was fostered. Moreover, those who

had studied, even in broad outline, the development of the Soviet Union knew that racial prejudice and persecution had been specifically condemned in the 1936 Soviet Constitution. Above all, through the influx of American papers and magazines, many people have become aware of the views of prominent American writers on the subject, not only on Negroes in the United States, but on the whole racial problem as it concerns both the black peoples of Africa and the yellow peoples of the Far East.

Before the First World War, ignorance of these matters was widespread, not only in Great Britain, but also in the Colonies. " If it were not too serious," Lord Milner once said, in 1908, " one would be tempted to smile at the crude ignorance " which made people " confound all men of coloured race, from the high-class and cultured Asiatic gentleman or noble, to the humblest coolie, in the common category of ' niggers.' " Yet even to-day such mistakes are not uncommon; and American writers are not slow to point them out when it is a question of their own countrymen. For example, Pearl Buck, the American authoress who has written much on China, says that in the Far East, among educated Chinese, the white man's belief in the colonial system is considered out of date, and that with the awakening of Asia this must in time be realized. In this she is only saying what Mme. Chiang Kai-shek said in her book *We Chinese Women* (New York, 1943), when she declared that the West would have to revise its ideas regarding the East. In the future world society, she wrote, mankind could not be divided into the twin groups of superiors and inferiors. Such a division and the ideas underlying it were vigorously assailed by one of America's foremost anthropologists, Dr. E. A. Hooton, in July 1944. These allegations of superiority and inferiority were not, he said, based upon any scientific findings and had never deceived any except the ignorant. Later in the same year the late President Roosevelt, in an election address at Boston, declared that racial intolerance was a menace to the liberties of America, and that there was no room for such feelings in the United States. Similar views have been expressed by others; and there is a growing tendency to consider the desirability or otherwise of legal enactment, by which anti-racial discrimination may be rendered liable to punishment. As has already been said, the 1936 Constitution of the Soviet Union contains such a clause (see p. 202), and, almost as I write,

some of the Canadian Provinces are introducing Acts and amendments of a similar kind.

Before discussing the origin and nature of racial and colour prejudices it will be as well to obtain some sort of factual background without which little real understanding of the subject can be achieved. For this purpose we will begin by a short account of the meanings of such words as "race" and "nation," and then proceed to a brief description of the coloured peoples and their distribution. Having thus cleared the ground, we can then take a glance at the history of slavery, in which its relevance to our main subject will be shown, and thence, after a brief discussion of anti-Semitism, pass on to a description of how the colour bar operates in a few selected regions of the world. Having seen the results of racial theories in action, as it were, we shall then be in a position to review the facts and enter upon a brief discussion of the psychological basis of colour prejudice, and show how such sentiments arise in individuals and in societies, how they are perpetuated, and how they are linked with the whole social and economic structure of the modern world.

CHAPTER I

RACE AND NATION

EVERYBODY knows that the various groups which comprise mankind have certain well-marked differences. For example, many of the people who live in Northern Europe and who have made their homes in such countries as Norway and Sweden are tall, and have heads shaped rather more like an egg than a sphere. Their skins are likely to be fair, and their hair wavy rather than straight. They have not usually much hair on the body, and their eyes are commonly blue to grey, and their noses are straight.

On the other hand, the Negroes in Africa and elsewhere are very different. Often tall, they are moderately long-headed—or dolichocephalic, as anthropologists say—and the skin is dark and sometimes almost black. The hair also is black, and is very characteristic, being of a woolly or rather of a kinky type, and if the individual strands are closely examined it will be found that they are characterized by spiral rings which, well rolled and close to one another, are apt to join up and form tufts. Like the men in Northern Europe, Negroes do not have much body hair, and it is to be noted that the hair on the face, such as the moustache and beard, tends to be straight up to a certain length. It is this sparsity of body hair which often gives the Negro's skin that satiny feeling so different from the skins of people with more hair on their bodies. The eyes are dark, whilst the nose is flat and broad with wide nostrils which are commonly associated with peoples living under hot moist conditions such as the tropics.

Again, let us glance at the physical characteristics of the Mongoloid or yellow-skinned peoples of Asia or the Far East. These are of medium to short stature, round-headed, and have yellowish or brownish skins. The hair is black, coarse, straight, and sparse on the body; and whilst the nose is small and narrow, the face is apt to be round and somewhat flat, with slanting eyes and high, splayed cheek-bones. In some of the more typical members of this group there occurs a feature which is called by anthropologists the *epicanthic fold.* The canthus is the angle at the corners of the eye-opening where the lids are

joined. Quite frequently among the Mongoloid peoples a small fold of skin is to be seen arising above the free edge of the upper lid and passing down so that it almost covers the inner canthus. Sometimes one eye has the fold clearly marked, whilst in the other it is hardly noticeable. It is occasionally found among Negroes and Whites, although in the latter case few examples have been noticed and described.

Here, then, are three groups of human beings which it would be impossible to confuse. Even if a Chinese might perhaps be mistaken for a Japanese, nobody is going to confuse him with a peasant from a Norwegian inland valley, or a Wolof Negro from the Senegal in Africa, who has what is probably the darkest skin of any of the African peoples. Can these groups therefore be correctly said to belong to different *races*? In one sense, perhaps, they can, but modern scientific work has made the question so difficult to decide that it is better to avoid the word *race* altogether. It must be remembered that the individual differences between various members of the groups, the characteristics of which are outlined above, are often so considerable that it is impossible to decide to which " race " specific individuals may belong. For example, it might be asked, To what " race " does a person belong in whose make-up there runs a minute strain derived from a coloured ancestor, who for his part might have had a white parent? Does he belong to the White or the Negro Race? The question has only to be asked to demonstrate its absurdity. Properly speaking, these major divisions into which mankind is divided can be treated as varieties or, if it be insisted on, racial *types* in which these physical characteristics, which are transmitted to the offspring, are important. All persons, to whichever group they may belong, can be classified as members of one species, namely *Homo Sapiens*; and the fact that crosses between one group and another are fertile makes statements about " pure races " so much nonsense. For thousands of years movements and migrations have taken place; and intermarriage has occurred freely, and is still going on all over the world, with results which cannot be foreseen. To speak of the German race or the British race, as is frequently done by German and British political orators, is meaningless. Mixture is so obvious that it is difficult to see how the speakers can thus commit themselves; and the most superficial acquaintance with history and the course of human mobility in the continent of Europe

ought to be sufficient to show the misleading nature of these words. The German and British peoples are mixed groups—now so hopelessly mixed that, from the point of view of genetics, they can never be separated out into the components from which they originally sprang. In the United States the task would be even more impossible; and in places like Hawaii and Trinidad, group mixture is so complex that the populations represent a confused hotch-potch of jumbled types, the characteristics of one group being found with those of another in the same individual, so that the task of assigning any specific person to any particular race is immediately seen to be impossible. The writer well remembers the startling examples of these products of mixed breeding when inspecting some of the schools in Port of Spain, Trinidad, where persons of European, African, East Indian, and Mongoloid descent have intermarried and have produced offspring exhibiting the most startling examples of human intermixture. Here were children with yellowish skins and Negroid features, and children with a European cast of countenance but with the characteristics which betrayed their mixed origin. Similar situations exist in other parts of the world, where, through immigration and the movements of people in search of work, diverse groups are thrown together under conditions of poverty and bad housing, where choice is restricted and where intermixture becomes inevitable.

We have seen above how meaningless is the word *race* when used in contexts which have become familiar to us in popular books and newspapers. Generally speaking, political orators and others have no clear idea of the precise meaning of many of the words they use with such sonorous effect; but when they speak of *race* they usually mean either one of the great divisions of mankind mentioned above, or more usually what would be more properly called a nation. When we speak of a *nation* we mean a group of persons born in a community having certain geographical boundaries, and sharing a common fund of traditions, exercising the same kind of social obligations, and being controlled by a common set of legal forms and economic regulations. These ties form a kind of group consciousness, or as we say a *national* sentiment, and thus we can speak of any people who possess these sentiments and feelings of solidarity as a *nation*. Although a common language makes for a firmer and more closely knit entity, it is not a necessity. The Swiss

can be said to constitute a nation, and here both French and German are spoken. Similarly, once the idea of nation is grasped it will be seen how erroneous it is to speak of the British or German *races*, since those who make up these peoples are composed of a whole medley of stocks drawn from widely different groups and exhibiting a variety of what some anthropologists have unwillingly called racial *types*. Yet in spite of their varying ancestry they live together in each country holding a set of common values, and thus nationalism can be regarded as the sum of these values which are held as almost sacred by some of the members of the community. It is here that we can see how it is that such concepts as internationalism are frowned upon by persons who have an exaggerated and often perverted sense of the sacrosanct character of the national values of their particular country. It was this over-estimation which led the Germans to their fantastic mystical ideas about the national and racial " soul," and which led them to cut themselves off from any idea of the essential unity of mankind and the desirability of international co-operation and relationship. To them the nation was a thing apart. It became exclusive and almost omnipotent: coupled with fantasies about " race " and " blood " the nation became a group believed to be destined to rule the rest of the world, a master-people. To such thinkers law and order have no place where the defence of the nation is concerned. As Hitler said in 1932: " We are not going to yield to a gang of twaddlers seeking to talk us into that silly slogan (*dummen Phrasen*) of law and order. This pitiful bourgeois twaddle has not brought back to life one single dead comrade of mine." The whole of recent German (and more specifically National Socialist) thought is permeated with ideas of this kind. To preserve the German nation from external contamination became a social duty; to carry through her mission was the one good to which all else was secondary. If Germany could be made free, then, declared Wilhelm Stapel, the German nationalist writer, we should be ready to burn the entire world to ashes!

It is in sentiments like these that can be seen most clearly the dangers which can arise from forsaking the paths of science and wandering off into the fields of fantasy and mystical " intuition " which, when translated into action and reality, take the form of weapons of destruction and every kind of terrible device for the extermination and enslavement of other nations and

peoples. Yet the seeds of such crazy notions can be found widespread in various parts of the world, and are by no means wholly confined to Germany. Peoples advanced in material welfare and technological achievement are apt to regard with disfavour and look down upon other peoples, whose ideas of the meaning and purpose of life differ from their own. The barrier of language prevents that free interchange of thoughts and ideas which might make suspicion less acute and broaden understanding and mutual esteem. Yet even where a more or less common language exists we find grave difficulties arising, not only as between members of two nations when in contact with one another, but also even within the same group, as, for example, in the United States of America.

Before passing on to a consideration of these national and racial prejudices, it may be as well to say a few words on another current example of confused thinking which centres on an alleged correspondence between language and race.

During the last ten years everybody has learnt something of what the Germans call the Aryan Race, especially in connection with controversy about the position of the Jews and the problem of intermarriage with " Aryan " partners. The word *Aryan* was unfortunately popularized by Friedrich Max Müller, who died in 1900. He was a student of comparative philology; or, in other words, a specialist in linguistics and the formation of language. In the course of his lectures he fell into the occasional habit of speaking of the Aryan or Semitic races, by which he often probably meant simply the people who spoke Aryan or Semitic languages. The Aryan-speaking peoples can be divided into an Asiatic and a European group. For example, the Brahmins of India belong to the Asiatic group, and so do the peoples who now speak Bengali or Urdu. Similarly, the people who spoke the ancient language of Persia, namely Zend, belong to this group; and other peoples can be included, such as certain groups in Central Asia. The European group includes both North and South Europeans, such as those who speak Germanic, the Slavs, and the peoples whose language was derived from Latin, such as the French, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese. From Germanic the bulk of the English language is derived, although we have, of course, borrowed largely from the Italic and Hellenic groups and to a certain extent from the Celtic. Thus the term " Aryan " cannot possibly be applied to a race, but can only be used as a linguistic term. In spite of this,

however, the idea of a great and superior " Aryan Race " was supported by a considerable number of historical (but unscientific) writers in England, Germany, and France; and the idea began to be mixed up with notions of Nordic superiority, and the fantasy that an " Aryan " was a tall, blond European from whom all material culture was derived and who was destined to rule the world. It is from such small beginnings that world forces spring which rock nations and civilizations to their foundations.

CHAPTER II

THE COLOURED PEOPLES

In considering the question of race and the controversial material that has been written about it we have already noticed how most of the difficulty has arisen on account of the misuse of words which have been used in a way which is not permissible from the scientific point of view. Indeed, as will be remarked later, much confusion is bound to arise if in all subjects, and perhaps more particularly those concerning race and colour, the terms used are not fully understood, and thus are not employed in a sense which can be accurately defined, and so rendered suitable to express the required meaning. Were these precautions to be observed no one would be guilty of using such expressions as " the British race," or calling certain of the people of India " niggers." In speaking, therefore, of the coloured peoples the first thing to discuss is precisely what we mean by the word "coloured" when applied to a human being.

Before discussing the varied types to which the word *coloured* has been applied, it is clear that on one point at least everybody can be agreed. The word obviously refers to the colour or pigmentation of the human skin. Now the colour of the skin in normal healthy subjects is due to two causes: (*a*) to its pigmentation, and (*b*) to the blood within its vessels. Changes in skin colour due to the latter cause are readily seen in such phenomena as blushing, where a temporary reddening of the face occurs; or in cases of what is called cyanosis, where a bluish discoloration of the skin is observed, due to deficient oxidation of the blood. It is not, however, this kind of skin colour which concerns us here. It is the first cause—namely, pigmentation—with which we are primarily concerned. A pigment is, in its broadest sense, a colouring-matter, and the discoloration due to such material is called pigmentation. In the human skin the pigment partly responsible for its colour is called *melanin*, which comes from a Greek word (μέλας) meaning *black*. Not much is known about it, but there is no doubt that it occurs in the basal cells of the lower layers of the epidermis or outer layer of the skin. It consists of fine granules, and all normal human skins contain it, the difference

in colour being due to the amount present in the cells. Thus in blond people not all the cells contain the pigment, which is present only in small quantities; in darker people the granules are more numerous, and in the case of very dark Negroes the basal layer is full of them.

Apart from melanin it has been thought by some that another pigment, closely allied to it, is also present throughout the epidermis, although this is not the place to discuss the matter in greater detail. However that may be, it is clear that the colour of the human skin, be it white, black, or yellow, is due to the effect of the two contributing factors of the blood on the one hand, and on the presence of varying amounts of melanin granules on the other. Different shades of colours under varying circumstances are easily observed in cases of illness or sudden faintness. Thus in white persons a pallor may invade what might otherwise be a ruddy face; whilst in the case of Negroes the skin may sometimes take on a peculiar ashen colour in cases of anæmia, or even a slightly greenish hue in attacks of severe sea-sickness.

When the facts of intermixture down the ages are considered, it is clear that the variation in the colour of the human skin must be very large. Moreover, life in the tropics is apt to colour a white skin brown, since the action of the ultra-violet rays upon the epidermis has a chemical effect that is shown by reddening and swelling of the irradiated surface, with consequent pain and discomfort. In small doses little ill effect is to be observed, and the skin gradually turns that golden brown so loved by sun-bathers. Thus a white man who has lived long under the tropical sun may have his face, neck, and arms coloured a deep brown, whereas the parts of the body covered by clothing remain the natural hue. Such changes in skin colour do not at the moment concern us, since they have no relation to the presence or absence of pigment in the basal layers which is responsible for the generalized skin colour among the so-called coloured peoples.

Having got a tolerably clear idea of what it is that is responsible for pigmentation in the human skin, we can now pass on to a further consideration of what constitutes a coloured person. It is here that further difficulties immediately confront us, difficulties which not only offer obstacles to precise definition, but which present some of the hardest nuts that legal minds have ever had to crack.

Let us suppose we are visiting West Africa and walking through a village. We shall have no difficulty in deciding that most of the villagers are " coloured people." Their skins are dark, and their other characteristics, such as their hair, reveal their African origin. Now let us go to a small town in the Deep South of the United States. Here will be numbers of people whom we can immediately class as coloured folk or Negroes, but among them we shall see quite a few whose skins are less dark and whose features betray their mixed origin. In other words, these people have clearly got some white blood. Again, we shall see some whom, at a glance, we should decide were " white," whereas as a matter of fact they have a certain proportion of coloured blood. Quite recently I was lunching in my London club with one of my friends from the United States who was visiting England. The other members of the club regarded him as a rather fair type of American, and might have thought that he was of Scandinavian ancestry. With his keen, intelligent eyes and ready smile, he could be accepted anywhere and welcomed in the most exclusive circles. Yet the truth is that he is an American Negro, and one of the most important leaders of coloured people in the United States. In what sense, then, can he be called a Negro? Clearly only in the sense that a certain percentage of Negro blood runs in his veins, and this percentage makes him, according to the legal definition current in the country whence he comes, a " Negro." Now it must be obvious that classification based upon such standards must be extremely difficult and vague. Indeed, so difficult is it that in the United States there is no definite or uniform legal decision upon who is or who is not a Negro. In other words, it cannot be agreed as to what percentage of Negro blood is necessary to make a man a Negro or " a coloured person." Moreover, confusion is so widespread that in some States the definition varies according to circumstances, the same individual being sometimes treated as white and sometimes as coloured. Decision after decision is handed down by the various State courts in which vague terms and ambiguous words are used; decisions that have then to be interpreted by legal experts, who are often at a total loss, since the facts upon which such definitions can alone be based are lacking. For example, in 1852 a person in Maine having only one-sixteenth African blood was not a Negro where the question of intermarriage was concerned.

In 1910, in Louisiana, it was decided that any person who had " an appreciable amount of Negro blood " was a coloured person within the meaning of the Jim Crow law. What " an appreciable amount " meant is obscure; but it would seem that what was implied was an amount which rendered the physical characteristics of the individual concerned clearly Negroid to the ordinary observant person. In the same year, however, the Louisiana Court again became involved in hopeless confusion, and handed down a decision that the word " Negro " does not of necessity include persons " in whom the admixture is so slight that even a scientific expert could not be positive of its presence." Yet there are often cases in the United States of young people, who had no idea that they had any Negro blood, being socially ostracized by white people when it has been revealed that traces of Negro ancestry have been disclosed.

In 1890, in the official U.S. Census, the word " Black " was used to denote persons who had three-quarters or more of black blood, whilst others were called quadroons, etc. In 1920 the Census reported as " Black " all full-blooded Negroes, and as " Mulatto " all Negroes having some proportion of white blood, although how far these facts were ascertained is not clear, and should, in my opinion, be regarded with some caution. In the Census taken in 1930, and again in 1940, the enumerators were instructed to return as " Negro " all persons of mixed white and Negro blood, no matter how small the percentage of black blood. Both " blacks " and " mulattoes " were to be returned as Negroes without distinction; while in cases where there was an admixture of American–Indian blood, persons were to be returned as Negro unless Indian traits predominated, and the person was generally accepted in his or her community as an Indian.

The presence of the Indians in the United States has added another complication to legal decisions and enactments regarding coloured people. In 1810, for example, the Louisiana legislature applied the word " colored " to all persons not of the " white race," and thereby included the North American Indian; but later years have shown a decided tendency to limit the term to persons of African descent. The policy of discrimination, however, has been applied to other stocks, especially in the schools, California having supplied separate schools for American, Indian, Chinese, and other persons of Mongoloid

descent. Indeed, in this State, owing to Chinese and Japanese immigration, Mongolians were more unpopular than Negroes, largely as a result of economic competition.

The Indians of North America, who, together with those now living in South America, are sometimes called Neo-Amerinds, seem originally to have come from Asia, and gradually to have spread to the east coast. They are broad-headed and their hair is usually straight and inclined to be lank; whilst sparse on the body, it is usually abundant on the head. Although the American Indians have been called Redmen, or Redskins, for a long time, their skins are certainly not red, the misnomer perhaps arising from the fact that they occasionally use red ochre for application to the body. The colour of their skins is really brownish or yellowish, the tints ranging from a very pale yellow through olive brown to a deeper, richer shade. Some have such pale skins that they might pass as Europeans, whilst others are so yellow that they might be mistaken by the unobservant for Chinese or even Japanese. At the present time the American-Indian population of the United States hardly exceeds 360,000, the increase since 1930 being very slight. Oklahoma has the largest number, closely followed by Arizona and New Mexico.

There is little doubt that admixture of white blood began in early times. Similarly, Negro admixture took place, since at one time the Indians themselves became slave-owners and the slaves accompanied them on their wanderings into various parts of the continent. To-day, some States, such as Arizona, forbid marriages between whites and Indians; and in Louisiana and Oklahoma, marriages between Negroes and Indians are prohibited. It is not clear how far investigations proceed when it is a question of both parties having mixed blood, although in North Carolina it is said that in certain cases the union of Indians with persons of Negro blood to the third generation inclusive is forbidden.

From the above brief account of the position of the Negroes and Indians in the United States, one fact of particular significance emerges. This is concerned with the different point of view from which the Indian and the Negro are regarded in the United States. Although it is true that the two populations can hardly be compared as to numbers (360,000 compared with over 12,800,000), the way in which they are thought of varies in quality, just as the average educated American's opinion

differs when it comes to comparing the Negro with the Hindu. The American–Indian is apt to be regarded as, in a sense, a kind of fictional or legendary figure, a system of thought which is, perhaps, derived from the Wild West tales which have always been so popular in the United States. Thus he is often imagined to be a tall, straight, and athletic figure, very dignified and proud and exceedingly powerful. His dwelling is pictured as a wigwam, within which he prepares for his scalping expeditions, whilst his squaw is busy with domestic tasks. On the other hand, he is often imagined to be cruel and treacherous, addicted to torturing his enemies out of spite, and not altogether to be trusted when dealing with white men.

This fantastic portrait is hardly supported by the facts, although it is impossible here to deal with them in detail. The average American–Indian cannot be considered a very powerful or physically a very strong man. Far from all of them living in wigwams, some dwell in substantial log houses or huts; and although scalping was well known, it was often not carried out in the manner so luridly described in the Wild West novel. Neither are the Indians more cruel than many other peoples; and their honesty, especially among those with whom there has been little culture contact, has been testified to by many observers who have lived among them. This composite picture of the Indian is one which successfully covers up the truth of the terrible story of the relations between the American tribes and the invaders from across the ocean. For the fact is that, from the earliest days, the Indians were subject to a brutal enslavement and oppression which well-nigh led to their extermination. It is but another example of the treatment of coloured people by men of paler skins, and it is one which coloured people generally are not likely to forget.

Although there is little excuse for confusion, there are some people who are still apt to think of the word "Indian" as always referring to the same kind of people, and to mix up the Indians of North and South America with those living in Asia. So we will now take a necessarily very hasty and brief glance at the peoples of India, who constitute a compact body of some four hundred million persons.

Out of about every five people in the world, one is an Indian; and, of these millions, about a quarter are not British subjects, but live in the Indian States, and are not under the responsibility of the Parliament in London.

On account of the vastness and complexity of the problem the racial history of India has not yet been fully explored. It is, however, probable that the most ancient stratum of the population is that living in the forest areas of the Deccan, in the south of India. They are long-headed and short in stature, whilst their skin is very dark and their hair wavy or sometimes curly. As we go northward the types begin to change, and the influence of Aryan-speaking peoples becomes apparent. Similarly, in the north, Mongoloid types are discernible, where the face has the characteristically flat appearance, and the eyelids are often oblique.

It is impossible and unnecessary to enter here into a detailed survey of the immense number of variations in the peoples of India. Without taking into account the dialects, there are over twenty languages; the Dravidian group predominating in the south, and the Indo-Aryan languages in the north and west. Similarly, there are a large number of religions and sects. The greatest number of adherents is claimed by Hinduism (about 255 millions), which in early times had only four main castes or groups [1] bound by certain rules, such as being forbidden to intermarry or even to eat with one another. Gradually these castes were extended, and there are now some thousands of them, of which the most numerous are the so-called depressed classes, or "untouchables." These number some forty-nine millions, and it is only very gradually that their lot is being improved. It is here that we can see how enormously complex such questions as those of social security and freedom from want or fear must be when applied to India. Generally speaking, the social position in the caste system is, for the Hindu, fixed at birth. He cannot rise in the caste scale, as it were; it is sometimes done, but it is the exception and not the rule. All he can do is to look forward to the

[1] The Brahmin, or priestly caste; the Kshatriya, or warrior class; the Vaishya, or commoners; and the Sudras, or servile class. Since there was in fact a colour bar between the lighter-hued Aryan-speaking peoples and the dark-skinned Dravidians (which is always to be expected when a dominant people conquers a weaker group of a different colour), it is possible that the original idea of caste was derived from colour, which was rapidly associated with status and so developed into its later forms. According to a story preserved in the *Mahabharata*, one of the great epics of Ancient India, the castes arose from the fall from grace of persons of different colour, who thereupon were formed into groups of different colour—a legend which illustrates the connection between caste and colour.

possibility that his position will be higher in some future life, for it must be remembered that the idea of reincarnation is widely accepted among the Hindu population. These facts induce a fatalistic attitude among those who are confronted by them. What is, must be; and there is nothing to be done about it. Unlike colour prejudice, caste limitation has all the authority of religious dogma behind it. With the breaking down of such rules and regulations comes the gradual cracking of the religious foundations upon which they are founded. Moreover, conversion to Christianity will not in itself obliterate even the cruder forms of racial intolerance. When the high-caste Hindu is reproached for his rigid attitude as regards even the shadow of an untouchable falling on his food, he may merely remind the objector that in some parts of the world a white man will go so far as to break a glass if a Negro has used it on a previous occasion. Similarly the caste Hindu will strenuously object to the possibility that the children of the depressed classes may find a place in the better schools. The existence of the "untouchables" in India, and the treatment accorded to them, may excite horror and disgust among many who fail to see what is going on nearer home. When the author was young he was brought up with the idea that the "Board Schools" were for the benefit of the so-called "lower classes." To the white citizen of a country town in Georgia or Louisiana it is unthinkable that he should share a table with a Negro at a restaurant or sit by one in a public conveyance. Caste and colour prejudice are often intermingled. Even in parts of the United States, and in the Union of South Africa, religious sanction is often sought in their support. It is obvious that with such forces acting within a society the attainment of democratic institutions must be a difficult task.

The next largest religious body in India is that of the Moslems, who number nearly ninety-five millions, and who claim that their religion is one of the most democratic, since distinctions such as those insisted upon by the Hindu religion are absent. Indeed, it has been thought by some that the fascination that Islam exercises over so many of the world's peoples may be due in part to its spirit of toleration and its repudiation of all rigid barriers of caste and colour prejudice.

Apart from these two great religious groups there exist a number of other bodies which claim their thousands of adherents. Among them are the Buddhists, the Jains, and

above all the Parsis, who, although not numerous, exercise considerable political and industrial influence on account of their intelligence and activity in economic affairs.

This is not the place to enter into any discussion of what is called the Indian problem, which in itself is a misnomer, since there is not one problem but many, and each is linked up with other problems of global organization and the scientific development of the world's resources. The main problem of India itself is the problem of poverty, and with this goes the rise in population. In some fifty years the population of India has risen by nearly one hundred and ten millions. Judging by the recent improvement in mortality rates, it is possible that an increase of about seventy millions might arise from this source alone in another fifty years. Even now, mortality has been reckoned as from four to eight times that of our own; and the expectation of life is under half that of ourselves, for it must be remembered that malnutrition not only weakens those subject to it (thus opening the door to disease), but, in serious cases, renders many millions a prey to conditions which, on any standard, can only be regarded as the verge of actual starvation. When we consider the variety of racial stocks in India, and pause to remember the diverse social and cultural patterns with which each is connected, and then realize that many of the traditions and regulations centre on such subjects as food, educational facilities, and the position of women, then we shall have a fuller understanding of the difficulties with which the authorities are faced when it comes to the question of unifying India and introducing modern agricultural methods, which may help in lessening the evils of malnutrition and the manifold troubles which follow from it.

To sum up, then, the chief characteristics of the people of India, it may be said that the great bulk of the population belongs to what has been called by some anthropologists the Mediterranean or Brown Race. Very early these came into contact with people of Mongoloid stock migrating westward, and this is how we find that, for example, the Ghurkas (Nepal) show a mixture of Mongol features together with traits characteristic of the Brown Race. These latter people, of sallow to pale brown complexion, are long-headed and have dark hair. They are lightly built, tend to be short rather than tall, and are found in North Africa, Southern Europe, Arabia, Persia, and elsewhere. The early populations of Egypt were of the Brown

Race, being noticed in Pre-Dynastic Egyptian skeletal material between perhaps 4000 B.C. and 3400 B.C. The Negro does not, on the other hand, seem to have appeared in Egypt in any numbers until the twelfth Dynasty (about 2100 B.C.).

This brief description of the peoples of India will again remind the reader of the difficulty that will always be experienced if attempts are made to divide up mankind into rigid categories, and then to assign to these divisions certain basic features upon which to build theories of superiority and inferiority. Let us take as an example some of the people living in the Punjab, Kashmir, or Rajputana. With the exception of their colour, many of them might be taken for Europeans from the Mediterranean region, and even then they are hardly darker than some of the types to be seen in Southern Italy or Sicily. Are these people to be classed among the " coloured peoples "? If so, we ought to call numbers of people in Southern Europe and North Africa " coloured " also. The ancient Egyptians would also fall into this category, and thus those among us who suffer from what is called " colour prejudice " would have to admit that civilization arose from and was developed by the coloured peoples of Egypt and the Far East. Yet there is little doubt that there are numbers of people both in Great Britain and in the United States who, if they met one of the Hindu undergraduates in Oxford or Cambridge, would call him a coloured person; and there must be many landladies in England who, if they cater for Indians, are accustomed to tell their friends that they are used to letting rooms to " coloured gentlemen." Moreover, who can doubt that the position of the Indians in South Africa has not been made more difficult from the fact that they have brown skins? The temper and temperament of the white population in the Union of South Africa must be taken into account when the question of " non-Europeans " is involved. It is true that the Indians are classed as Asiatics, but many of the disabilities under which they suffer are not shared by the Jews, many of whom are not Europeans in the accepted sense. Is it not likely, as Mr. P. S. Joshi has said in his book *The Tyranny of Colour* (Durban, S. Africa, *pr.*, 1942), that this differentiation is due to the fact that the Indians have the darker skins? On the other hand, just as we have seen in the case of the United States, there is no positive legal definition of what it is that exactly constitutes " colour." Description is negative. By

the word " coloured " is meant, generally speaking, people " not of unmixed European descent nor of unmixed Bantu descent, nor Asiatics." Here it is clear that Indians are excluded, but the Malays, of whom there are not very many, are often classed with the coloured group. Strictly speaking, the word " coloured " in the Union of South Africa is confined to the group known as the " Cape Coloured," which is mainly made up of the intermingling of three stocks—namely, the Europeans, the Hottentots, and Malays from Madagascar and Malaya itself. It will thus be seen that the Cape Coloured people occupy a kind of intermediate position between the Europeans on the one hand, and the Bantu on the other. There is some reason to believe, however, that their position is beginning to undergo modification. It is true that for some time the Cape Coloured have enjoyed certain political, labour, and commercial rights, but the constant agitation by the more extreme elements among the European population in favour of a stricter policy of racial control may lead to a demand for the inclusion of the Coloured people within a series of regulations hitherto applied only to the Natives, as the Bantu population is called.

Thus in the Union of South Africa the word " coloured " has both a popular and, in a sense, an official meaning. The Bantu, for example, can be described as being *coloured* as opposed to *white*, but are not included in the group officially designated as the Coloured People. Here again we see the confusion which must always attend artificial divisions based upon the pigmentation of the human skin. Indeed, one writer on South Africa, who is known for his extreme views, divides the population into " white, black, and coloured," where by the word black he clearly means the Bantu. Deploring the attempts made by the Bantu people to rise and become, like the Europeans, " civilized men with equal rights," he maintains that towns are no place for the natives, although he does not appear to raise any objection to them being employed in the mines and elsewhere. It is to be noted that the confusion which besets " anti-racial " writers regarding the distinctions between the various groups of mankind is nearly always also to be found in their views on what is to be done about what they call the " menace of colour." There is no need to go farther in this direction than to remember the agitation which used to be carried on regarding what was called the " Yellow

Peril." Note well the adjective. They did not speak of the Far Eastern Peril, or the Peril of China and Japan. It was the *Yellow* Peril—that is to say, the peril which was to be feared from men and women with yellow skins—another example of colour prejudice together with ignorance of the history and culture of the Mongoloid peoples of the Far East.

We have now to ask ourselves whether the Chinese, Japanese, and other Oriental peoples can be called "coloured." Here again the same uncertainty confronts us. There is little doubt that they have been the victims of colour prejudice. The idea of the Yellow Peril proves this, or rather strongly suggests it. But can they be properly included within our category of the coloured peoples? In one sense they can, inasmuch as we are dealing in this discussion primarily with non-white persons with whom in various parts of the world colour or race prejudice has become associated, and it is in this restricted sense only that the term "coloured" is to be applied to them.

Those who know even the rudiments of Chinese history and culture must always be somewhat shocked when the derogatory word "Chinks" is applied to the citizens of the Celestial Empire. This is especially so when the word is used in America, since such material advantages as taxis (without the motor!) and ice-boxes, together with such immaterial notions as that of "the good neighbour," were known to the Chinese hundreds of years before they became commonplace in the United States. Through the teaching of Confucius (born 551 B.C.) the basic principles underlying any true civilization were laid down. The rights of others were given their true recognition: the idea of to live and let live became the kernel of the good life. Man, Confucius thought, was not born with a dose of original sin: it was his contact with an evil environment that caused him to become anti-social. The idea of a future life did not particularly interest the Chinese philosopher: it was this life and its social and moral obligations that claimed his attention. Nevertheless, psychical experiments were carried out long before Spiritualism made its appearance in the West; and the planchette, trance communications, and dark séances were all well known in China. Be the human skin white, black, or yellow, the desire to pierce the veil seems always evident, and must be so as long as man remains the curious and exploratory animal that he is.

It can thus be said that many of the principles upon which

any ordered and decent civilization must be based were laid down in China some 450 years before the birth of Jesus Christ, and art and literature were flourishing centuries before Western painters and writers were busy at their easels and desks. The debt that Europe owes to China in ceramics alone can never be repaid; and Chinese painting has produced a long succession of talented artists for more than sixteen centuries. Were more material pleasures required, who can forget that the virtues of tea were praised by the Chinese themselves at the time that Carthage was being stormed by Belisarius in the sixth century?

If it be decided, therefore, that the Chinese are to be classed among the coloured peoples, then their contribution to civilization is of the highest. The same could be said of the Ancient Egyptians, who, like some of the peoples of India, belonged to what has been called the Brown Race, the physical characteristics of which were briefly noticed on p. 21. The artistic and technical ability of the people of Ancient Egypt was amply shown when the tomb of Tutankhamen was opened, in 1922. Ten centuries before the birth of Christ the Tombs of the Kings were a veritable museum of artistic objects and furniture, and illustrated not only the civilization of their makers in terms of material achievement, but also indicated the range of the philosophical and religious outlook which prompted them to endow the dead with such surpassing richness.

Although the Egyptians themselves recognized and portrayed at least four main groups of human beings, they did not represent their own skins as white, as they portrayed the Libyan peoples of the West and North. The colour of their own faces was shown as reddish, slightly darker than the yellowish tinge given to Asiatics, but much less dark than the black reserved for the Negro peoples from the South. Moreover, writers who stress the dangers they foresee if the " white " population of the world fail to continue to dominate the coloured peoples, do not hesitate to class the modern Egyptian as a " coloured person." For example, Dr. J. W. Gregory, in his book *The Menace of Colour* (London, 1925), defines a " Person of Colour " as any member of the " darker sections of mankind," and included among those sections are people whom he calls "Dark Caucasians," evidently referring to persons belonging to the Brown Race, and thus admitting Egyptians. Indeed, on p. 143 of his book he actually says that " the white

race" in Egypt has suffered a reduction in its authority, and speaks of the influence of the "Dark Caucasians in the north."

Here again the same story repeats itself when we come to a discussion of what constitutes a coloured person. It is becoming clearer as we proceed that no precise meaning can be attached to the word. What to one person is a coloured man is a white man to another. A Negro, according to legal American usage, may be mistaken for a Scandinavian by a person who has only appearances by which to judge. The confusion seems complete, but before proceeding we must try to decide what will be meant by the term as it will be used during the remainder of this discussion.

In 1906 a Bill was being brought into the United States Congress relating to the schools of Washington, and in it there was a phrase concerning a Board which it was proposed to set up and which was to consist of nine members, of whom three should be "of the coloured race." Now a Representative from Tennessee, Mr. T. W. Sims, raised an objection to this phrase on the ground that, as it stood, it would include Chinese, Indians, Japanese, Malays, Sandwich Islanders, or indeed "any persons of the coloured race"—an argument which showed how the term was understood at that time in at least one part of the United States. As a substitute for this vague description Mr. Sims proposed the word "Negroes"; or, as an alternative, "persons of the Negro race," for as a matter of fact this was what was intended, it being clearly understood that the word "Negro" was to be defined as far as possible in that sense as laid down by the Courts. Thereupon a lengthy controversy arose as to the proper name to be applied to those persons of African descent resident in the United States of America. Advice and assistance were received from prominent Negro leaders such as Dr. Booker T. Washington, who gave it as his opinion that the best word was "Negroes," spelt with a capital N. Others objected to the term, preferring Afro-Americans or Negro-Americans; but the majority seem to have preferred the word "Negroes," and few seem to have favoured "coloured people" or "persons of colour." Indeed, the choice seems appropriate, since the word, even in its present form, suggests the people of the Great River (River Niger); and the purest Negroes, or "true Negroes" as they are sometimes called, still live close to the Guinea Coast, in West Africa.

Thus, when dealing with conditions in the United States it will be convenient, if the word "coloured" be used at all in connection with people, to mean those persons of African descent who are otherwise called Negroes, and thus we shall exclude both Indians and Asiatics. The word "Negress" is to be avoided, as objection to its use has been raised on account of its historical associations, since in the old slavery days the term was commonly used when advertising auctions at which female slaves were to be sold.

Having decided that in the United States "coloured persons" means Negroes in the sense mentioned above, we can also, if we wish, use the same adjective for Negroes in any part of the world. It will thus to a certain degree be a technical term as opposed to a merely descriptive one, like that in the heading of this chapter.

In the West Indies the word "coloured" is often applied in a sense which means both not-black and not-white; black being used in respect of the very dark Negroid population, and white for the Europeans and white creoles—that is to say, those born in the West Indies of white ancestry. Thus the coloured people here represent a kind of intermediate class of mixed parentage, mainly in the mid-economic levels, and thus dividing the white upper stratum on the one hand, and the black worker on the other. Their position thus gives them a peculiar kind of potential authority, since, in cases of trouble or disorder, their support is sought from both upper and lower levels of the West Indian population, especially in such islands as Trinidad, where the existence of this intermediate class is much more marked than elsewhere. Were the weight of their influence to be brought in support of their darker compatriots in the lower wage and living scales, then prospects for reform might perhaps be brighter than they at present appear.

Arising out of the above discussion it may be convenient at this stage to point out that the terms "racial prejudice" and "colour prejudice" are not mutually synonymous. It is true a person may labour under both forms of prejudice—a situation which is common enough, to be sure—but the one form is not indissolubly linked to the other. For example, a person may be what is called an anti-Semite, by which is meant that he is prejudiced in a certain way against Jewish people. There are many anti-Semites in the United States and Great Britain,

but not all of them have a colour prejudice in addition to their anti-Semitism; and even this has only received a racial emphasis in modern times.

Before me, as I write, lies a somewhat rare book by one Francisque Michel, which is entitled *Histoire des Races Maudites de la France et de l'Espagne* (i.e. *History of the Cursed Races of France and Spain*), which was published in Paris in 1847. Here certain groups of people are dealt with, both in France and in Spain, who have been subjected to the hatred and antipathy of those living around them, and who have been the victims of numerous acts of discrimination and segregation. For instance, the author describes the treatment formerly accorded to the so-called Cagots, who lived in scattered communities in the western part of the Pyrenees and elsewhere. In early times (late fifteenth century) they were persecuted, and a form of strict segregation was applied. Although pious Roman Catholics, they had to suffer their religious observances being as rigidly controlled as their social life. They were railed off from the rest of the congregation, and a special holy-water stoup was provided for their use. Sometimes they were actually barred from taking the Sacrament, and at others the wafer was extended to them at the end of a stick—a truly singular procedure when it is remembered what Catholic doctrine is on this matter. Yet, from the physical point of view, later inquiries did not seem to show that they were so very different from their neighbours, except that perhaps in a few cases they were somewhat fairer in complexion. It is clear that we have here a case of prejudice and persecution which had little, if anything, to do with the colour of their skins. It is true that various physical and psychological peculiarities were imputed to them, just as they are to the Negroes in the United States. Thus, it was said that the colour of their eyes was dark and lacked lustre, and that the lobe of the ear was often missing. Moreover, they were credited not only with abnormal sexual powers, but also with an addiction to unnatural vices, which aroused the horror of some and the curiosity of others. They were inclined, so it was said, to sorcery and magic; they exuded an offensive odour and had bad breath. It is to be noted that the accusation of a bad smell attached to persons who are subject to prejudice and hatred is widespread. The Italians at one time credited the people of Lombardy with it; and when Charle-

magne wanted to marry the daughter of the Lombard King Desiderius, Pope Stephen III warned him against any alliance with the Lombards, who, he declared, suffered from leprosy—an affliction which was also said to be one from which the Cagots suffered. Similarly, the fetid smell of the Saracens was noted by their enemies, although the odour could effectually be removed by baptism—a procedure which was also thought to be successful in the case of the Jews, who were also accused of exhaling a foul smell. Even to-day these characteristics and tales are preserved in colloquial speech, as when some unpopular individual is described as being "in bad odour," or as in the phrase "he stinks." As is well known, the offensive smell of Negroes is fervently believed in by many white people; the same charge being sometimes levelled against whites by Negroes, and also by the Japanese, who have described the smell of certain European women as both pungent and rancid, a variation being that Europeans smell like lions and tigers.

It is not easy to say what truth, if any, there may be in these beliefs in specific "racial" odours. Although it is not very difficult to devise properly controlled experiments followed by a statistical analysis of the results, it does not seem to have been done; and, indeed, the carrying out of such tests would not be nearly so easy as the planning of them.

Apart altogether from odours due to diet, perfume, etc., it is probable that the origin of the so-called racial odours, if they exist, is to be sought in the secretions of the skin, some of which, especially when under the influence of bacterial decomposition, might give rise to certain smells.

Although there is no need to go into physiological details, it may be of interest to some to state briefly that the glands of the human skin are of two main types: (*a*) the ordinary sweat-glands, or eccrine glands as they are sometimes called, and (*b*) the apocrine glands, to which the hair follicles give rise and of which the secretion possesses some odour. The sweat-glands in man are well distributed over the body, whilst the apocrine glands are found only in certain restricted areas, of which, for our present purposes, the arm-pits are the most important. Now there is some evidence which suggests that certain scents, among them being the smell of sweat from the region of the arm-pit, have a sexual significance; and although it is customary, especially in these days, to decry body odour

and apply commercial deodorants to the arm-pits, yet it is well recognized that there are many people who, even if they do not admit actually liking the scent, are at least stimulated by it. Moreover, since apocrine glands are found in the arm-pit, their secretions, which consist of a number of substances, have a varying degree of quantity and scent, according to circumstances. Thus persons who sweat profusely, and are not over-fastidious regarding cleanliness, may often appear to exude a stronger body odour than others with the reverse proclivities.

It must, however, be observed that if it is to be shown that distinctive racial odours exist, it would have to be proved that differences are to be found between the chemical composition, and so on, as between different human stocks, and that these differences could account for the alleged variations between, for instance, the smell of Negroes and Europeans.[1] Before committing ourselves to any fixed opinions on the subject it would be as well to make sure that actual cases of odours personally experienced are not due to clothing, perfume, lack of cleanliness, or other artificial factors, rather than anything which could clearly be attributed to the natural peculiarities of the people to which the person belonged.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that if we assume that the odour of Negroes is really deemed highly unpleasant by white people, and vice versa, then certain facts are very difficult to explain. How is it, for example, that in the United States the employment of coloured people in white households is so common? How is it that so many children are entrusted to black nurses, the preparation of so many meals to black cooks, and the service at so many tables to black waiters? In many cases members of a black domestic staff do not live in, but come from their own homes daily to serve their white employers. Is it likely that these daily workers have a bath every day, which, even if they did so before setting out, would remove their natural odour only for a short time, if at all? The same question might be asked regarding conditions in many other parts of the world, such as South Africa, Kenya, or Trinidad. Moreover, to ask them is, in a sense, to answer them. If it were true that Negroes *as a group* have a peculiar odour which is offensive to white people, then it is frankly

[1] It ought, perhaps, to be said that in certain parts of the body the apocrine glands are said sometimes to be three times as numerous in Negroes as in Whites (*Bull. Johns Hopkins Hosp.*, 1926, xxxviii, 370).

incredible that they should be employed in the kind of services in which they indubitably are employed. Is it not, perhaps, more likely that *some* Negroes and *some* whites smell unpleasant to each other *sometimes*, owing to a variety of different reasons, and from this fact a generalization has been made for the purpose of supporting a racial or colour prejudice? On what other theory can we account for such a strange situation, or explain the remarkable belief, mentioned above, that through baptism the fetid odour of Jews and Saracens could be removed?

In conclusion it might be said that critical observers have in many cases failed to substantiate these allegations. The present writer, who has had good opportunities to verify them among coloured people in the United States and elsewhere, has never on a single occasion been able to do so; and Mr. William Archer, who travelled through the Southern States of America under the most diverse conditions, said that to the best of his belief "the body-odour of which we hear so much is mainly a superstition" (*Through Afro-America*, London, 1910, p. 144). If this be so, then accusations of this nature are to be regarded as essentially part of the mechanism by which racial hatreds and suspicions are preserved and continued, and through which a rational justification may be obtained for an irrational prejudice.[1]

[1] In this connection it may be of interest to recall what the seventeenth-century English physician and philosopher, Sir Thomas Browne, wrote about national odours and the smell of the Jews.

In his inquiries into vulgar and common errors, which were published under the title of *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, he dealt with this question in Book IV, Ch. 10. Touching upon the unfounded belief in pure races, in reference to the Jews, he says that it is odd that the odour "is no way discoverable in their Synagogues where many are, and by reason of their number could not be concealed," and then goes on to point out how even more odd it is that "no Man imputeth this unsavoury odour" to converted Jews, just as if they had been "aromatized by their conversion"! Continuing, he points out how some writers had explained the odour by supposing that it was a curse put upon the Jews by Christ; but this, he thinks, "is a conceit without all warrant." Finally, he sums up the whole controversy in a sentence which will serve to sum up the matter regarding racial odours in general. It is a dangerous point, he says, "to annex a constant property unto any Nation, and much more this unto the Jew; since this quality is not verifiable by observation; since the grounds are feeble that should establish it, and lastly, since if all were true, yet are the reasons alleged for it, of no sufficiency to maintain it."

With regard to the Negroes in the Southern States of America, it is, however, only fair to say that Mr. Stephen Graham, unlike Mr. William

From what has been said above it is clear that racial prejudice can exist altogether apart from a bias due to the colour of the skins. In modern times the best example of the first type is to be seen in anti-Semitism, where prejudice is directed against a special cultural group of which the orthodox members are not Christians, and of which the unorthodox, although they may profess any or no religion, nevertheless have a traditional heritage and a certain unity due to historical and economic reasons. In this case the term "racial" prejudice is not strictly applicable, since the Jews are not a race, and have for centuries been intermarrying with non-Jews in all the countries in which they have made their home. Moreover, the racial aspect of anti-Semitism is a modern growth, which has been popularized during the last few years through the efforts of the Nazi propagandists.

In the United States both types of prejudice are found, and, as might have been expected, they are often apparent in the same person or society. For example, in the earlier days (1867–70) of the Ku Klux Klan, a secret Southern organization, the principal aim of its members was to keep down the Negroes during the highly disturbed period after the Civil War which goes by the name of the Reconstruction. Later, however, especially in the years during and following the First World War, the Klan extended its activities to embrace other principles in which anti-Semitism, native Americanism, and anti-Catholicism were combined with its original corner-stone of white supremacy. The methods by which these results were to be achieved were mainly by terror and violence, the local supporters banding together and patrolling the district, clad in white robes and fantastic head-dresses, with sometimes a stout noose of rope suspended from some part of an automobile as a gentle reminder of what to expect should their wishes not be respected. I hope to discuss elsewhere the historical and psychological reasons for these examples of "taking the law into their own hands" which are so common within the framework of American

Archer, found the odour "terrible." Hotel elevators reeked of it; a chambermaid filled the room with a "pungent and sickening odour"; and indeed the whole of Norfolk, Va., had it. Mr. Graham noticed other very curious things about the Negroes of Norfolk. They were blacker than those of Washington or New York, and "their eyes were more goggly." Their hair also "was more matted." It was all very odd. (See Stephen Graham, *Children of the Slaves* (London, 1920), pp. 29–30, and *cf.* P. Nielsen, *The Colour Bar* (Cape Town, 1937), p. 13.)

social life. Devotion to the Constitution goes side by side with principles and practices which are directly contradictory to it. This dilemma is apparent not only as regards the treatment of the Negroes, particularly in the South. It runs like a dark thread throughout the whole pattern of American society. It is as if there were two distinct layers, like oil and water, which can never mix. The attempt to combine them is one of the prime causes for that psychological conflict which is the key to many social phenomena in the United States and elsewhere. These can never be properly understood if the results of such a conflict within a modern society are not given their due weight and taken into account when describing and explaining social trends. Before dealing with this question, however, we must take a rapid glance at the history of slavery, and see how closely connected the problem of the colour bar is with the concept of the savage and with the ideas underlying the institutions relating to master and servant.

CHAPTER III

SLAVERY

SLAVERY as an institution is rooted in the idea of property. A slave is a man, woman, or child who is to all intents and purposes the property of another individual, and his place in any social system is one where he has to work for his owner and obey his instructions. The master has supreme power over his slave. It is only when that power becomes limited and the owner is entitled to only a certain amount of the slave's services that the status of slave changes into one which we usually call "serf." The serf has greater liberty than the slave, but he cannot be called a free man. He possesses certain rights, and gradually, as his position improves, his children may be free. Thus serfdom may be likened to a kind of half-way house between slavery and freedom, and sometimes both classes may be found in the same society. Thus the ancient Romans had the *servus*, which corresponds to slave, and the *colonus*, which approximates to serf.

It is often forgotten that the ideas underlying what has been called humanitarianism are of comparatively recent growth. With the gradual appreciation of that factor concerned with *personality* there began to arise the idea of the value of human life and the essential basic equality of mankind as being all members of the same species. It was perhaps this which inspired the makers of the French Revolution with their slogan of Liberty! Equality! Fraternity! But in the old days such notions had no place, and it is thus that slavery goes far back down the corridors of time until its origin is lost in the mists of antiquity. In the Homeric poems slavery is treated as if it were a well-established custom, and there is no doubt that it goes back far earlier than the ancient Greek civilization. Slaves were well known in Ancient Egypt: the Hebrews had a well-defined slave class, the regulations concerning which are recorded in the Old Testament (see *Leviticus*, xxv). Islam has always known slaves, and the Koran, like the Old Testament, discussed their treatment and warned the faithful to restrain themselves in certain respects when it was a question of preserving the modesty of female slaves (see *Sura* XXIV).

Ancient Hindu legal text-books fully endorse and discuss the institution; and long before the European invaders crossed the ocean, slavery was fully established in the empires of Central and South America. Primitive Christianity recognized the custom; and it was only very gradually and step by step that individual Christians sensed the incompatibility of the institution with their interpretation of the teaching of Jesus. Slavery was often viewed as a kind of punishment sent by God, which must be borne in patience and humility. After all, was it not God Himself who spoke through Noah when he cursed Canaan, the son of Ham, and said that " a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren " (*Gen.* IX, 25)? Moreover, did not St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, instruct slaves to be obedient to their masters " in fear and trembling "? Christianity gave little sanction to some forms of rebellion and resistance to authority. What it taught was the duty of obedience. As the Catechism says, what was required was to do our duty " in that state of life unto which it shall please God " to call us.

It is from facts like these that we can see how very ancient is the institution of slavery; and it may cause some surprise to remember that it was only when the idea became incompatible with existing morality that the custom began to die out, and is now disappearing except in a few parts of the world.

It is not here that we can tell the story of slavery and its decay. What is more important at the moment is to point out the relations that slavery bears to the subordination of the coloured peoples to those of paler skin, for it is in the slave tradition and all that it implies that is to be found one factor which plays an important part in colour prejudice in various parts of the world.

In early times there was no colour distinction in the sense that we know it to-day. The idea that " white " people were slaves to other " white " people excited no feelings of dislike and abhorrence, since colour prejudice was non-existent. The Greeks and Romans felt little, if any, colour antipathy: their slaves were drawn from many parts, and there is no evidence that suggests any form of severe discrimination between them. Apart altogether from war (the chief source of supply for most slave-owning peoples), a brisk trade was carried on between the fringes of the Greek world, whilst Corinth and Athens served as centres for the imported slaves. The Island of Delos

was an important market, and slaves were shipped thence to those localities where there was a demand for labour. Similarly, the Romans combed parts of Western Asia where Cretan slave-dealers carried on their trade, collecting the slaves into large groups before dispatching them to the great central markets. The Roman wars provided enormous numbers of slaves, since prisoners became slaves almost as a matter of course and common routine. Moreover, the enslavement of peoples from outlying districts, who were called " the barbarians " by the Romans, was a commonplace, and these simple-living folk were regarded as being naturally designed for the status of slave, just as in later times coloured peoples, being deemed inferior, suffered the same fate.

As we have said above, the early Christian world showed no hostility to slavery as an institution. Christian teaching, with its emphasis on humility, meekness, and obedience, was not concerned with the evils of the existing social order so much as with the individual lives of those professing their allegiance to Jesus Christ. In his teaching, Christ mentioned slaves and their relations to their fellow-slaves and their masters (*cf. Matt.* XVIII, 23 ff.) without in any way considering the nature of the institution which was taken for granted. Similarly, in the Epistle to Philemon, St. Paul's attitude towards slaves is unambiguous. He accepts without question the property-right of the master; although at the same time a slave is not one to whom the privilege of Christian friendship is to be denied. Indeed, it is possible that this attitude towards slavery was partly instrumental in gaining converts to Christianity from the slaves themselves. It was thus, perhaps, that later Christians began to see the incongruity in their position, and decided that the position of the slave on earth was not compatible with his position in the Brotherhood of Christ. Something else was wanted if slavery was to be supported and justified on Scriptural grounds. Somewhere, perhaps, were other peoples to be found who might become slaves, and whose nature and standard of culture might be of such a kind that consciences could be assuaged and even Biblical sanction extracted and quoted for the purpose. Africa provided just such a place.

From the eighth century onwards the powers of Islam were pushing outwards to conquer fresh territories. Turk and Arab, from what we now call the Middle East, and farther on towards

India, were demanding fresh labour forces for their empire; and the need was met when North Africa became a centre from which Arabs pushed southwards and established trading-posts right down the African coasts. Slavery was not unknown to African tribes: it seems, in many respects, to have been a well-known and customary feature of native life. One tribe would raid another and enslave any prisoners that might be captured. Here again it was war that supplied the demand for slave labour. From the ninth century the world of Islam drew Negro labour from Central Africa. The great caravan routes were worn thin by the tread of countless thousands making their way northwards to be shipped as far as Persia, or even India itself. Here in Africa was a country teeming with thousands of primitive and defenceless people—people who not only were neither Christian nor Moslem, but who were pagan, and therefore could be treated in a way which would have been more difficult had they professed the religion of their captors. The idea of " the savage " was very useful. It provided means for appeasing those who were beginning to doubt the legitimacy and morality of the slave trade. Savages were scarcely human: akin to beasts, their rights were not those of human beings. It was an idea that was well worth exploiting, especially when, in cases of difficulty, it could be explained that through contact with a superior culture these savages might eventually embrace the religion of their masters.

By the end of the sixteenth century Christian Europe was itself deeply involved in the slave trade. Warning and opposing voices were heard, but they availed little. Africans began to be shipped to the West Indies, to the East Indies, to the Cape of Good Hope, and to Spanish America. Literally hundreds of thousands of Africans were taken out of Africa by the inroads of Christian and Moslem traders. Methods of capture and treatment defied description. Hundreds died on the journey to the coast; hundreds more perished on the ships and were thrown overboard.

It was not until the nineteenth century that the system began to show signs of its final disappearance. Even to-day slavery may still be practised in parts of Ethiopia, where its total abolition must imply a radical alteration in the social and religious life of the people, since the institution is an essential ingredient in their culture, and the priests regard it as having been decreed by God Himself.

Although slavery among civilized peoples has practically disappeared, its results remain. And here we are not referring to the constant reminder of the past as exemplified by Negro peoples scattered over the world. What is more important for us at the moment is to remember the slave tradition and how hardly that dies. The conception of the savage is still too useful to be discarded merely because slavery in the old sense has been abolished. Colour became associated with slavery and savagery. Unlike early times, later periods brought forth men who derived their slaves from people who could not become lost and gradually assimilated, as were their forerunners. They bore ineffaceable marks upon them which might always set them apart from the peoples who had enslaved them. They were *black*, and it was their colour which gave them away. Thus, far beyond the borders of Africa the Negro became a perpetual reminder of the past. His former status as servant could not be forgotten. So it happened that attempts to keep him in a subordinate position were made in many of the places where formerly he had been a slave. The colour bar began to operate and, as we shall see later, it was reinforced by many other factors, some of which did not emerge into the consciousness of those nourishing colour prejudice, but appeared only in symbolic and distorted forms. Hence Negroes became subject to restrictions, discrimination, and " racial " antipathy—a fact which constitutes a blot upon those civilized communities which encourage and permit such sentiments and practices.

It is true that Negroes are not the only ones to suffer, although their colour makes practical discrimination easier. Anti-Semitism is widespread; and the policy of a " White Australia " rests upon ideas which, as regards Asiatic immigrants, remind us of those held in the United States in respect to the Negro. In the same way there are other peoples who are held in low esteem at the present time, such as some of the Mexicans in those parts of North America where they are congregated. These people are sometimes called by the derogatory name of " greasers "; whilst the word " dago " is still heard in England when an abusive epithet is required to describe an Italian or Spaniard whose behaviour excites criticism, and whose skin is somewhat darker than is commonly the case.

Since no study of racial prejudice, however brief, would be complete without some mention of the Jews, it will be as well,

before we pass to a consideration of colour prejudice and the colour bar, to digress for a moment to deal with the question of anti-Semitism and thus clear the ground for a more detailed survey of our problem as it affects the coloured peoples. It is here that we shall see how a movement and a feeling as strongly entrenched as anti-Semitism can arise and be perpetuated without any of that support which the tradition of slavery brings to prejudice directed against peoples with non-white skins.

CHAPTER IV

ANTI-SEMITISM

In a preceding section of this book it was remarked that racial and colour prejudices were not inextricably linked together, and that the one could be found without the other. Thus, in the case of that systematized prejudice which is directed against the Jews—anti-Semitism as it is called—we find antipathy expressed towards certain religious and cultural groups the colour of whose skins closely conforms to that of the majority of the people among whom they have made their homes. It will therefore be useful to consider anti-Semitism very briefly, as certain of the psychological factors connected with it are, I think, very similar to those operating in the case of colour prejudice.

Before doing so, however, it will be as well if we distinguish at the start of our inquiry between what may be called " dislike of the Jews " and anti-Semitism proper.

A mere dislike of Jews is the private concern of the individual, although to dislike *all* Jews because of an antipathy towards *some* is illogical, and may lead to anti-Semitism unless it be checked. Many Jewish authors have criticized and deplored the more unpleasant aspects of certain kinds of behaviour which are not uncommonly found among their own people. Moreover, the physical appearance and habits of certain Jews, especially those from Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, have been unfavourably regarded; and dislike of such traits by others more sensitive and æsthetically susceptible may be difficult to avoid, and indeed is often unavoidable. However that may be, anti-Semitism is an attitude which goes much farther than mere dislike of Jews, even taken as a group. It is a movement alleged to be based on the fact that the Jews are working for social and political domination, much of the evidence for which is based on fanciful interpretation, and sometimes on documents of more than dubious origin. Thus we find the idea that as early as about 930 B.C. Jewish savants had thought out a scheme peacefully to conquer the whole universe, and that this grandiose idea was later developed so that the whole world should be laid low through economic

crises and general destruction. Similarly, and running side by side with this notion, is the charge that the systematic disintegration of the European nations was to be accomplished by a moral rot which was to be set going by the Jews in numerous unpleasant ways. They were said to be at the back of much of the traffic in women and children; and their alleged lack of moral dealing, when it was a question of Gentiles, was said to be supported by passages from their legal codes. It is true that Jews are not unknown in what is called the white-slave traffic; but they hold no monopoly in it. Indeed, it would be strange if they played no part in such a lucrative trade, since their long history as urban dwellers interested in financial gain would well qualify those of them whose ethics were not of a standard high enough to restrain them from taking part in such activity.

Now the ordinary man or woman who " dislikes the Jews " knows little, if anything, about the vast mass of material which makes up the armoury of the anti-Semite. The word itself is quite modern, being, it is thought, hardly earlier than about 1879 in its German form, and perhaps 1880 in its English translation. Soon after W. Marr published some of his anti-Semitic writings, a good deal of similar material began to appear in Germany—a fact which was actually noted in *The Athenæum* for September 3, 1881. Hatred of the Jews was becoming a centre around which was forming a systematized movement based on fact, fancy, and even delusion. The anti-Semite was no mere disliker of Jews. His hatred and fear were based on what, in many cases, he really thought to be solid fact and sound evidence. The Jews, he thinks, are, through their policy of peaceful infiltration, becoming the social and political dictators of the world. Who, then, are " the Jews "?

The Semites, or rather the Semitic-speaking peoples, are akin to the Hamitic-speaking groups who belong to what we have called the Brown Race. Both the so-called Arabs and Jews are Semites, although their history has been very different. It seems probable that the ancient Hebrews may have lived originally in some part of Northern Syria; but later they became much mixed with elements from the south and east, and it is probable that certain peoples in Asia Minor, who are sometimes called " Armenoids," contributed their quota to this mixture, since the pronounced shape of the nose (which

is wrongly supposed to be a purely Jewish distinction) was a marked characteristic of these people and forcibly recalls that of the ancient Hittites as revealed on the monuments.

After the great dispersion and the destruction of Jerusalem, in A.D. 70, the Jewish exiles began to spread over Europe, and gradually this homeless people wandered farther and farther, until to-day they are found scattered all over the world.

There can be little doubt that in the course of their wanderings much intermixture has occurred. It is often popularly supposed that Jews conform to a simple type which can easily be recognized, but this is not the case. It has been estimated—although with what degree of accuracy I am not prepared to say—that not more than 5 per cent correspond to what is supposed to have represented the old " Semitic type." It is, of course, true that there are certain physical characteristics which are distributed among the Jewish people; but it will be found that in many cases the careful observer, if he follow these traits, will ascribe Jewish ancestry to persons in whose veins there would not appear to be a drop of Jewish blood. Indeed, the feature more commonly associated with Jews—namely, the " Jewish nose "—is, as has been said above, one of the most striking characteristics of the Hittites—an Aryan-speaking people of mixed descent, who, after having moved southwards, made their home in Asia Minor and began to disintegrate only towards, perhaps, 1300 B.C. Nevertheless, it has to be admitted that noses of this type do occur among Jews, as anyone can see for himself by noticing examples on the New York City East Side, or by examining albums containing photographs of Jews and their families. On the other hand, it has been estimated that, taking a sample of some 2,836 adult male Jews in New York City, only 14·25 per cent. had the so-called " typical " Jewish nose; and among female Jews the proportion was even less—namely, 12·70 per cent. (see M. Fishberg, *The Jews* (London, 1911), p. 79).

It is not possible to estimate, with any degree of accuracy, how many Jews there are in the world to-day. One difficulty is to define precisely what is meant by " a Jew." Various methods of estimating the Jewish population are in use in different countries, but it is clear that the figures arrived at can be considered to be only tentative. If the Jewish religion is given as the faith, then the person professing it is reckoned as a Jew; but there are numbers of non-orthodox Jews who

have either forsaken the faith of their fathers or have been converted to some other religion. Thus other methods of computation have to be adopted, into which we cannot enter here. Latest estimates are inclined to put the number of Jews in the world as about 15,650,000, the largest number being in the United States, which has about 4,770,000. Great Britain and Northern Ireland have about 380,000, which, excluding the refugees from Europe, is a small percentage of the total population of some 47,888,000. In the British Empire overseas the number is estimated at about 300,000; Canada claiming over half that number. Before the Second World War Europe had over nine and a half million, of whom over three million lived in Poland. In the United States the Jews constitute about 3·75 per cent. of the total population. The greatest number is concentrated in New York (over two million); whilst Pennsylvania follows with over 434,000. Of every hundred persons in New York, twenty-eight are Jews; and of those seeking admission to the United States in the year before the war (1938), 29 per cent. were Jews; this rising to 45 per cent. in 1941.

As is now well known, anti-Semitism in its modern form is hardly older than the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Hatred of the Jews from religious motives was well established in the ancient world; and there can be little doubt that this antipathy was connected with the fact that, apart from their religion, they were, as exiles, aliens in every country to which they migrated. For example, in the *Book of Esther*, III, we read that Haman told King Ahasuerus that Jews were scattered abroad among his people, and that " their laws are diverse from all people; neither keep they the King's laws: therefore it is not for the King's profit to suffer them." In this passage we can detect one of the cardinal reasons for the dislike and antipathy which are felt for certain groups. It is the fact that they are *different*; and in the case of coloured people their difference is something which it is impossible to conceal, especially when it is combined with other physical characteristics. Assimilation is never easy at the best of times; but in the case of the orthodox Jews it is almost impossible. The complications of the ceremonial law, and the apparent absurdity of certain of the regulations regarding food and worship, set such people apart from their fellows, especially when they regard themselves as superior to the Gentiles among whom

they have found refuge. Their dietary code alone made it difficult in the past, and still makes it difficult to-day, for strictly orthodox Jews to join with non-Jews at social festivals where food is served. Their insistence on " Kosher " food—or, in other words, food prepared in a certain way, and therefore ritually fit to eat—makes it impossible to join with others at a mixed table; and similarly, their rigid insistence on refusing to work on Rosh Hashannah (New Year) and Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement) often makes Gentile firms hesitate to employ them in cases where a twenty-four hours' service might be interrupted if certain members of the staff enjoyed special privileges on the ground of their religion.

Although in early days there was much hostility to the Jews, it does not seem to have been in any sense a widespread and organized movement. A goodly number of other peoples suffered a similar hostility in certain respects; and we have only to remember the hatred of the Christians to see that the Jews were by no means the only ones to arouse antipathy and to suffer persecution. The fact is that, wherever an alien people or group is in a minority status, then there is the danger of that minority becoming suspected and disliked, unless it becomes wholly assimilated into the main body of the people among which it dwells. Strangers are always regarded with suspicion and distrust; and strangers who remain aloof, and whose customs and way of life differ from those of the people around them, run the risk of dislike and jealousy which can easily turn into persecution. Here again can be seen one of the reasons why the Jews have been subject to that hatred which seems always to have pursued them down the ages. But it is clear that this alone would not have been sufficient to account for the bitter feelings and wild accusations which have for centuries been levelled against the Jews.

As the years rolled by, and antiquity gave place to the Middle Ages, the Jewish strangers became more isolated instead of enjoying the advantages of assimilation. They were compelled to live in separate communities (the so-called Ghettoes); they had to wear special badges; and the possibilities of employment became more and more limited, and openings for commercial activities less and less. Moreover, the Christians could not forget that it was the Jews who had crucified the Saviour; and the apparent disregard of the Jews for the evidence which to them seemed to prove the truth of Chris-

tianity made them still more hostile towards this obstinate and bigoted people. Ousted from many normal occupations, the Jews took to money-lending and petty trading—both of which activities were hardly likely to increase their popularity. The practice of usury, it is true, brought riches as well as misery; but their wealth merely excited cupidity on the part of some, and the suspicion on the part of others, that it might be used for sinister ends and constitute a hidden hand behind national and international events. Their petty trading also was not always carried on with strict regard for honest and upright dealing. With the rise of the industrial system and capitalistic enterprise the Jews began to take advantage of commercial possibilities, for which they were well suited on account of their long experience in financial operations. Success attended some of their efforts: poor Jews who emigrated to America often became comfortably off and some of them grew rich and powerful; while the means by which they attained their ends might not always have been those which would have borne minute examination. It was a period of frenzied activity, of cut-throat competition, of sweat-shops, and of fraudulent business operations. It was not that the non-Jews in, for instance, the United States failed to attune themselves to the existing system. The greatest financial successes and business deals were often the work of non-Jews, but when the latter were involved it excited comment and aroused jealousy of a very different type from that which would have been noticeable had Jews been in the picture. Methods which, in the case of Gentiles, would have been passed over, were condemned when employed by Jews, who were accused of fraud and of smart, slick dealing. Men who failed to keep the pace, and who often faced bankruptcy and ruin, had to find excuses by which they could explain their lack of success to themselves and to their friends. It was the fault of the Jews, they declared. It was the Jews who controlled finance, who manipulated the Press, even if they did not own it, and who thus were able to influence public opinion. The frustration which such people felt when no success attended their efforts was turned outwards and was transformed into aggression.

It is here that the reader meets one of the most important factors in racial and colour prejudice. It is, however, more than that. Without some understanding and appreciation of the part played by frustration in modern societies much will

remain obscure and not easily explicable. By realizing the importance of frustration and its effects, not only on individuals, but on whole peoples, the reason for such movements as Fascism and anti-Semitism becomes clearer, and a flood of light is thrown upon certain aspects of Western civilization which, without this knowledge, would remain inexplicable.

It is often thought that many of the findings of what can be called analytical psychology are fanciful, far-fetched, and even nonsensical. Psychology itself is sometimes regarded as a kind of fad indulged in by long-haired professors with nothing better to do. It is true, I think, that some psychologists are to blame for this attitude on the part of certain sections of the public, since, in their efforts to appear erudite and academic, many of their productions are almost unreadable; while the more popular exponents are often prone to exaggerated statements and unwarranted inferences. Nevertheless, the fact remains that man, being a thinking animal, offers in his mental processes a field of study which can hardly be considered as of no importance and without interest. Such studies go behind the easily accepted explanations of why one man believes this and another man does that; they reveal the inner springs of faith and action, and thus are instrumental in understanding ourselves.

In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to describe many psychological phenomena in anything but what must be called figurative language. Such a method of speaking has always been found useful in science, and is almost essential when describing how something seems to occur in the field of mental activity. Now what do we mean when we speak of *frustration*? When a person is frustrated we immediately think of him as being thwarted, baffled, foiled, or balked. It is as if his efforts were *in vain* and without the desired results. This failure arouses, very naturally, the anger and irritation of the person in question, and with his rising temper he sometimes resorts to action, and at times to violent action. In order to offset his sense of helplessness and failure he tends to become aggressive and overbearing. Thus the very short man sometimes tends to make up his deficiency by a boastful and pushing behaviour which acts as a kind of mask to hide what he considers to be a weakness. Even the baby in the cradle kicks and screams if it be deprived of something it wants: in other words, it demonstrates its frustration by acting in an aggressive

manner. It will be seen from this last illustration that frustration begins early in life. Indeed, it is one of the many sufferings which are exacted from us in our cultural progress. Civilized man is a frustrated animal, and woman even more so. Is it very surprising, therefore, that we find aggression and aggressive tendencies manifesting themselves on every side?

When we are faced with the problem of aggression, either in individuals or in societies, it is always as well to try to discover if some form of frustration does not lie in the background. In the case of the Jews it is especially noticeable. Many of the accusations against them centre on such statements as that they are boastful, pushing, and aggressively self-confident. Is not this exactly what we should expect of a people who, for centuries, have been subject to persecution, discrimination, and segregation, and who in many cases, although not to the same extent as the Negroes, bear the marks of their origin either in personal appearance, social customs, or name? They tend to be watchful, suspicious, and on guard; they scent an insult where none is intended; failure to obtain some coveted position may easily be ascribed by them to anti-Semitic prejudice, and so their hostility may be intensified towards the people around them. Thus they tend to stick together and to act in concert; and, in order to offset what they consider to be unfair treatment, they are inclined to become overbearing and pushful, in this way increasing the dislike and antipathy to which these tendencies give rise.

At one period of my life I found myself engaged on a detailed study of certain forms of espionage and subversive activity. Much of my attention was directed towards an examination of the mental make-up of what can be called the "subversive agent"; that is to say, a man or woman who is engaged in activities deemed unpatriotic, or even treasonable, by the authorities in power. It was my task to examine the lives of these people and to try to determine the sources of their actions and ideas, and to discover whether it were possible to detect the seeds of subversive activity in people who were not at the moment accused or suspected of any such propaganda or dubious dealings. Many of the dossiers which came before me showed quite clearly that among much political intrigue and semi-treasonable activity these persons, in a considerable percentage of cases, exhibited a high degree of anti-Semitism, colour prejudice, and an almost morbid sense of their own

importance. On looking farther into their past it was evident that in numerous cases they had suffered severe frustration. They had had many jobs and lost them; bankruptcies and financial failures dogged their footsteps; their books did not sell and their articles came back from the leading magazines accompanied by rejection slips. Since it seemed as if they were spurned by society, their aggressive tendencies became directed against society; refusing to accept their failures as due to their own inadequacy, they tried to find external causes for their misfortunes and, as is so often the case, fastened upon those elements of society which had already incurred enmity and suspicion. Thus it was the Jews who were at the bottom of their trouble; the Jews took, by guile and fraud, those jobs which rightly should have been theirs. Was it not well known that the Jews controlled the Press, the cinema, and the financial houses of the nation? It was thus that these frustrated people argued and discussed their position with their friends; they began to run their own journals and their own organizations. They became anti-Semites, and their anti-Semitism tended to get them involved with the avowed enemies of their country. Their frustration had turned outwards, and they had become aggressive: from social and commercial failures they had become leaders of queer societies and cults, and their revenge on the society which had spurned them led not only to the discovery of a convenient scapegoat on which they could vent their spleen, but even to treasonable dealings with persons who could only be classified with spies in the service of a foreign Power. It was not for nothing that Dr. Goebbels's propaganda machine made such use of anti-Semitism. He understood the workings of the human mind: he was a good psychologist.

In the above brief sketch of some of the reasons for anti-Semitism we have seen how diverse may be the elements which can become foci from which anti-Semitic prejudice may spring. There is no one simple reason for anti-Semitism, any more than there is for colour prejudice. The motives which actuate human beings are many; they depend on early education, subsequent upbringing, and the events and incidents which make up each individual life. It is a mistake to generalize and to think that, when dealing with these complex phenomena, the reasons for them are to be found in some clear-cut and definite set of principles or conditions. Moreover, some of the more basic reasons which influence violent anti-Semites

are due, as we have noted, not to logical processes of thought, but to the impelling drive of frustrated impulses which, turned outwards, are transformed into aggressive actions directed towards some convenient group. Such sentiments and tendencies are not based on reason any more than the action of the child who kicks the door as a means of working off a fit of passion which originally was in no way connected with that inoffensive object. Similarly, attempts have been made to explain anti-Semitism through the theories that, since the Jews crucified Jesus, their action made them for ever accursed; or that the hatred of the Jews is really due to the belief that the Jews are the spawn of Satan, bent upon the destruction of Christianity and employing all the apparatus of hell, from sorcery and magic to poison and murder. These ideas are connected with another theory which hazards the guess that hatred of the Jews, and with it anti-Semitism in general, is really a mask behind which is a hatred of Christianity and its ethical and moral code. According to this theory Moses was the man who made the Jews what they are by giving to them a religion which made them feel that they were superior to all other peoples. God had made them his Chosen People; they were the people above all who were favoured by the King of Heaven. Moreover, since Christianity is so closely linked with Judaism it is assumed that the hatred of one is transformed into hatred of the other. Openly to express hatred of Christianity in a civilization purporting to be founded upon its teaching is thought to be so difficult and delicate that it is assumed that this antipathy is concealed beneath an open hatred of Judaism, which thus becomes a substitute for an unconscious, or even conscious, loathing of Christian principles and the restrictions and limitations which belong to Christian teachings.

This is not the place to discuss or criticize these theories in any detail. But it may be said that some of them seem to me to be open to grave doubt, although certain elements in them may be detected in the actions and utterances of certain anti-Semites. On the other hand, it may well be that jealousy plays a larger part in hatred of the Jews than is usually supposed; and there is some reason to think that these envious feelings are not only directed towards Jews who have been successful in commerce or finance, but are also at times derived from sexual sources. The charge of sensuality and success in sexual

achievement has for long been levelled against the Jews, and the fertility of their women has been imagined as lending weight to these ideas. The practice of circumcision, moreover, is popularly supposed to be connected with the sexual successes which they are believed to achieve, and the combination of these circumstances has led to a certain jealousy on the part of non-Jews—especially men—who have not been conspicuously successful in affairs of the heart. Students of anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany will doubtless recall many facts which will support this suggestion, and we shall find, as we pursue our study of racial and colour prejudice, that the factor of sex is one of the most important components in its make-up.

In this connection it may be of interest and value to digress a moment to consider the persecution of the early Mormons in the United States. This religious organization, of which the correct title is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, was founded in the State of New York as the result of a series of visions which one Joseph Smith (1805–1844) claimed to have experienced about 1820. His following increased rapidly, but in the course of their teaching and practice they came up against many opponents and were driven from one place to another. The history of their wanderings and of their courage and steadfast adherence to their principles makes one of the most striking stories in American history. To follow their trek from Illinois to Utah, where, in 1847, they founded Salt Lake City, is to live with a company of men, women, and children who will always be remembered when records of human fortitude, pluck, and intrepid spirit are discussed. Hundreds died from starvation and exposure; they became the prey to epidemics and the assaults of Indians. But few of them wavered; they kept on, and finally reached their goal, where they hoped to be allowed to live in peace and preserve their customs and way of life.

Now when the word *Mormon* is mentioned, many people think at once of another word—*polygamy*. It is true that in 1843 Joseph Smith the elder declared that he had had a revelation which sanctioned and enjoined what was called plural or celestial marriage; and the reasons which made him do this are of great interest to the student of abnormal psychology. What is important for our present purpose is to see how the later course of Federal resistance to the Mormons was concentrated around the question of polygamy. The wild mobs

who beat them up, tarred and feathered the leaders, and generally displayed the most astonishing lack of Christian virtue, could hardly be supposed to have been aroused to this state of feverish excitement were it not for some very deep emotional urge which prompted them to action. Indeed, many non-Mormons came to Salt Lake City in order to take advantage of what they thought were the easy morals of its citizens, only to find that plural marriage was very different from what they had imagined. What, then, prompted men and women, in places far remote from Salt Lake, to these wild outbursts of hatred? Is it not most probable that one potent cause of their frenzy was *simple, downright jealousy*? Might they not have been envious of a group which, under what they may have supposed to have been religious hypocrisy, openly practised, not only what many of them wanted to do themselves, but what some of them actually did without the sanction of either religion or law? Indeed, there seems some reason to believe that Mormon women were accustomed to think that Gentile women were jealous of them, and defended their own position whilst attacking the polyandry which they declared was not unknown in Washington or New York. In addition, they were naturally not at all anxious for their way of life to be made illegal and for 20,000 wives to be declared "mistresses," and their children to be branded as bastards.

The horrific tales brought back by travellers merely served to whet the appetites of Gentile inquirers. Yet the facts as recorded by reliable observers like Sir Richard Burton did little to assure future visitors that the alleged joys of Mormonism would counterbalance the strict rule of life enjoined upon the Saints. For, from these accounts, a life of unrestrained licence and gaiety was the last thing to be expected; and the trials of celestial marriage hardly compensated for the moments of pleasure. A rigid Old Testament morality was not one which would appeal for long to persons who found themselves fettered and restrained by the moral and legal obligations which, except as regards plural marriage, were not lacking in Salt Lake City. One aspect of this pertinacity in following Old Testament teaching is of some interest to us in our present discussion. Although the Latter-day Saints welcomed nearly every people in the world, Negroes were excluded and severe penalties were inflicted upon mixing the blood of Shem and Japhet with the race of Ham, which was for ever accursed.

Brigham Young, the Mormon leader, thought that the descendants of Canaan were clearly the Negroes. Canaan was Ham's son, and his darkness was a curse put upon his skin by God himself. It is said that in the early days one Negro only was admitted into the Church, and that one was by an act of the Founder, Joseph Smith. His successor, Young, was content to wait until God had removed the curse from the Negro peoples. Here is a case where colour prejudice was based, it would seem, almost wholly upon what was believed to be religious teaching.[1]

This exclusion of the Negro was one of the few serious restrictive measures enforced by the early Mormons. The Church tolerated dissent and discussion; anti-Mormon literature was circulated in Salt Lake City; the convert merely added the new revelation to his other beliefs. Few Churches have ever been so tolerant, yet persecution followed them wherever they went. When, in 1896, plural marriage was declared illegal, molestation ceased. Here and there incidents caused a momentary flare-up, but systematic baiting was over. The Mormons at last conformed to popular clamour. Indeed, in November 1943 the fifth ranking member of the Council, seventy-two-year-old Richard R. Lyman, was excommunicated for an alleged violation of the " Christian law of chastity." And in April 1944 the old custom of plural marriage within a sect was again before the courts, and again the women concerned defended their position. One declared that her husband had as many wives as he could count on his fingers. No woman ever had so loving a husband. He neither drank, smoked, nor used profane language. In fact he was, it seems, a Mormon of the old school.

I have purposely digressed to comment upon the persecution of the Mormons in order again to draw attention to one factor in racial and colour prejudice which, I believe, should be credited with far more weight than it has hitherto received. That factor is, of course, *jealousy*. If it be true that jealousy contributes to prejudice, then it is not in the least curious that it has been under-emphasized. Although we are jealous, we do not care to exhibit it.

> " Yet he was jealous, though he did not show it,
> For jealousy dislikes the world to know it,"

[1] Membership of the Church is now open to all, regardless of colour.

said Byron, in *Don Juan*, and many a jealous person conceals his feelings beneath a mask of righteous indignation or derogatory criticism.

This tentative submission that both anti-Semitism and colour prejudice may be due partially to jealousy of Jews and Negroes will probably be brushed aside as so unlikely and improbable as to be beneath discussion. Yet the very energy with which the proposition is turned down may serve to make the careful student look a little more closely. For envy and jealousy (which are near akin) are not features which we would willingly impute to ourselves. It is well known that one of the main characteristics of the jealous person is that he distorts the facts; that he is unable to see things as they are; is suspicious of trifles; catches at every straw that blows; sees hostile intentions in innocent acts; and malevolently and cruelly pursues the object of his feelings. Now the person against whom jealousy is directed is hated, not only because he has something which is wanted by his detractor, but also because the fact that he has it is construed as a suggestion of the inferiority of the one who envies him. If we look, therefore, for signs of jealousy in the literature of anti-Semitism, we shall, I think, find far more than we at first expected. As has been said above, the anti-Semite is very often a person who has been a social failure from the worldly point of view He feels his inferiority and lack of success, but self-esteem compels him to excuse himself on the grounds of external circumstances which he cannot control. Jealous of others whom he thinks have succeeded at his own expense, he directs his jealousy against them; and from, perhaps, jealousy of an individual he projects his feelings on to the group to which the individual belongs. It is sometimes thought that Hitler's anti-Semitism may have arisen partly from the fact (or supposed fact) that a woman to whom he was attached forsook him for a Jewish admirer. Instances of this kind are commonplace and illustrate the close connection between jealousy and sexual interests. Moreover, if we look at the more extreme examples of anti-Semitic literature we shall soon see the frequency with which charges of sexual delinquency are levelled against the Jews, and the repeated stories of the seduction of Gentile women by Jewish men. Indeed, the pages of *Der Stürmer*, the Nazi anti-Semitic paper, were so filled with the subject that many of the issues could be classed

only as pornographic literature. Somewhat similar material was issued in the Nazi *Das Rotbuch über Spanien* (The Red Book on Spain), which was published in 1937, and which stressed the part played by the Jews in the Spanish civil war.

In our discussion of the nature of colour prejudice we shall return to this question of the factor of jealousy as it is found to occur in open and in symbolic forms. It will suffice here to point out that *some* form of jealousy is at times clearly discernible among the elements which go to make up the general features of the psychology of the anti-Semite, and hence is a factor which must be taken into consideration. But it would be erroneous to suppose that it is the basic factor beneath all anti-Semitism. It is, I think, open to serious question if there be a basic factor. What lies at the bottom of the prejudice is rather a combination of historical, economic, religious, and psychological facts which, taken together, are found to fit into a pattern of which the Jews are the victims. In early days, before the dislike of the Jews was part of an organized and systematic movement, the basis of the feeling varied according to social, economic, and religious circumstances. Later it was found desirable to give *reasons* for the hatred. People living in modern civilized communities are not anxious to exhibit strong prejudices unless they can give what they think are valid reasons for them. They argue, indulge in controversy, make deductions, appeal to evidence, and quote documents and historical records. Thus we find that modern anti-Semitism is no longer just blind hatred. Even the ordinary person who " dislikes Jews " is not unwilling to give grounds for his dislike. A Jew has swindled him, or maybe has pushed his way in front of a queue, or has been suspected of or proved to have had dealings in the black market. In the case of the modern anti-Semite the reasons appear to be less personal and more theoretical. The enthusiasm which greeted the famous *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (afterwards shown to be worthless as evidence) indicated how desirous anti-Semites were to obtain documentary proof for their ideas. Indeed, in an anti-Semitic publication now before me it is actually stated that the claim of the Jews that the *Protocols* are forgeries is in itself an admission of their genuineness. To the pronounced anti-Semite there is a Hidden Hand which exerts its pernicious influence throughout the European continent; and he can quote diaries, statements in the Press, and documents from

Jewish sources to prove it. Very similar tactics are pursued to-day by those who call for a colour bar and who suffer from extreme colour prejudice. They are no longer willing merely to quote Scripture and to talk about the curse of Canaan. They have to try to prove, from historical and scientific sources, that their prejudice is supported by facts and by experiment.

In the case of the Jews, we find that in some important respects their own beliefs and actions excite feelings against them which are not always wholly unjustified. A people without a home, they exist everywhere as minorities, yet are knit together by religious or traditional customs which proclaim their exclusiveness and apparent refusal to assimilate. In this respect the Jews are their own enemies. They deplore being treated as aliens, yet at the same time reject full assimilation; abhorrent of racial prejudice when applied to themselves, they do not hesitate to regard others as their inferiors. Thus they exercise a kind of perpetual, but mild, irritant in every society into which they penetrate. Although Christianity itself arose from them, they stand apart, a constant reminder that even now the slayers of the Lord are still unrepentant. Whilst the unambitious poor are sunk in squalor, the more impatient and energetic among them climb upwards and onwards through those commercial, competitive channels where every man is for himself and where ethics are not those common in personal relations. Here again they incur the hostility of those with whom they are brought in contact. Their success excites jealousy and suspicion, and thus the enmity which, among ordinary citizens, might have been directed against the principal offender becomes directed against the whole group, and the charge that " Ben Cohen has swindled me " becomes changed to " the Jews have swindled me." Hardened by adversity and the dislike by which they are surrounded, they become bold and provocative. Their approach to women is often open and unrestrained, and success is not always lacking. This in itself excites the jealousy and rage of more sensitive and timid suitors, who on their part direct their feelings outwards against the Jews as a group. Once a dislike of " the Jews " is firmly embedded, hatred has to be supported by supposedly rational explanations and theories. It is at this stage that the man who " dislikes the Jews " is in danger of becoming an anti-Semite. He tends to be the victim of an organized and systematized hatred, and when under the influence

of his delusions is capable of exercising the most unpleasant manifestations under the guise of preserving national life or of keeping the racial blood pure from alien pollution, etc.

Anti-Semitism, therefore, is based upon a whole complex of circumstances, ideas, and psychological conflicts which are so closely woven into our whole social fabric that it is impossible to disentangle them. All we can do is to ponder upon the events of the last ten years and note to what tragedies the disease of anti-Semitism can lead. Eradicated in Nazi Germany, it will spring up elsewhere, for its roots lie embedded in the unconscious depths of the human mind. Anti-Semitism is both a disease itself and a symptom of disease. Where it flourishes, social institutions are likely to show decay and disintegration. With improvement in social conditions and education, together with a lessening of poverty and an increase of opportunity for all to fulfil the potentialities of their being, will come a decline in hatreds, and, with them, in anti-Semitism. Both Jew and Gentile will have their parts to play in working towards such a goal. The first primary need, however, is to try to understand how anti-Semitism works, and from what sources it derives its power and its malignity. It is hoped that the above brief discussion may help readers towards such an understanding.

CHAPTER V

COLOUR PREJUDICE AND THE COLOUR BAR

WE have now to consider, firstly in broad outline and later in somewhat greater detail, the nature of colour prejudice and its relation to what has been called the colour bar.

It will be remembered that in the case of antipathy towards Jews it was noted that this dislike could be found in two main forms. There were the people who simply " disliked Jews," and then there were those who not only disliked " the Jews," but who erected a complex theory about alleged Jewish aims and methods, of which they made use to buttress and justify their dislike. These, we decided, were victims to anti-Semitism, and many a man who openly professed to dislike Jews would be totally unable to describe even the basic tenets of the anti-Semite, and might even have to admit that he had never heard of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion.*

Now in those suffering from colour prejudice it may be said that, very broadly, we can find a similar dual division, and, just as in the case of Jew-haters, the one class may merge into the other. Thus, there are many people, both in this country and elsewhere, who know very little about racial theories, or inferiority as demonstrated by intelligence tests, or the alleged dangers of miscegenation, but who simply say that they do not like Negroes. How many times have I asked people of this sort to give their reasons, and how many times have I got this kind of answer: " Oh! well, I really don't know why I don't like them; I just don't like them." Or, if pressed still further, a man will say: " Well, I think they are all right as far as they go, and when they know their place and don't accost white women; but when they get above themselves, then I can't stand it. After all, Niggers should know their place." A woman, on the other hand, will speak rather differently. She will be vaguer, but it is usually clear that a kind of fear is uppermost in her mind. She may say that they smell badly and that their appearance makes her sometimes a little nervous. " After all, you never know what they are going to do, do you? " she will ask, and it is obvious that she is referring to possible sexual advances. She has heard the stories of rapes and deeds of violence, so that her attitude is inevitably influenced by them.

These are often people who have rarely come into contact with Negroes, but who have taken over what they think is the right kind of attitude towards people whom they have always been told to think are inferior to themselves.

Now let us take the case of people living in a different social setting. In some of our great ports, like Liverpool or Cardiff, there are areas which are occupied to a large extent by seamen of various nations and by the women with whom they live when on shore, and the children, many of them half-caste, who are the offspring of these unions. It may well happen that, as has actually been the case, white women working in the great factories situated in these ports have objected to the management taking on coloured women, or even half-caste workers, and one of the reasons may be that " they don't like Niggers." What, then, is the basis of dislike on the part of these factory workers? It is when we begin to attempt to answer a question like this that we can see how diverse must be the real reasons for colour prejudice, and how mistaken it would be to assume that there is any one basic reason which can be called dominant. This does not imply that, in the case of an individual person, his or her dislike may not be mainly due to one particular factor; what it suggests is that for colour prejudice as a whole the same thing holds good as for prejudice against the Jews—namely, that the dislike is due to a whole complex of circumstances, ideas, and psychological conflicts which are closely woven into the social fabric.

In the case of the factory workers who object to the presence of coloured workers, we have to consider, for example, why in some localities there are factories where coloured people are unwelcome, and others in which they are not. Now in large ports such as Liverpool and Cardiff the areas whence coloured workers might come are not considered what might be called " high-class." Rather are they thought to be low and rough, and the people living there are considered tough, not particularly clean, possibly dishonest, and certainly in many cases what polite society would call " immoral." However fantastic this opinion may be, as far as it concerns the Tiger Bay district, in Cardiff, there would seem some reason for the supposition that the girls in the local factories might object to the engagement of coloured or half-caste workers on the ground that they had no wish to mix with " that Tiger Bay crowd," since it might tend to lower their own social standard. This alone would be

sufficient to cause colour prejudice to arise, apart altogether from ideas that white workers might lose jobs to coloured ones, or that the introduction of coloured women into a mixed factory might tend to divert male attention to the newcomers. Here we can see how forms of colour prejudice can be engendered in a working-class population which knows nothing whatever of the theories and experiments with which people higher up in the social scale bolster up their own anti-colour point of view. There is, however, something more in it than that. We have to realize that, consciously or unconsciously, as the case may be, we are all influenced by the general picture of any particular country or people that is being continually presented to us. How many people, before the war, were apt to think of the United States as a country of film stars and gangsters, of millionaires and sky-scrapers! This false presentation was largely derived from the films and American news as selected for the British Press, and is only now becoming less influential owing to closer relations between British and American people. In the case of the black man the picture as usually presented is even more fantastic. It varies from a wild savage with cannibalistic tendencies, and brandishing a spear, to a comic clown or a " mammy," often dressed up as a cook, and used to advertise cereal preparations or washing-powders. Try as we may, it will be with great difficulty that we shall ever find black people being presented simply as *people* like ourselves, like ordinary men and women taking their part in daily life. When characters in a film or a story, Negroes are usually found in subordinate positions, such as porters or servants; and everything appears to be done to preserve that vicious tradition of master and servant which is the legacy that slavery has left behind. It is only when we turn to such admirable publications as the *Negro Digest* or *The Negro Caravan* that we can get away from this distorted picture of Negro life as presented to white readers, and have a look at the world through the eyes of educated and literary Negro writers.[1]

[1] Readers in Great Britain have but little idea of the amount of material of good literary quality which is being yearly contributed by Negroes in the United States. A list of Negro reporters, authors, and poets would be too long to include here, but as examples I would mention Mr. J. S. Redding's *No Day of Triumph* (New York, 1942), which gives a vivid and penetrating account of a journey in the Southern States; and as a specimen of vigorous and high-speed reporting, Mr. Roi Ottley's *New World A-Coming* (Boston, 1943).

It is on the framework of Negro life as presented by whites for whites that the ordinary person is apt to build his or her idea of black people in general. I remember that, many years ago, I was once taken as a child to see a show at, I think, the London Hippodrome, which had as its title, " Savage South Africa." Here we were treated to the usual spectacle of half-naked savages being mown down by rifle fire from amply armed British soldiers gaily clothed in scarlet and gold. I remember I loved it; and the picture of the sandy arena on which howling savages were falling has remained with me to this day. It was much later that I began to realize what harm such shows must do to children who, when they grow up, have little chance of revising the ideas implanted in their minds or of meeting the so-called " savage " face to face. Even if they were to do so, it might well be in some exhibition where some Negroes have been induced to show themselves in some " model village " or similar fake spectacle.

Apart from influences of this kind on our conception of black peoples and how they differ from ourselves, there are others of a subtler nature which we shall discuss more fully later. Here it will be convenient to note one factor which is, perhaps, more important than might appear at first sight. I refer to the use of the word *black*.

In English, and in other languages also, the word for *black* is often used to denote something sinister. It is also closely associated with the subject of death. Children are told that the *Black Man* will get them; we speak of the *Black Mass*, *Black Magic*, *Black Maria*, the *Black Death*, and we cannot forget such words as *blackmailer*, *blackguard*, and *black sheep*. Moreover, black is so often associated with dirt that such expressions as " Your hands are black " is quite a common way of saying that they are dirty. This idea of evil and dirt is, as it were, carried forward so that the notions get attached to persons and things. White is the colour (or rather the lack of it) which represents innocence, purity, and light; black absorbs and buries light, and thus it has been made to symbolize death, mourning, and humiliation. As Shakespeare says in *Love's Labour Lost* (Act IV, Scene 3):—

> . . . " black is the badge of hell,
> The hue of dungeons and the school of night."

It is a word which at once conjures up ideas of death and night,

of dirt and soot, and even of the impossibility of doing something which would be clearly desirable, such as is implied in the expression " to wash a blackamoor white."

This connection of the idea of black with colour prejudice and with the fear of coloured people is probably closer than many of us would care to admit. Although children show no fear of Negroes before such ideas and feelings have been instilled by their parents or teachers, they naturally notice the difference in skin colour and comment upon it. It is certainly odd that, if racial antipathies are as ingrained and deep-rooted as some people would have us believe, so many children become so deeply devoted to their coloured nurses that the memory of them remains with them all their lives.

As we have already indicated, the mere dislike of Negroes may be due to quite different causes, according to locality and social pattern. In Great Britain, where few Negroes live and where the colour bar is less obtrusive (though none the less efficient) than elsewhere, colour prejudice has tended to increase in the last fifty years. It is to be found not only in the upper social levels, where the term " nigger " is almost invariably used even by high-ranking officials, but also among the middle and lower classes, who tend to imitate the attitude of their superiors and thus regard the non-white peoples as innately inferior to themselves. Generally speaking, the attitude is one of a somewhat patronizing tolerance. As long as the Negro keeps within an invisible line over which he must not step, all is well. Open Jim Crow regulations would be impossible in England: what can and cannot be done is suggested by hints, rebuffs, and being made to feel what is permitted and what is not. Occasionally a Negro visitor may be refused at a hotel on the ground of objections raised by white visitors, but there are not very many restaurants in London which would refuse to serve a coloured visitor if he maintained the standard of dress and deportment expected in the establishment he patronized. The same might have been said of the ordinary commercial houses and businesses before the war of 1939. Since then, the advent of the Americans, especially those from the Southern States, has made many people in Great Britain colour-conscious to a degree unknown before their arrival. For in these Southern States, as we shall see later, colour prejudice is to be found in a more violent form than almost anywhere else in the world. The main reasons for it there are naturally

rather different from those operating in England, for, in addition to the factors outlined above, we have those arising within a society which exists under very different conditions from that in Great Britain. In the Southern States of North America the Negro population is large, and it must be remembered that Negroes were actually slaves in the United States up to 1865—less than one hundred years ago. Thus the tradition of slavery and the master–servant relationship influence nearly all transactions between white and black. Moreover, there are additional reasons for colour prejudice; for example, the fear on the part of the whites that, were the Negroes given equal civil and political rights, they would be able to control effectively certain areas; and also that, if they received equal and adequate technical training, they would compete with whites both in business and industry. Similarly, in the Union of South Africa, the main reason for the colour bar, apart altogether from the religious origins as seen in the Ham legend, is the fact that since the social economy of the Union is arranged for the profit of the few instead of for the good of the many, it is impossible to permit Africans to be trained to a stage of technical and industrial efficiency where they would compete with white labour. Further, owing to the great disparity in numbers between the European and the non-European population it is clear that the granting of any complete measures of political and social equality would mean the virtual control of affairs by the black majority—a prospect naturally not regarded with favour by the dominant white group. This point of view was forcibly put by General Smuts when the question of the rights of Indians to citizenship was being discussed at the Imperial Conference in 1923. After pointing out that, were an Indian franchise to be granted in Natal the Indians would have a voting majority, he went on to say that if equal suffrage were given to the Indians it would have to be given to the blacks, and " the whole position for which we have striven for two hundred years or more now would be given up " (See *The Times*, (London), November 2, 1923, p. 20). Very similar arguments were put forward for the policy of a " White Australia," concerning which we shall have more to say in another place. What we have to note here is again the effect of local traditions and conditions on the existence of colour prejudice, and with it the imposition of a colour bar. It is only in certain parts of the world that racial and colour bias is almost, but never quite,

unknown. Such countries as widely apart as the U.S.S.R. and Brazil exhibit these features, and the reasons for the absence of prejudice in these countries will help us to understand some of the more subtle factors which lie at the root of many of the more violent forms of colour antipathy in the Southern States of America and elsewhere. Even in Lourenço Marques (Portuguese East Africa) visitors from Johannesburg, not so many hundreds of miles to the west, are sometimes shocked by the way black persons sit in the hotels and make use of public facilities jealously guarded by the whites in the Transvaal.

Before dealing, however, with the psychological reasons for colour prejudice it will be well to take a brief survey of a few selected regions where the colour bar is in operation, as this will give us a clearer picture of what colour prejudice can do when it is harboured and supported.

CHAPTER VI

THE COLOUR BAR IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

IT may be as well to begin our brief account of how colour prejudice and the colour bar operate in selected areas by considering the situation in the United States of America. Here we shall find not only nearly all the elements which make for colour prejudice, be they religious, psychological, social, or economic, but also the results of that prejudice, and the bar consequent upon it, together with the effects on the white population.

It has now been admitted for many years that the Negro problem is *the* problem of the United States. Even in 1891 Mr. W. L. Clowes, whose articles in *The Times* of London were reprinted with much additional material under the title of *Black America*, declared that in his opinion the race question in the United States was " of towering importance " (p. 69). To-day the same opinion is held by all competent observers; and Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, probably one of the most objective of them, has recently characterized it as the " skeleton in the American closet," and the treatment of the Negro in the United States as " America's greatest and most conspicuous scandal." [1]

It is impossible to understand this state of affairs without glancing backwards into the historical setting of the early days of slavery. In 1760 the total population of the Southern colonies was reckoned as about 718,000, and of these, some 400,000 were Negro slaves. The tyranny that King Cotton exercised in the South (where a profitable economy arising from slave labour made the institution prized and even, as some thought, necessary) forced the controversy regarding slavery to become sectional rather than national; and the rise of the anti-slavery movement in the 1830's increased the bitterness and mutual recrimination. It must be remembered that the Declaration of Independence (1776) did not abolish slavery. The fact that " all men are created equal " was a truth held " to be self-evident "; but it was not immediately construed

[1] *An American Dilemma* (New York and London, 1944), II, 1,020, 1,040.

as a belief which automatically set the Negro free, although the first anti-slavery society had been established in Philadelphia the year before. It was only very gradually that the institution broke down under the pressure of public opinion, and later under even greater pressure. Thus, in Massachusetts it was abolished in 1780, eighty years before Lincoln was elected President and the devastating civil war had forced the issue leading to the Emancipation Proclamation of 1862, and almost total abolition in 1865. Thus one hundred and sixty-five years elapsed between the date when Samuel Sewall (1652–1730) published his tract called *The Selling of Joseph* (Boston, 1700) and abolition. Although the pamphlet was the first anti-slavery tract to be printed in America, the author had little doubts that the prospects for successful assimilation were poor. Negroes were so different that he thought that they " can never embody with us, and grow into orderly Families, to the Peopling of the Land: but still remain in our Body Politick as a kind of extravasat Blood." [1]

This idea was still further fructified by the religious and supposedly scientific teaching of the time. Even as late as 1883 Edward A. Freeman, the great English historian, in his book on some impressions of the United States, said that the Negro cannot be assimilated owing to the " eternal laws of nature, the eternal distinction of colour." The whole question of the possibility of assimilation, which is still being debated, was closely connected with those religious, anthropological, and psychological ideas which were current from the early nineteenth century onwards. It is interesting in this connection to recall the fact that Bishop Henri Grégoire of Blois (1750–1831) actually sent to Jefferson his famous book *De la Littérature des Nègres* (Paris, 1808) in order, apparently, to influence him on the side of a wider toleration. Grégoire, one of the most remarkable of the French revolutionary prelates, was noted for his sturdy adherence to the principles of liberty and justice. In sending Jefferson a copy of his book the Bishop acted just as a modern propagandist would have done; and it is noteworthy that, whilst Jefferson thanked him for sending the volume, he was not particularly impressed by it, for on October 8, 1809, we find him writing to the versatile Connecticut wit,

[1] Sewall's conclusions were vigorously opposed the year after by John Saffin in his *A Brief and Candid Answer to a Lately Printed Sheet . . .* (Boston, 1701).

Joel Barlow, and saying that Grégoire's credulity had made him collect every story he could find to prove his case. Jefferson's own views on the matter were naturally coloured by the prevailing tendencies. Whatever people might say of the intellectual capacity of the Negro, he said that " degrees of talent " were no measure of their rights, whilst at the same time maintaining that, as compared with white men, they were at least as brave and " more adventuresome." Indeed, he added, " Nature has done them justice in the endowments of the heart, if not the head." [1]

Towards the middle of the nineteenth century support for the views concerning Negro inferiority was provided from anthropological sources. Dr. Josiah Nott, the son of a Judge in South Carolina, collaborated with Dr. George R. Gliddon in compiling two volumes which became the Bible of the pluralists (who believed in the multiple origin of man) and the chief ethnological authority for those who supported slavery. In their *Types of Mankind* and *Indigenous Races of the Earth* (Philadelphia and London, 1854 and 1857) the two authors printed not only contributions from their own pens, but also material drawn from such well-known writers as Samuel Morton and Henry S. Patterson—a fact which led some reviewers to declare that the reputation of these gentlemen had suffered damage thereby. Thus, in 1854 the naturalist John Bachman printed a scathing attack upon the *Types of Mankind*, in which he again joined issue with those who supported the plural origin rather than the unity of all races. Similarly the London *Athenæum* (September 12, 1857, 1140), in reviewing the second work, dryly remarked that it was feared that " the cause of Ethnological science could not gain much thereby."

How far Nott and Gliddon were influenced by the work of Count J. A. de Gobineau, the French racial theorist and one of the real founders of the Nazi racial creed, is not easy to discover. There is no doubt that Nott corresponded with ethnologists abroad, and it is quite possible that he exchanged notes with Gobineau on the subject which formed a bond of mutual interest. Gobineau's book on the inequality of human races was published in Paris in four volumes, from 1853 to 1855, so it is perhaps possible that Nott and Gliddon might have seen the earlier volumes. What is certain, however, is that in 1857 Nott contributed an appendix to the 1856 translation of Volume I

[1] See T. Jefferson, *Writings* (Washington, 1853–4), V, 429, 380 ff., 475.

of Gobineau's work, in which Nott again set forth what he claimed to be the " latest scientific facts bearing upon the question of the Unity or Plurality of Species." This connection between Nott, Gliddon, and Gobineau is especially interesting when it is remembered how important their contributions were to racial thought in the United States and in Germany. Although the part played by Nott and Gliddon in the formation of colour prejudice is now nearly forgotten, the danger inherent in such theories can scarcely escape attention when it is remembered how prominent the role of Gobineau, and his disciple Houston Stewart Chamberlain, was in the formation of Nazi racial ideology and its truly horrific results.

These excursions into a kind of Biblical ethnology were not without their effects upon two schools of thought regarding the Negro. Nott himself had endeavoured to show the connection between the Biblical and the physical history of man five years before *Types of Mankind* was published; and thus the pious religious believer supported his faith by what purported to be the latest conclusions of science, whilst the more sophisticated were glad to find their prejudices buttressed by a correct interpretation of Holy Writ. Controversy raged as to the question of the precise ethnological status of the Negro. Was he of the Adamic Race, and did he descend from Ham? What was his relation, if any, to the white man? Back and forth went the arguments, and they seemed still to excite some interest at the dawn of the twentieth century. For in 1900 Charles Carroll published his famous book *The Negro a Beast*, and twenty-three years later A. S. Leecraft published a further addition in his " *The Devil's Inkwell.*" *A Story of humanity, embracing Biblical evidence establishing the everlasting, irrefutable and utter supremacy of the white man on the earth since the beginning of historical time* (Houston, Texas, 1923).

In his interesting account of a journey through the slave States J. S. Buckingham, in 1842, discussed these religious views with some objectivity, and noted how the theory that the Negro was " the great beast of the Apocalypse " was held in the more simple areas of the South. Nearly twenty years later others were still talking in a similar vein, as, for example, Dr. A. S. Cartwright, a student of the effect of alcohol on the Negro, who thought that the talking serpent in the Garden of Eden was really a Negro—an idea which seemed connected with the Rev. Adam Clarke's notion that the serpent was not a snake,

but a " creature of the *ape* or *ouran outang* kind " (*Commentary on Gen. III*, London, 1825).

These arguments, which to-day seem to be merely of academic interest, are of some importance, since they illustrate the process of how that dilemma was formed which still confronts American society and its treatment of the Negro. Appeals to Scripture and the claims of an ill-digested ethnology can sometimes be regarded as methods for appeasing a guilty conscience. If a man sincerely believed that Negroes were subhuman, or, as Hitler has it, " half-ape," then they could not possess any of the rights accorded to human beings, but could be treated as chattels or as domestic animals. It was thus that any erudite arguments which supported the view of the Negro's lowly status were greeted with a joyful acceptance. Precisely the same feelings were aroused when the story of Ham was quoted as proving the reality of " The Curse." Moreover, as the years went by and fanciful Biblical interpretations faded, and scientific inquiry began to explode the earlier ethnological theories, so we can see, with the growing embarrassment inherent in the dilemma, further frantic attempts to prove the innate inferiority of the Negro peoples. Many of the papers on the Negro's brain, on mental differences between white and black, and on intelligence-testing of white and coloured children, are of this type. They are the modern counterparts of the earlier theses which have been briefly mentioned above, and with the failure of their arguments the dilemma ever grows more obvious and more difficult to surmount.

It was natural that the South, dominated as it was by a master class in which burned a fanatical Protestant zeal, should exhibit this dilemma in its most acute form. But not only on the Negro question was the South divided. It was not that the Southerner was a hypocrite and a conscious deceiver. Far from it. According to his lights he was sincere, honest, and well-meaning. The dilemma that confronted him in his relations with the Negro was intensified by the dilemma which harassed his whole attitude to life in general. It was as if the luminous haze of the Southern atmosphere had entered his mind and rendered everything vague, blurred, and indistinct. His was a mind divided against itself; it was just as if he lived in two worlds. In many respects he was, as we say to-day, nearly schizophrenic. The very conditions under which he lived made such tendencies practically unavoidable. His religious

inheritance of rigid Protestant dogmatism was supposed to blend, not only with a frontier mentality, but with all the temptations of life in a country where the sun by day, and the moon by night, seemed almost to be deliberately calculated to bring about his downfall. Life on the plantations was a continual test; and it was a test to which flesh and blood, least of all Southern flesh and blood, could hardly submit and come out unscathed. Colour prejudice and arguments about Ham were forgotten when the moon rose and hung like a great Chinese lantern over the cotton-fields. The Negro woman was not only complaisant; she was free from that ever-present sense of guilt and sin which still permeates all American society. Thus she offered a contrast to the white woman of the South, who was thereupon raised on a pinnacle and presented to the world as the perfect example of ice-cold chastity, purity, and innocence. The result of this gynæcolatry was (and is still) catastrophic. For the terrible frustration which the Southern woman suffered was turned outward and became aggressive, and her aggression was directed quite simply and naturally against those whom she believed were partly responsible. It is thus that we find that the whole question of colour prejudice in the South revolves around the sexual question. The ever-present thought of rapes; the eternal question as to whether one wants one's daughter to marry a Negro; the marked sadistic elements in certain lynchings; the growing jealousies and rivalries which are beginning to spring up—all these, to the student of abnormal psychology, are unmistakable pointers towards what J. W. Johnson has called " the core of the heart of the American race problem." [1]

In the South, sex, as Gunnar Myrdal has put it, is nothing less than an obsession; but he need not have limited his judgment to the South alone. Sex dominates life in the United States in a manner and in a way which is found nowhere else in the world. Without a full appreciation of its influence and its results, no elucidation of the Negro problem is possible; or indeed any true understanding of some of the basic problems confronting American society. The attitude towards love and sex in the United States is nothing else than the tragedy of a frustrated people.[2]

[1] *Along this Way* (New York, 1933, p. 170) and (London, Penguin ed. 1941, p. 80).

[2] I hope, shortly, to deal with this question in detail (with full docu-

In the South, therefore, we find a credo based upon certain premises which hardly admit of rational discussion. When Abraham Lincoln was confronted with the supposedly unanswerable question of the Negro and miscegenation, he protested, "now and for ever," against what he called "that counterfeit logic which presumes that, if I do not want a Negro woman for a slave, I do necessarily want her for a wife." [1]

But such arguments and replies are of no avail. Colour prejudice, as must now be sufficiently clear, is not a rational belief. It is something already *pre-judged*; it arises partly from the unconscious, and when brought into consciousness appears in fantastic and distorted forms, just as we have seen to be the case with anti-Semitism. Thus, in the credo of the South, on which the colour bar is based, we find certain fundamental assumptions on which theory and practice are built. Very briefly its essentials are these. God has so arranged mankind that the white-skinned peoples are for ever to be dominant. The Negro is innately inferior—or, as J. K. Vardaman put it, "God Almighty created the Negro for a menial" [2]—and so political and social equality are alike impossible. If Negroes are to receive literary, industrial, or technical education, then that education must be so arranged and devised that its results will be of benefit to the whites as well as to the blacks; but, at the same time, the status of the best-educated coloured man must always be lower than that of the worst-educated white. Voting privileges must be severely curtailed in order to avoid the danger of a black majority swamping any particular area. Yankee meddling is to be resisted, since it is the South which is confronted by the Negro problem; and it is the South which understands the Negro, loves him, and keeps him in his place.

Such, in essence, are the foundation-stones on which the Southern view of the Negro and his position in society are built. Merely to condemn and ridicule such ideas is a profound mistake. They are the honest and sincere opinions of men and women who believe that any tendencies towards the views held

---

mentation from the seventeenth century to the present day) in a forthcoming volume on *The American Woman: Her Place in the Culture of the United States.*

[1] Reply to Judge Douglas at Chicago, July 10, 1858.

[2] Quoted by V. Dabney in his *Liberalism in the South* (Chapel Hill, 1932), p. 239.

in the North and East would be disastrous to the way of life they cherish and hold dear. They cannot help noticing that ideas about possible political and social equality with the Negroes are often accompanied by other ideas concerning religious and social questions which would be characterized in the South as verging on Atheism and "Red Communism." The opposition to the teaching of evolution belongs to the same pattern. The South is full of fear and frustrated desires: regarded as a psychologist would regard his patient, the South is very sick. Even the collapse of cotton, and the great slump, were sufficient only to jolt it. Something even more radical in the way of shock therapy would be wanted to rouse the South from its romantic dreams and pave the way for its own material and spiritual regeneration. In the meantime facts have to be faced as they are; and as long as the South, and the rest of the United States for that matter, hold the views they do on the question of the Negro, so long will a colour bar be essential. Without it the things most feared in the South might come to pass. Segregation, which is naturally more clearly defined in the South than in the North, is one means by which the Negro can be kept at a distance. In the North and East it is less evident; but it must be remembered that Negroes, like other minority groups, tend to draw together, and so we have such localities as Harlem, in New York City, and the Black Belts of the other large Northern and Middle Western cities. Broadly, the great difference between the South and the North is that, in the South, segregation, discrimination and other social regulations are an integral part of the legal system of the States, whilst in the North and East these rules and attitudes are to a certain extent tacitly accepted and understood by both whites and blacks. Thus, in places like New York and Chicago, Negroes rarely attempt to enter well-known and expensive hotels and restaurants, especially those which cater for transients and tourists, and are known to be patronized by visitors from the South. Although in States like Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, appeal might be made to the Civil Rights Acts, which prohibit certain kinds of discrimination [1] in accommodation, the methods employed by hotelkeepers and restaurateurs are such that it is difficult to base any case upon their action. It is true that such cases are brought

[1] Discrimination in employment was prohibited in New York State by a Bill enacted in March, 1945.

to the courts, but they are rare. In a recent instance which was before the court in January 1944, an international representative of the United Automobile Workers (a Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate) brought a complaint that, as a Negro, he was refused accommodation at the Knickerbocker Hotel, 10 West 45th St., New York City. In Special Sessions, on January 12, the assistant-manager of the hotel was found guilty, and a fine of $100 or thirty days imprisonment was imposed. According to Justice N. D. Periman it was the first decision of this kind ever made in New York City. Generally speaking, however, blank refusals are not given. In the South a Negro applicant might be kicked into the street; in the North he is simply told that there are no rooms. He understands what this means: word goes round, and few further attempts at that hotel are made. Similarly in restaurants, the Negro, if not wanted, is made to feel that he is unwelcome by numerous hints, some of which are unmistakable. Thus, he is kept waiting for an inordinate time; prices on the menu are mysteriously raised; or when food is served it is uneatable. Racial and colour barriers may be less visible in the North, but they exist; they may shift their position or become more shadowy at one point whilst becoming more solid at another; but they never quite disappear. Few are the Negroes who can " pass " as white. It is done; but, generally speaking, the colour of the Negro and the type of his hair give him away. He is *different*; and his difference is one which is not easily eradicated. Moreover, evidence is accumulating that in many cases Negroes do not want to be made white by artificial aids. Certainly when I was last in Harlem, the number of dekinking advertisements seemed as great as ever, but preparations for skin-bleaching are no longer regarded with the same interest.[1] Indeed, when in 1943 Dr. Louis Schwartz announced that he had a chemical that would turn the skin of Negroes white, he stated that he could not find one who was willing to try a crucial experiment. They all said that they were born with a black skin " and intended to remain that way," he reported during the discussion

[1] Dekinking advertisements are not confined to the Negro press. The " Hair-Strate Salon " in B—— advertises in the New York *Daily News*, and in one treatment is said permanently to straighten kinky hair, giving " amazing results on most stubborn kinks." The effect is said, by the owner of the salon, to last one year and to be inexpensive. The Queen of Dekinkers was, of course, Madame C. J. Walker, who died a millionaire.

that followed his address at the Pennsylvania State Medical Society.[1]

It must not be imagined that the Negroes are the only group in the United States who are clearly recognizable as belonging to the non-white majority. Although they form the largest group (over 12,865,000), the Japanese number some 127,000, the Chinese 77,500, and the Filipinos 45,500. It is true that many descendants of quite recent immigrants like to think of themselves as 100 per cent. Americans; but it must be remembered that, of the twelve million Negroes, at least 97 per cent. are of purely native parentage, whilst the American Indians, who are scarcely regarded as Americans, are not immigrants at all in the ordinary sense of that word. As concerns population growth, there seems to be some evidence to the effect that the Negroes are increasing more rapidly than the whites, although recent figures indicate that the Negro birth-rate is falling in the urban areas. However this may be, it is largely a long-term problem, and need not be discussed here. It is with the colour bar as seen in the United States that we have now to deal.

Before describing the results of the colour bar, and how it affects the Negro population, it may be as well again to emphasize some of the more important factors outlined above as regards the Southern States. The Negroes are the descendants of slaves, and thus the old relationship as between master and servant still survives in the South, together with all those subtle factors that were implied in that relationship. Moreover, the sexual aspects of the question, and the American view as to the position of woman generally, made—and still make—the position in the Southern States much more delicate than in any other parts of the United States; and the views of the political leaders of the South, together with those of some of the more prominent white citizens, possess a somewhat disproportionate influence when we consider their principles and educational background. The South, in many respects, is inclined to be somewhat primitive and insular; and the people look back to the times when they were not confronted with the hard problems which are now clamouring for solution, many still thinking that these are best solved by simple methods of rough justice and summary decisions, in spite of the fact that such an approach is now completely out-of-date.

[1] See the London *Evening Standard*, November 16, 1943, and *cf.* the Washington *Times-Herald*, October 9, 1943.

In the old slavery days racial discrimination was hardly a problem in the modern sense. The two peoples were too far apart from the social point of view, separated as they were by that gulf which divided the free from the slave. As we have seen, concubinage between white men and coloured women must have been prevalent to some extent, as the Census enumeration of mulattoes indicates. Although no attempt is made to-day by the Census authorities to estimate the number of mulattoes in the United States, earlier figures give some rough indication as to their numbers. Thus, in 1850 11·2 per cent. of the Negro population were recorded as being mulatto; this rising to 15·2 per cent. in 1890, and 20·9 per cent. in 1910; after which, separate enumeration ceased. Although some of the plantation rules and manuals expressly discouraged such concubinage, it was probably more common than is usually admitted, and was based not only upon natural desire, but also upon the fact that the breeding of slaves had an economic value. Anyway, no rigid, legal colour bars had then been erected, since they were there already as part of the social pattern of the times.

After the Civil War, when the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments [1] seemed to guarantee freedom and lack of discrimination in civil and political rights and the privileges of voting, it was clear that the whole structure of Southern society was on the verge of cracking. In the so-called " Reconstruction " period, when ignorant Negroes, manipulated by Northern adventurers of unscrupulous and corrupt antecedents, brought home to the South what might be expected from Negro carpet-bag rule, the decision to re-establish and preserve white supremacy was naturally strengthened. Once control was regained, there began that long series of measures designed to evade the legal decrees which conferred freedom and civic rights upon the Negro. By a wily interpretation, and the quick seizure of points omitted in the various amendments, the rights and voting privileges nominally possessed by Negroes became more or less dead letters, and thus began that period of legal and social discrimination which still exists in the Southern States. The so-called Jim Crow laws—whereby dis-

[1] The Thirteenth Amendment (adopted 1865) abolished slavery; the Fourteenth (1868) dealt with the protection of freedmen; and the Fifteenth (1870) declared that race and colour should not be a bar to the suffrage.

crimination was effected in hotels, travelling accommodation, and places of entertainment and recreation—became established; for it was argued that the *separation* of black from white could not be regarded as *discrimination* as long as the alternatives offered were equally good. This interpretation, which was upheld by the Supreme Court, made Jim Crowism an established feature of Southern life; and since the alternatives were rarely equal to what was provided for the white population, the system became a standing source of irritation and resentment among the coloured people. At the same time it served as an unpleasant reminder to the whites that they had failed to live up to American democratic ideals, which in itself produced a feeling of guilt and uneasiness of conscience—of which the results were, as might have been expected, acts of still further oppression and social ostracism.

In the above few paragraphs are sketched, in barest outline, the nature of the setting out of which discrimination in the South grew up, developed, and is now showing signs of partial disintegration. Let us now glance at some examples of how discrimination in the South has affected the Negro in his business and social relations, and compare it with that meted out to him in other districts to which he migrated, hoping for relief and a better standard of living.

In the old days of slavery the economic status of the Negro was based upon a certain kind of security that it has since lacked. It was to the plantation-owners' interest to see that his slaves were healthy and well fed; and their "poor white" neighbours envied them their material condition, just as the slaves envied them the freedom due to the possession of a white skin. Moreover, in the urban districts the Negro slave artisans found themselves in a position in which they were beginning to compete with white workers; and in some districts their success led to legislation with the object of limiting it.

In the North, where anti-slavery sentiment predominated, a new factor of considerable importance was emerging. Socialistic theories, sponsored by working-class movements (in which German organized workers played a leading part), led to agitation which not only condemned slavery in the case of the blacks, but also what was thought to be the wage slavery of the white workers; and this in turn led to the growing power of organized white labour, which gradually became exclusive when

the possibility of serious Negro competition was envisaged. This competition was at first felt most keenly in those trades, such as building, in which the Negroes were already skilled before they were freed. Thus arose the struggle in the labour unions on the question of how far these organizations were to be of mixed membership, or whether some unions were to be reserved exclusively for white, and others for black workers. It is here that we can see how discrimination and segregation arose almost entirely from purely economic causes, untinged, except perhaps superficially, by the basic psychological factors underlying other kinds of racial prejudice.

The early history of the struggle for the recognition of Negroes by the Trade Unions need not detain us here. At this point we are mainly concerned with the question of how far the existence of colour prejudice affected Negro oppression and how it operated when it was present.

Until comparatively recently Negroes were excluded from some twenty-five national and international labour unions; whilst in other cases exclusion was attained by methods through which the difficulties of membership were made almost insuperable. Although the American Federation of Labor (the A.F.L.) expressed the view, as early as 1890, that Unions should not exclude coloured persons from membership, it was the rise of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (the C.I.O.) that gave the Negroes new hope. The C.I.O. early showed its opposition to any discrimination based upon colour; and today the Negro membership is well over the 100,000 mark. Indeed, in some of the admirably designed propaganda posters which were used by the C.I.O. Political Action Committee for the 1944 Presidential election, Negro workers are shown side by side with whites—a fact which illustrates the general point of view now adopted by the C.I.O.

On the other hand, there are also independent Negro unions, among which the most important is the Brotherhood of Sleeping-Car Porters, which for some time has been under the able management of Mr. A. Philip Randolph, who organized the proposed March on Washington, in January 1941, in order to discuss with the Administration the whole question of racial discrimination in the war factories.

With the outbreak of war at Pearl Harbor, and the intensification of the American armament drive, the position of the Negro in relation to the war industries became crucial. When

Randolph called off his proposed March on Washington, his action was influenced by the decision of the President to issue an Executive Order followed by an intragovernmental letter in which some practices leading to Negro discrimination were abolished. The fact that on January 25, 1941, the President issued this Executive Order on Negroes was made an historic occasion, since it was the second, concerning Negroes, ever issued by a President of the United States; the first being the famous Emancipation Proclamation which, in preliminary form, was issued by Abraham Lincoln in September 1862.

Following the issue of the Executive Order came the formation of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice (the F.E.P.C.), which was later placed under the control of the War Man-power Commission, and later still was made partially independent. At the start the Committee had, as Chairman, Mark Ethridge, former publisher from Louisiana, and a man of liberal tendencies; and among the members were William Green, President of the A.F.L., together with two Negro members, Earl Dickerson, a Chicago attorney, and Milton Webster, Vice-President of Philip Randolph's Brotherhood of Sleeping-Car Porters.

The Committee has been deluged with complaints from various quarters, and in a considerable number of cases the firms concerned have agreed, at least in principle, to the abolition of the practice of discrimination in their factories. Thus the Vultee Aircraft Inc., in January 1943, is stated to have accepted the directions; and a similar decision was arrived at by the Capital Transit Co. of Washington, D.C., a month earlier. At one time it was thought that the Committee would not dare to despatch its members for an investigation in the South; and the anti-Negro Press was not pleased when an inquiry was started in Birmingham, Alabama. Indeed, one of the Southern papers announced in sneering tones that a " bunch of snoopers " was coming along to determine whether the " South was doing right by Little Sambo." [1]

The decision to appoint the F.E.P.C. was dictated by a number of cases where discrimination against Negroes had been reported. For example, charges were made against the Warner & Swasey Co., turret lathe manufacturers. In testifying for the defence against the charge, the President of the concern said that he had no prejudice against Negroes, but that the

[1] The Gadsden (Ala.) *Times*, June 16, 1942.

A.F.L. Machinists' Union would not permit the firm to engage Negroes for other than unskilled jobs. With regard to Negro women, the President stated that, if these were engaged, a number of white women would leave. Another case concerned the Thompson Products Co., with which was affiliated the Government-financed Thompson Aircraft Products Co., headed by Mr. Frederick Crawford, one-time President of the National Union of Manufacturers. In another instance, in 1942, more than 300 Negroes took part in a demonstration around the plant of the Carter Carburetor Corporation of St. Louis. The demonstration was organized by the March on Washington Committee, and placards were tied around the bodies of the marchers with such slogans as "Racial Discrimination is Sabotage," "Barring Negroes from War Industries Makes Axis Propaganda," or "Let's Practise Democracy as we Preach It."

On the other hand, the management of Lockheed Vega agreed to employ Negro labour, and the foremen and supervisors of the plant decided to ensure that the plan should succeed if it were humanly possible. Each of the employees was given a statement of the policy, in which the President's Executive Order was quoted. One Negro worker after another was gradually introduced into the plant, and coloured people began working at the Vega factory in production jobs and elsewhere; and it appears that little trouble has been reported. The same thing happened when Western Electric hired Negroes for their Kearney plant in New Jersey, where the experiment was successful in spite of the fact that there were no separate cafeterias or washing accommodation. In the naval shipyards Negro labour has also been employed; but in spite of these outstanding examples there is no doubt that discrimination was still being effected, especially in those plants where Southern political influence plays a decisive role with the management.

It is not only the A.F.L., however, which has shown resistance to coloured membership in the Unions. Although, as already stated, the C.I.O. has never officially opposed coloured membership, discrimination has been attempted by C.I.O. men. In Detroit a strike arose when the Chrysler Corporation tried to promote coloured workers to positions of responsibility. The same sort of thing happened in 1941 in connection with the Packard factory. The struggle against such prejudice is only beginning, but the urgent necessity of war needs may break

down such feelings far more effectively than many years of propaganda. Generally speaking, many Negroes can become successful workers, and it is success that counts in the United States. It may well be due to the fact that C.I.O. men have attempted discrimination here and there that a Committee on Racial Discrimination was set up in Boston by the C.I.O., in 1942, and issued a statement (in January 1943) which argued that the existence of discrimination against Negroes and other minorities was not only a blot on American democracy, but was also a serious drag on the total mobilization of the people which was needed to win the war against Axis slavery. It went on to say that American Negroes were anxious to work, and that " to allow employers or any other agencies to bar them from jobs is worse than unjust—it is an active help to Hitler." Too often, the statement continued, has mere lip-service been given to the principle of equal opportunity. Although notable exceptions occur, they could easily be made the rule if the national policy were made completely effective. The statement concluded by declaring that it was determined to press for these measures in order to end both gross injustice and " criminal waste of needed man-power."

As the man-power situation became more acute, further efforts were made to fill up the deficiencies through the use of Negro labour. Much was done by various agencies, such as the National Youth Administration, and gradually the numbers of coloured workers employed began to creep up. In July 1943 it was estimated that some 1,300,000 Negroes were employed in the war plants, and by the time the Allies had entered Germany the number was probably near the one-and-a-half-million mark. In some of the major industries, such as shipbuilding, a large increase in the number of Negroes employed has been effected. Discrimination had broken down to such an extent that it has been said that in March 1944 the number of Negroes employed in the shipyards was greater than the total of all shipbuilding workers in 1940. Where the most numerous failures have been registered were in those positions where skilled ability was required. This was partly due to the difficulty in training, from scratch, men who had never had the opportunity to make their way upwards by degrees; but also it has to be admitted that the colour bar was apt to make white technicians tardy in training Negro workers who, after the war, would enter into competition with them in their own fields.

With regard to the Armed Forces, it must be remembered that, generally speaking, it has always been easier for Negroes to serve in the United States Army than in the Navy. During the Civil War over 170,000 Negro soldiers were employed, and they engaged in many of the most severe battles. During the First World War at least two million Negroes were registered for service in the Army, and of these over 340,000 were mobilized into full military service. Some 100,000 were drafted to France, and their record was good, although some of the Negro officers did not entirely fulfil the hopes which had been entertained.

In the Second World War discrimination was forbidden in the Selective Service Act. Every male citizen and alien had to register if he was between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-eight, the exceptions being so unimportant as not to merit attention. Later, changes were made in the age-limitations, but it appears that at no period was any serious attempt made to introduce racial or other restrictions based on colour prejudice. What little showed itself was in the comparative difference in speed in the induction process. Even as I write (October 1944), the deficiencies have not been entirely overcome, although it is estimated that Negroes make up 10·4 per cent. of all selective service registrants, whilst in the Army they make up 9 per cent. of all the men. In February 1944 the estimated numbers of Negroes in the Armed Forces were about 664,000 in the Army, 100,000 in the Navy, 10,000 in the Marines, and some 4,000 in the Coast Guard. Five thousand Negroes have been commissioned; and it is stated at the time of writing that 50 per cent. of the troops are serving overseas. In the United States Air Force, Negroes were admitted into the Army Air Corps for the first time in 1941; and the 99th Pursuit Squadron was formed at Tuskegee, Ala., for training Negro combat fliers. They have done good work and have seen service in the European sphere of operations.

One of the most interesting examples of the gradual lack of discrimination was that seen at the Officer-Candidate Infantry Schools at Fort Benning, Georgia, and elsewhere. Negroes here mix with the white soldiers, sit in the same lecture-halls, eat in the same mess-rooms, and sleep in the same barracks. These schools are, however, exceptions. Generally speaking, there has been rigid segregation. Moreover, there have been many complaints as to the extent of the

discrimination effected, especially in the South. Where camps have been some distance from the nearest town, Negro soldiers have found that transportation has been difficult or impossible; and, when they arrived, there was always the possibility that they would be refused admittance to cinemas or other places of entertainment. There have been several ugly incidents and some actual rioting. Occasionally it has been reported that the United States uniform was no protection to a coloured soldier when it was a question of observing some of the traditional attitudes current in the South. Clashes have occurred between white and coloured soldiers, and between coloured soldiers and white civilians and police. In 1942 a minor riot occurred in Louisiana when a white military police officer attempted to arrest a Negro soldier in Alexandria. State troops had to be called in, and in the subsequent skirmish some thirty Negroes were wounded. Such incidents have been difficult to avoid in the Southern States, where American troops, largely drawn from the Southern population, have had to mix and co-operate with Negro units. As early as August 1942 Senator Bankhead (Democrat, Alabama) suggested that Negro troops from the North should be stationed only in the North, in order to avoid what he described as "racial difficulties." This proposal was immediately rejected by General George Marshall in a letter to the Senator, in which he pointed out that the first consideration in dictating the placing of troops was the needs of military policy, and therefore, although full consideration might be given to civilian sentiments, nevertheless military necessity and efficiency must come first.

Although, as has been stated above, the Navy has accepted Negroes far less willingly than the Army for any duties other than menial, the outbreak of war compelled the authorities to take a more liberal line. The Great Lakes Naval Training Station has already graduated some Negro sailors. In the summer of 1942 1,000 were already in training, and more were to follow. In the Merchant Marine, also, Negroes are finding places which they can fill. A good deal of interest and comment was aroused when it was announced that a Negro, Hugh Mulzac, had obtained his United States Master certificate, and had been appointed to command the Liberty freighter *Booker T. Washington*. The ship was christened by Marian Anderson, the famous Negro singer; and President J. Curran, of the

National Maritime Union—an organization connected with the C.I.O.—welcomed the appointment with some enthusiasm, since he has rarely, if ever, attempted to bar Negroes from his organization, and he saw in Mulzac's appointment a move whereby his Union could increase its strength.

With regard to aviation, it is true that few Negroes have in the past been permitted to train for civil aeronautics, and not much encouragement has been given to them to expect a place in the Army Air Corps, or elsewhere, for combat duty. In one instance, which attained a certain degree of notoriety, Mr. Walter Robinson had been given flight-training under the Civil Aeronautics Authority at the University of Minnesota. He did well in his class, but when later he applied for enlistment it is stated that he was told that Negroes were not encouraged in the Army Air Corps. Robinson had apparently heard that the British Air Force had been thrown open to all without regard to race or colour, so he immediately went to Canada, where he was accepted for training.

It is perhaps in education that the results of discrimination and segregation can best be appreciated. Although illiteracy (by which I mean the incapacity of a person ten years of age or over to write in any language) is decreasing among Negroes, the average percentage in 1930 was still 16·3, as opposed to 1·5 per cent. among the native whites. In the cities the percentage was lower (about 5 per cent.), and among the foreign-born whites the figures ranged from a minute proportion, among the Scots, to 36·9 per cent. among persons coming from the Azores. Among aliens the Portuguese topped the list with a percentage of 34·7—the Germans having the least (3·2 per cent.)—these calculations excluding aliens from North-western Europe. Of the Negro illiterates, the greater part live in the Southern States; South Carolina and Alabama being especially noteworthy in this respect.

There seems little doubt that the practices of discrimination and segregation are partially responsible for the amount of illiteracy among Negroes in the United States. In many schools there is complete racial segregation; and in the South seventeen States have separate school systems. In the North no concerted policy of educational segregation exists, but the fact that the Negroes are largely concentrated in certain areas—i.e., are voluntarily segregated—achieves the same result. Where segregated schools are established the provision of

adequate accommodation for Negroes is restricted, teaching is poor, and the teachers badly paid; whilst the equipment is often out-of-date, or even non-existent except for a few absolute necessities. In some States the salaries paid to Negro teachers are half those paid to whites, and a number of cases have been coming up in the courts which deal with this question. One of the most interesting of these was the one in which a Negro teacher, Melvin Alston, brought a test-hearing in Norfolk, Virginia. In June 1940, Judge John J. Parker, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, reversed the previous decision of the lower court and made an important statement on this aspect of racial discrimination. Declaring that the allegation was that the State, in paying for public services of the same kind and character to men and women equally qualified according to those standards actually prescribed by the State, arbitrarily paid less to Negroes, he said that " this is as clear a discrimination on the ground of race as could well be imagined and falls squarely within the inhibition of both the due process and the equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment." [1]

Without taking into account the public high schools, there are to-day over 200 institutions for the secondary and higher instruction of Negroes. Graduate work leading to degrees is, for example, carried on at Atlanta, Fisk, and Howard Universities; whilst the total number of Negro graduates must now exceed 30,000, of whom perhaps half have graduated from the colleges in the South.

The gradual changes in opinion regarding the desirability of rigid segregation in Southern schools can be detected from the protests that are occasionally heard from those favouring such forms of discrimination. Thus, in 1942 the then anti-Negro Governor of Georgia, Eugene Talmadge, suggested that certain of the educational authorities were advocating mixed schools for whites and Negroes. Thereupon the Chancellor of Georgia's college-university system issued a statement in which he said that no evidence whatever existed which suggested that anyone was trying to teach the doctrine of co-education of the races in the Georgia State colleges. He went on to say that he would never endorse any instructor in any

[1] For an account of discrimination, etc., in Negro education see C. S. Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York and London, 1943, and London, 1944), pp. 15 ff.

institution in the university system in Georgia who taught such co-educational ideas, or indeed any doctrine, either directly or indirectly, which ran contrary to the established traditions of the South.

It is in words like these that we can see that hard shell of Southern prejudice which is slowly beginning to crack here and there (especially among the younger groups), and which must eventually be forced off by the accumulating pressure beneath. How far the solution will be reached without breaking up the whole structure of Southern society remains to be seen. Everything will depend on the attitude of Southern politicians and educators, who are slowly beginning to appreciate more fully the problems of the modern world and to realize how the United States must play its part in the development of the post-war social economy.

Discrimination is found not only in the Southern colleges, but also in the public libraries. In the Acts of New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, libraries are specifically mentioned as places where discrimination is not permitted. In the South separate libraries for coloured readers exist; and in the larger public libraries State officials are sometimes directed to maintain separate accommodation for Negroes, which often means that the opportunities for reading and study are limited and generally inferior to those enjoyed by the white students.

Where separate schools exist in a mixed community it is occasionally difficult to determine to what school a child should go. In one court it was decided, in 1910, that a child having one sixteenth or more Negro blood, although lacking any Negro physical characteristics, was still to be considered "coloured," and sent to the Negro school.[1] Such cases illustrate the lengths to which the authorities have to go when enforcing regulations regarding the segregation of Negroes in a country where it is sometimes impossible to determine who is and who is not "a Negro."

If we sum up the facts of discrimination and segregation among Negroes in the United States as regards education, we can see that throughout the discussion, and the legislative enactments dealing with the question, there runs the thread of a dilemma in which the educational opportunities are always

[1] In the Wall *v.* Oyster case, in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

involved. Theory has it that equal educational opportunity must be given to the children of all races. Now nobody, even in the United States, pretends that this guarantee is kept in the Southern States. For here, as we have already said, Negro schools are nothing like so efficient as those for the whites, especially in the rural areas. Facilities have to be duplicated, and where one school would have sufficed, two have to be built and equipped. Thus taxation is raised and prosperity delayed. By keeping the Negroes " in their places," and at the same time being forced to supply alternative accommodation, the white population is actually impoverishing itself. Colour prejudice can sometimes become an expensive luxury to those who foster it. There are some people in the South who are beginning to recognize this. Thus, in Pascagoula, Mississippi, which had less than 6,000 inhabitants in 1940, a boom set in owing to war conditions, and the local authorities showed what can be done by an energetic administration. The Negroes get a fair share both in housing and in education, and the coloured teachers in the Negro schools have the highest salaries in the State. Although segregation is still the rule, it is understood that, as one of the social workers said, it is impossible to build a sound social foundation on what can only be called a submerged class. Moreover, the educational authorities realize that, if the white population is to rise in the social and educational scales, the Negroes must also rise—a truth which they are beginning to understand both from the educational and economic points of view.[1]

However good an educational system may be, and however wide may be the opportunities offered, it avails but little if the people concerned are unable to take advantage of what is presented to them. Thus improvements in educational facilities for the Negro must be accompanied by a general improvement in his social status, without which increased expenditure on schooling would be largely waste of money. For example, take two factors which are both highly relevant to the present discussion: health and housing. If children are to obtain advantage from their education, they must be well fed and well housed. Half-starved pupils coming from wretched homes are hardly likely to be as successful as children whose nutrition is adequate and whose homes are well built, with proper heating, lighting, and sanitary arrangements. Now in

[1] See Selden Meneffee, *Assignment : U.S.A.* (New York, 1943), p. 172.

the case of the mass of the American Negroes these elementary physical conditions are not fulfilled. Apart from the comparatively small upper and middle-class minority, the Negroes, be they in the rural regions of the South or in the congested slum areas of the large cities, can be described only as very poor, even if the word "destitute," [1] as employed by Dr. Myrdal, be not used to suggest the extremity of their poverty. In the United States the average life of the Negro is *ten* years less than that of the whites; the maternal death-rate is *three* times that of the white rate; and infant mortality shows a rate which, taking the whole of the United States, is just over 70 per 1,000 live births, as compared with the white rate of just over 40. Poverty and malnutrition go together, and diseases like tuberculosis go with malnutrition. Generally speaking, although there appears to be an annual decline in tuberculosis mortality, the Negro mortality is somewhere between three and four times the mortality in white people. Tuberculosis is the second largest cause of death in the coloured population; whilst among the whites it is the seventh. Moreover, provision for coloured patients in hospitals and sanatoria is quite insufficient; and the necessity for remaining at work till the last moment makes many of them seek relief too late. In 1934 it was stated that there were only 3,334 beds for coloured tubercular patients in the whole of the United States, thirteen Southern States supplying 1,666 of them.

Along with health and adequate nutrition go housing, warmth, and shelter generally. The reason why Washington's tuberculosis rate is so high may be partly the housing shortage and the totally inadequate facilities afforded to the Negroes, of whom over 187,000 live in the District of Columbia. When I was last in Washington I saw some of these tumbledown and decrepit tenements hidden away in back quarters of the city. According to the findings of a Congressional inquiry it was estimated that in 1943 450,000 people, both white and Negro, were living under housing conditions which could be described only as those commonly associated with slums,[2] and this in the capital of the nation which prides itself on having the highest standard of living in the world.

Federal housing projects, when instituted, have to conform to the prevailing policy of segregation in those districts where

[1] G. Myrdal, *op. cit.*, I, 205.
[2] Selden Meneffee, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

this is the accepted social pattern. In some cases, however, successful attempts have been made to avoid such discrimination. War conditions have made the building of such mixed estates practically unavoidable; and it may well be that the experience gained in forming them may prove of considerable value when it comes to furthering similar experiments in the future. But until the Negro people are, on the average, as well fed, housed, and paid as the Whites they will not be able to take advantage of any radical improvements in the educational system. Thus not only is their general literary standard likely to remain low, but also any political advancement is certain to be retarded. Apathy and lack of appreciation of the meaning of the suffrage would necessarily hinder them from exercising the voting power even if the possibility of doing so were not impeded by poll taxes and similar devices. It is true that certain of these restrictive measures are disappearing—such as the so-called " grandfather clauses " [1] of the Louisiana Constitution of 1898, which were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1915, and the white primaries ruling in 1944—but there are still many ways by which the exercise of the Negro vote can be circumvented. The struggle over the poll tax indicates, however, that such forms of discrimination are beginning to be questioned, and there are many who think that the example of North Carolina, which deleted the poll-tax qualification from her Constitution in 1920, should be followed by other States, for Louisiana, be it noted, acted similarly in 1934, and Florida in 1937.

We must now pass rapidly in review a few other examples of how the colour bar operates in the United States, and then sum up our brief survey and try to see how the general picture is changing.

When a Civil Rights Act was passed, in 1866, the Negro was admitted to citizenship and granted certain rights and privileges, such as the right to make contracts, hold property, and be equal in benefit before the law. In July 1868 the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified by three-fourths of the States; and in March 1870 the Fifteenth Amendment was proclaimed as having taken effect, since thirty States had ratified it. The

[1] This clause, along with others, provided that anyone who was legally able to vote at a certain period, or who was the descendant of such a person, could qualify; but the date set was one when the Negro could not legally vote, so he was virtually disenfranchised.

origin of this amendment was clearly due to the fear felt by the Radical Republicans (then in control of Congress) lest the Southern States might try to deprive the Negroes of their votes, and thus they decided, in February 1869, to submit another amendment to strengthen the position.

These amendments are so important in the history of discrimination in the United States that certain sections must be quoted in full. Thus in the Fourteenth Amendment it is said that:—

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Fifteenth Amendment directly concerns Negro suffrage. It reads:—

> Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

There is good evidence which suggests that one of the purposes of the provisions included in the Fourteenth Amendment was, as has been mentioned above, to prevent States from legally discriminating against Negroes. Indeed, in 1875 Congress passed a Statute (18 Stat. 335) which prohibited any discrimination not suffered by all citizens alike from being applied in cases of accommodation, in hotels, transport, and places of amusement and recreation. It was not until 1883 that the Supreme Court, in what are called the Civil Rights Cases, declared that direct legislation of this sort was not authorized by the Fourteenth Amendment, and thus the 1875 Statute became largely a dead letter. Moreover, since the Reconstruction Period the situation has been such that it would not be going too far to say that the clauses of the Fifteenth Amend-

ment, as they concern Negroes, have been almost totally disregarded in the South. A search in Congressional Legislation since 1876 will almost certainly fail to reveal any trace of that "appropriate legislation" which is mentioned in Section 2 of the amendment. This attempt by the Southern States to nullify both the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments in regard to Negro suffrage and discrimination generally is bound up with the doctrine of State rights as opposed to Federal interference; but recent tendencies have been rather in the opposite direction, in which the power of the States has been minimized, whilst the operations of the Federal authority have been strengthened.

Discrimination against Negroes in the common civil rights of citizens is so widely spread that it is just accepted by the mass of the population. Since the more Negroes there are in any group the more discrimination, it is natural to find the most flagrant cases in the South. Here it would never enter the minds of the majority of the Negroes to try to apply for accommodation in hotels or inns frequented by whites, or to seek admission to the more expensive seats in theatres or places of amusement. Such intrusions would lead to violence, and possibly to a riot. As has been said above, even in the North the larger hotels and restaurants may indulge in any action or subterfuge to prevent Negro clients from making use of their premises. An illuminating commentary on such a situation was presented by the National Conference on Social Work held in New Orleans in 1942. Among the delegates were more than fifty Negroes, and great efforts had obviously been made by the officers and staff of the Conferences to ensure as much comfort as possible for the coloured members. Yet many hotels and eating-places refused to admit them; taxi service was difficult to obtain; and the use of elevators was banned. Thus at one locality, where meetings took place on the second floor of the building, the majority of the delegates walked up the stairs to avoid the unpleasant contrast as between white and black if the whites had ascended by means of the elevators. All lunch and dinner meetings had to be abandoned, as the Negroes could not be served at these functions.

Such practices as these, which are widely observed in the cities of the Southern States, might now be prevalent in the North were it not for the fact that the Negroes themselves tend to congregate in their own districts (e.g., Harlem in New

York City), where they have their own hotels, restaurants, dance-halls, and places of amusement. Thus a form of auto-imposed segregation has become a feature of the social setting. Black Belts become established; and when Negroes begin to move into districts frequented by Whites the latter tend to move out, and the area changes colour. Since in many cases the economic status of the incoming Negroes is less than that of the outgoing Whites, it often happens that the standard of the property goes down, values decrease, and slum conditions are apt to set in.

In the professions Negroes are gradually becoming better known. Schools for coloured people in law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and nursing have been opened; but there still exists a large measure of discrimination. Even if the United States Army be short of medical officers, few Negro physicians have been called up, although the military authorities have stated, so it is reported, that they would take Negro personnel up to 10 per cent. of the total required. There are altogether some 4,000 Negro physicians, and half that number do dental work. Six thousand women are nursing both privately and in hospitals. There are some 1,200 lawyers, although colour prejudice makes their work very difficult except in some towns in the North, where feeling is less keen, and in courts which have to deal with a considerable number of Negro cases. In the South, where a case is defended, Negroes will often prefer a white lawyer, who will not arouse that instinctive opposition in a jury which has to sit opposite a Negro legal pleader who is so clearly not " in his place." Negro judges have exercised their functions in New York City, Philadelphia, and Washington, whilst there are several Negro Justices of the Peace in both Northern and Southern States. A woman Justice, Jane Bolin, is, at the time of writing, at the Domestic Relations Court in New York City. State Councils have Negro members, and there are also coloured persons on the rolls of State Legislatures. Into the dramatic and film worlds Negroes are gradually entering in spite of a good deal of opposition. The good work of the Negro division of the Federal Theater Project injected fresh life when it was most needed; and Paul Robeson led the way in his call for more serious treatment and an end to the portrayal of Negroes as children or comic minstrels, and the assignment to them of roles which fluctuate between that of clowns and exotic witch,

doctors. There seems little doubt that this presentation of the Negro does much to further the view that coloured people are a race apart, and to perpetuate forms of discrimination which depend on the theory that Negroes are subjects for amusement and comic relief, but not for serious co-operation as between human beings. Indeed, much of the social presentation of the Negro in the United States, through the medium of fiction, stage, and screen, cannot be regarded as anything but a form of anti-colour propaganda of a particularly insidious type, although pictures such as *Bataan*, *Sahara*, and even *Syncopation*, show a decided change for the better.

Another form of discrimination which aroused bitter resentment was the separation of the Negro blood donations from those given by the white population. This segregation was considered to be especially obnoxious in view of the Nazi racial beliefs regarding the blood of Jews, and the refusal of fanatical Nazis to have blood from such a source even at the risk of losing their lives. Wild statements were made by some of the more rabid Negro-baiters, among which was the suggestion that, were Negro blood to be given to a white man in need of a transfusion, his children might be black! It need hardly be said that competent serological tests have failed to discover any striking difference between the blood of the various groups as far as the human species is concerned. The decision of the Red Cross in segregating Negro blood was rendered still more unfortunate when it was recalled that Dr. Charles P. Drew, at one time director of the Red Cross Blood Bank in New York City, was a Negro.

With regard to the Negro Press in the United States, there are now about 200 or more Negro newspapers, without counting the numerous social and religious sheets, which would bring the number to a considerably higher figure. Statistics of circulation are misleading as regards readers, since copies are thumbed from hand to hand, and often one copy does duty in an entire household. But even so the figures are not without interest. The Pittsburgh *Courier* sells over 150,000 copies a week, and the Chicago *Defender* and the popular *Amsterdam News*, a New York weekly, have circulations of probably well over 80,000 and 35,000 respectively; whilst, in the South, that of the Norfolk *Journal and Guide*, edited by P. B. Young, is estimated to be around the 31,000 mark.

Generally speaking, the Negro Press is somewhat parochial

in outlook, interest being concentrated upon local and topical affairs of importance to Negroes. Any cases of discrimination are played up; and there has recently been, according to some critics, a tendency to resort to sensational advertising of the Negroes' grievances which has led to what has been described by one Negro observer, Mr. W. H. Brown, as a drift into hate-mongering and rabble-rousing accusations—a suggestion which has been vehemently denied by other writers. Nevertheless, some of the journals, such as *The Crisis* and *Opportunity*, exhibit what can only be regarded as a high standard of journalism; whilst the *Negro Labor News* of Houston, Texas, is a paper with a circulation of about 16,000 or more, and caters for the increasing number of coloured people who wish to keep abreast of what is happening in relation to the trade unions and the operations of the F.E.P.C.

Little can be said here regarding the part played by Negroes in the art, literature, music, and science of the United States. Negro music, or rather music played by Negroes, is still held in popular esteem; but there is too much association in the public mind with night-clubs and dance-halls, and it is not yet widely understood that jazz, whatever its origin, is really not more black than white, and seems to be largely popularized by Jews—a fact which, seeing how modern music is produced and circulated, is not surprising. Indeed, it is probable that boogie-woogie is more Negro than jazz ever was, although in England it can hardly ever be heard, as it should be in the tradition of Clarence Smith, and with words sung as only Bessie Smith can sing them.[1]

Novels and stories by Negroes are everywhere becoming better known, and throw a vivid light upon their own feelings on discrimination and the operation of the colour bar. Fiction of this kind can be usefully compared with the more autobiographical material which is now appearing, such as Mary C. Terrell's *A Colored Woman in a White World* (Washington, D.C., 1940); Elizabeth L. Adams's *Dark Symphony* (London, 1943); and Zora N. Hurston's *Dust-tracks on a Road* (London, 1944). Similarly, in *Ziba* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1943), James Pipes, a white clerk in a store patronized by Southern Negroes, has collected a mass of useful material in which may be seen reflected the common everyday interests of coloured folk, their sorrows, their hopes, and their ambitions.

[1] *Cf.* " Gimme a Pigfoot " (Parlophone Record, R2146).

In the above brief summary, which illustrates how discrimination has affected the Negro in his various occupations and interests, much material has had to be omitted which would have thrown additional light upon the various processes at work. But enough has, I hope, been given to supply a reasonably clear idea of how the colour bar operates in the United States, and where its influence is most acutely felt. Before closing this section, however, it may be as well if we glance at the attitude taken up by the Christian Churches regarding the colour problem generally in North America.

Roughly speaking, the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is *officially* both simple and direct. It holds to the general principle of the unity of the human family under the Fatherhood of God. Without that, the brotherhood of man becomes a fiction. Catholic teaching takes the view, however, that such questions as those of assimilation and racial admixture may be safely left to themselves. Believing in the check imposed by natural restraints, the Church is inclined to the view that wholesale miscegenation would be unlikely were the colour bar to be removed; but on the other hand it does not raise insurmountable objections to mixed marriages where the proper requisites are present. With regard to the Negro peoples, the Pope specially singled them out for his paternal solicitude when, in 1939, he addressed a letter to the American bishops expressing his special affection for his Negro flock on account of the care and comfort which should be bestowed upon it, since it was very deserving of such help.

In spite of the labours of the Catholics among the Negroes, membership of the Catholic Church is not high. It is probable that 200,000 would be an over-estimate. There are about a dozen Negro Catholic priests, and less than 250 exclusively coloured parishes. The historical background of the Negroes and their religious inclinations tend rather towards the Protestant denominations than towards the Roman Catholic Church. Thus Negro Baptists number over three and a-half million; and the African Methodist Episcopal Church nearly half a million. Church property to the value of nearly two million dollars is owned by Negroes.

How far the influence of the Christian Churches in the United States is directed towards lessening discrimination it is hard to say. In certain quarters good work has been done and augurs well for the future. The Institute of Racial Rela-

tions meets usually every year under the auspices of the American Friends' Service Committee, although work by the Quakers is not considered nearly radical enough by some of the more progressive and aggressive Negro elements. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has a department of race relations which, in a small way, can be compared with the secular Commission on Interracial Co-operation which was organized in 1918, in Georgia, where it had its headquarters. Apart, however, from attempts by societies and organizations dominated, perhaps, by men and women who are prominent in Church work, it is not easy to point to any united effort by the leaders of the Christian Churches to denounce discrimination and injustice towards Negroes, and, having issued denunciations, to act in a practical way in order to lessen and diminish the effects of the colour bar. But in all fairness to the Christian organizations it must be said that within recent years there have been signs of a distinct awakening to the realities of the situation, not only as regards the position of the Negroes, but also with reference to anti-Semitism and troubles arising within the Mexican community. Were the Churches to act in advance of public opinion, little good would accrue: what they have to do is so to mould the public conscience that, when the time comes, any action will have a solid background of popular support.

Before passing on to a brief consideration of what is the general drift of opinion regarding the colour bar as it affects Negroes in the United States, it may be of interest to some if we glance at the situation as it concerns other minority groups whose skins are, perhaps, not altogether lily-white, and also at what is happening in American territory outside the United States proper.

One Latin-American group is of especial interest, as not only did it constitute a major problem before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, but also it is likely again to become an acute point of unrest now that armament boom is over and the spectre of unemployment is again feared by those who have been absorbed into the munitions industry and who have to find new jobs when hostilities cease. This group is made up of the Mexicans of the South-West, concerning whom the average American knows but little and the European still less.

At the close of the Mexican war, when the United States, by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (February 1848), gained nearly

530,000 square miles of fresh territory, the Mexicans who became United States citizens failed to assimilate, and remained aloof and apart from the civilization of the conqueror. They remained essentially Mexican, as, above all, did the rich landed proprietors, who stayed on in their isolated world, ruling over their labourers as they were accustomed to do before the annexation. Apart from these rich and racially proud landowners, who in many cases claimed a link with the early Spanish invaders, there were the middle-class Mexicans of mixed Spanish and Indian blood, and also the *peones*, whose Indian ancestors were conquered by the Spaniards in the early days.

Generally speaking, in spite of a considerable amount of effort by educated and cultured Mexicans, Americans are inclined to look down upon them, since so many show their admixture with Indian ancestry; and by the average American the South American Indian is considered " coloured," although the Census now classes the Mexicans, however much Indian blood they may have, as " white."

In 1940 the Census listed over 1,800,000 people as claiming Spanish as their mother tongue, and of these the greater part were Mexicans, of whom some 1,600,000 lived in the South-West. Tens of thousands of migrant Mexican labourers are engaged in agricultural work, following the crops and forming what is really a mobile army of workers who live in shack settlements during the winter months, and are socially ostracized and regarded almost as public nuisances. Where a certain measure of prosperity permits, some of them live in the towns, where a kind of voluntary segregation is the rule, and where social regulations as rigid as the colour bar in the case of Negroes effectually prevent them from mixing freely with the ordinary citizens. Moreover, even the Negroes have been known to lay themselves open to the charge that, whilst objecting to intolerance on the part of the white population when they are involved, for their part do not now and then hesitate to show intolerance to the Mexicans. It has actually happened that Negroes in Denver strongly objected to Mexicans who had come to live near them. In some cities considerable numbers of Mexicans are to be found; and in the County of Los Angeles at least 215,000 are living, whilst in San Antonio it has been reckoned that perhaps as many as 100,000 persons of Spanish ancestry are congregated. With the increase in prosperity due to war conditions, much unrest began to be felt

owing to the deplorable inadequacy of the local housing conditions; and some clearance of the worst slums was effected, together with the completion of some new building projects of a satisfactory kind.

One indication of the atmosphere of strain was the trouble with the gangs of youthful Mexicans, who were partly responsible for the outbreak of minor rioting which started in 1941, and which, to a certain degree, was due to the anger and resentment felt by the more aggressive of the Mexican community on account of the discrimination to which they were subjected. Meanwhile, efforts are being made by Mexican Americans in the upper social levels to become better assimilated and to enter more fully into the economic and social life of the community around them, whilst preserving those traditions and cultural features which belong to their past. Although many have undoubtedly been successful in their attempts, the problem of the Mexican migrant workers remains; and there can be no solution of the Mexican problem—in which, be it said, the Mexican Government takes a lively interest—until the United States authorities undertake an examination of the whole question, together with a fuller realization of how the colour bar continually operates against that ideal of assimilation towards which they are always directing the minds of United States' citizens and those seeking naturalization. On the other hand, it is argued by some in the area where the Mexicans are known that segregation and discrimination are not applied on account of any colour prejudice, but on account of the social status of so many of the Mexicans, whose standards of decency and cleanliness are not always what could be called even moderately high. To this it might be replied that, if this be the case, then it is unfortunate that so little is done for one large group of United States citizens; and that as long as such a situation is allowed to continue, many will harbour the suspicion that the racial ancestry of members of the group may have something to do with the lack of interest in their living conditions and their future position in society.

With regard to Oriental peoples, the attitude of many Americans has been influenced by economic reasons (such as competition, especially in the West), and by the various attempts on the part of sections of the Press to excite public feeling against " the Yellow Peril," and to harp upon similar

racial themes. Moreover, the attack on Pearl Harbor aroused a wave of anti-Japanese feeling which, in some quarters, extended to Orientals generally, but which was much mitigated by the recent legislation regarding the Chinese Exclusion Acts.

The first Chinese to arrive in the United States are said to have stepped ashore in 1848. To-day there are over 77,500, and of these some 30,000 are American citizens by birth. Although colour prejudice against them is not so acute as with the Negroes, their appearance and the impossibility of passing as anything but Oriental have tended to bring them together, and their segregation in " Chinatowns," even when these are not dismal and akin to slums, has not helped them to overcome American feelings and racial consciousness.

On October 11, 1943, President Roosevelt made a statement in which he lent his support to the proposed legislation to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and later measures of the same type, and thus the whole question of the position of the Chinese in American life was brought to public notice.

It must be remembered that the year 1882 marked the first comprehensive immigration law to be passed by the Federal Government; and in the same year the number of immigrants reached a peak not to be surpassed until 1903. Although the Chinese were specifically mentioned in the 1882 Act, later legislation (e.g., the Barred Zone provision of the 1917 Immigration Act) extended discrimination to other peoples; and the tendency has been to erect a barrier between Oriental peoples and those of Europe and the Americas. It is important also to realize that these prohibitions have been almost, if not wholly, based on so-called " racial " reasons; and thus the door was opened to widespread possibilities once the United States became China's ally and Japan's enemy.

The history of Chinese exclusion is bound up with the history of California. It was from California that the agitation was directed, and it was in that State that most of the obnoxious " race " legislation regarding the Chinese was enacted. Closely related to the Negro problem, that of the Chinese became more and more acute; and in the 1882 Act all Chinese immigration was suspended for ten years, and the right of naturalization was disallowed. The next stage of importance was reached with the passing of the Geary Act, in 1892, in which further discriminatory provisions were enacted. The Act created somewhat of a sensation, the Chinese Minister in

Washington denouncing it as being in violation of every principle of justice, equity, reason, and fair-dealing as between two friendly Powers. Indeed, when President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress, spoke of " a historic mistake," he was merely echoing the words of Theodore Roosevelt when he declared that the policy of excluding Chinese labourers was a grave injury and wrong " not only done to China, but ultimately to this nation itself."

How far the legislation will change the position regarding the general status of Chinese residents in the United States remains to be seen. On account of economic competition the Chinese have more and more withdrawn from those occupations where their work might cause trouble. Thus, in 1860, some 30,000 worked in the Californian mines; in 1921, 151 only were thus listed. More than 50 per cent. to-day work in restaurants and laundries. Generally speaking, the Chinatowns are slums; conditions are unhealthy and the tuberculosis rate in the San Francisco area is some three times that of the rest of the city. Removal of the anti-Chinese legislation shows a trend in " racial " thinking in the United States which is of considerable interest and importance. The proposals were not, however, received without opposition. Correspondence in the United States Press shows that some thought the new proposals both " untimely and unwise "; [1] but it was not easy to voice too shrill an opposition in view of the position of China as one of the United Nations and the popularity in which she has been held owing to her long struggle against Japan. Moreover, Mme. Chiang Kai-Shek had not hesitated to publish her own point of view in various articles printed in the United States. Thus, in 1942, she said that the Chinese people had watched with incredulous amazement the sight of Western armies surrendering to the Japanese, just as they had seen the extraordinary spectacle of the West suffering insults, indignities, and face-slappings because it was not prepared for war. Such things are incomprehensible to the Chinese, said Mme. Chiang Kai-Shek, and it was clear that in the future world society there was no room for superior or inferior peoples. The time has passed, she declared, when status depends on the colour of the skin or the shape of the eyes.[2]

[1] *Cf. New York Herald Tribune*, October 10, 1943.

[2] See Mayling Soong Chiang, Mme. Chiang Kai-Shek, *We Chinese Women* (New York, 1943), pp. 23 ff., 42.

Restriction on Chinese immigration began in 1880, and the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts, together with the modifications in the regulations concerning the status of the Chinese in the United States, has naturally led to the consideration of other measures affecting Asiatics. Although colour prejudice as experienced with Negroes is not found to the same degree with Indians from Asia, nevertheless the less-educated Americans are prone to think of them as inferior merely on account of the colour of their skin. The question has nothing like the same importance as it has in South Africa, because their number is so small, in 1940 scarcely more than 2,400 Hindus being listed. Although, strictly speaking, the word *Hindu* should be restricted to one who professes Hinduism, the word is often employed in the United States to cover all Indians from India, the majority of whom are said to belong to the Sikh religion, in which caste is rejected and the brotherhood of man is stressed. Assimilation is obviously difficult, since the wearing of long hair and turbans sets them apart, and their regulations regarding food are as rigid as is the case with the orthodox Jews. Their relations with the Negroes are interesting, since in the majority of cases they regard the coloured people as inferior, and intermarriage is rare.

On March 15, 1944, Rep. E. Celler introduced a Bill authorizing the admission into the United States and the naturalization of natives and descendants of India. This proposal (endorsed by the President in 1945) was obviously inspired by the measures taken regarding Chinese immigration, and the United States Press discussed the Bill from this angle. Are the Indians not entitled to ask, it was suggested, why they should be excluded from the United States and from American citizenship? The removal of such restrictions, which are offensive to Indian pride and self-respect, will not merely be a testimony of American gratitude for their help in the war, but also a matter of justice and equality of treatment. As we have lifted the bars from the Chinese, so we can afford to do the same for the Indians, one writer urged, and he concluded his plea with the words, " We can't afford to do otherwise."

With regard to the Japanese Americans little need be said. The attack on Pearl Harbor aroused a prejudice against them which will not easily be forgotten, in spite of the efforts of the authorities to insist on the loyalty of many and to stress the unavoidable military necessity of the enforced evacuation from

the West Coast, in 1942, of all persons of Japanese lineage and their subsequent settlement in the relocation areas.

In 1940 there were over 126,000 Japanese in the United States, of whom nearly 80 per cent. were in California, engaged mainly in fruit and vegetable marketing for the urban centres. What is important for our present purpose is to remember that the mass evacuation was based upon *racial* grounds, and as such constituted a precedent of grave import. Thousands of these evacuated people have never been in Japan, knew no Japanese, and had up to that time regarded themselves as loyal Americans.

Indeed, the constitutionality of the order has been seriously challenged, although grounds of imperative need in a national emergency were sufficient to render it operative.[1]

How far prejudice against Filipino Americans will lessen owing to the wave of popular sympathy which was extended to them during the Japanese occupation of their homeland is not easy to say. Before the war there were some 45,000 in the United States, of whom 32,000 lived in California. Before the war they were often considered Orientals, and suffered the usual results of racial prejudice. Moreover, inability to become American citizens when in the United States caused resentment in some quarters, although Filipinos in the United States Army were able to receive citizenship papers within three months.

Assimilation of Filipinos in the general population was not rendered any more easy by certain economic and social facts apart altogether from racial prejudice. The ratio between the sexes, for example, is out of all proportion, the males exceeding the females by over 90 to 1. Owing to what many consider their gambling proclivities and addiction to other vices, they are viewed with suspicion and distrust; and since in several States they are banned from marrying "white" American women, they are apt to form unions with other minority groups, such as Mexicans or mulattoes, and thus increase the racial mixture and uncertain position of any children that may be born to them. Relationship with the Negroes was at one time not particularly good; but in recent years an improvement has taken place and former difficulties have been forgotten. It must be remembered that it was Frederick M. Roberts, a Negro, who, in the Californian State Assembly,

[1] See Carey McWilliams, *Prejudice* (Boston, 1944).

brought forward a Bill in which it was proposed to deport all the Filipinos to the Islands.[1]

On the other hand, their musical and artistic faculties are not to be underestimated; these, together sometimes with personal charm, render them likeable to a certain class of American girls, who are at times forced to avoid their attentions lest trouble ensues. Economic infiltration also has to be considered, and anti-Filipino demonstrations in the past have not been unknown. Generally speaking, the lot of the Filipinos in the United States has not been particularly happy, although it is possible that after the end of the war with Japan it may be considerably improved.

Before concluding, a word must be said of the condition of affairs in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, those outposts of the American Empire which reveal a way of life very different from that understood on the mainland. In Hawaii, if there be racial prejudice (and there is always some almost everywhere) it is not often openly expressed, but is rather quiescent and hidden. Hawaii never had a slavery tradition to overcome, and the various mixed groups intermarried among each other as well as with the native Hawaiians. Thus in earlier times there was no one dominant group which was able to claim power over the others; it is only within modern times, when the tyranny of the sugar and the plantation economy began to operate, that there started that gradual dominance of American commercial and industrial interests which is bringing about the formation of an upper white caste and a middle and lower class of "coloured" workers. Already the *haoles*, or people of Anglo-Saxon and North European stock, occupy the majority of the more favoured positions, and since they wield economic power through their ownership of land and industrial undertakings, their political and civic influence is also dominant. Similarly, the weight of the influence of the officers and men of the naval, military, and air bases is likely to be on the side of what they have been accustomed to in the United States. There seems little doubt that wage scales are becoming gradually graded according to whether the workers are *haoles* or not.

Some inquiries have been made as to the race preferences of various groups in Hawaii; and it is interesting to note that among some of the Japanese who were examined the Japanese

[1] R. Ottley, *New World A-Coming* (Boston, 1943), pp. 57–58.

themselves came first in the preferred list, followed by " other Caucasians," Chinese, White Hawaiians, Koreans, Hawaiians, Portuguese, Spaniards, Filipinos, and Puerto Ricans. From this list it would seem that it was rather a socio-economic status which was being considered than one in which colour was the dominating factor.[1]

There are, however, already signs of racial friction developing, since among the lower grades of industrial and white-collar groups the younger generation is reaching out towards a better status and a higher standard of living—an aspiration which will naturally set them still farther apart from the lower-grade worker and the plantation labourers. How far the present drift towards the emergence of colour prejudice will continue remains to be seen. There seems little doubt that the kind of racial treatment meted out to the Japanese-Americans in the United States would have been difficult to effect in Hawaii. There are about 150,000 Japanese in the Islands, and suspicion of sabotage and subversive activity has been slight, whilst the question of deporting any considerable proportion of the Japanese community does not appear at any time to have been seriously considered.

The blindness to colour differences which is noticeable in Hawaii is also to be observed in Puerto Rico, although here a slave tradition might have been thought to have had a greater effect than it actually has. With a population of over 1,800,000 (of whom three-quarters are " white " and the rest Negro), Puerto Rico is one of the most densely populated quarters of the United States dependencies, the number of persons per square mile (about 544) exceeding any of the States on the mainland except Rhode Island (674) and New Jersey (553). What segregation there is (except in the National Guard) is not really racial, but social; in this way approaching the situation in Brazil rather than that in the United States. This might perhaps have been expected, since the cultural background is distinctly Latin rather than Anglo-Saxon, and Catholic rather than Protestant, although it must be admitted that Spanish influence was less inclined towards toleration in racial matters than that exercised by the Portuguese.

One factor which must be taken into consideration when

[1] See J. Masuka, " Race Preference in Hawaii " (*American Journal of Sociology*, 1936, XLI, 635–41), and for the changes in the industrial organization see A. MacDonald, *Revolt in Paradise* (New York), 1945.

observing social as opposed to racial discrimination in Puerto Rico is the poverty of the poorer classes, which at times can only be said to beggar description. At least three-quarters of the population is poor: money is poured into the island; sugar estates are broken up; but the poverty remains. Immigration to the United States is undertaken by some of the more active and ambitious among the younger people; and there are some indications, as in Hawaii, of the development of a middle class half-way between the upper strata of Puerto Rican society (which looks down upon all menial labour) and the poverty-stricken labourers. In the United States the Puerto Ricans find that they are classed as Negroes; and although many of them live in lower Harlem and tend to stick together, they mix easily with their coloured neighbours, marriages between them and Negroes not being rare. This tendency to live in the same neighbourhood is nearly always apparent in the case of minority groups, who feel themselves disliked and sense an atmosphere of hostility in their neighbours. Their withdrawal and apparent lack of neighbourly feeling are interpreted as a form of snobbery or clannishness, and thus the vicious circle is complete and bitterness is increased on both sides. Moreover, the poverty of the majority of the Puerto Ricans, even after they have emigrated to the United States, is not likely to increase any esteem that might be felt for them, but is rather likely to annoy and irritate many of the more thoughtful Americans, who are thereby reminded of the poor material welfare of the inhabitants of one of their own dependencies, and of the wisdom of putting their own house in order before criticizing the colonial policies of other nations.

We have now given an outline of how the colour bar operates in the United States, and it is time to see what is being done by far-sighted Americans to break it down and so avoid some of its results, which have not only been harmful to the industries of the United States, but have caused discontent, social upheavals, and even riots, violence, and bloodshed.

Although the problem of the Negro in the United States can, I think, never be satisfactorily solved as long as the social structure of American society is retained on the existing pattern, yet a good deal has been and is being done to understand it better and to mitigate some of its more evil effects. Perhaps one of the most remarkable of the indications as to what is in

the air is the title of the book by Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, which we have already quoted—*An American Dilemma*. Again, there is creeping into literary, political, and religious discussions a marked tendency to emphasize the American *dream* at the expense of the American *way of life*. This suggests that some Americans at least are beginning to feel more and more acutely the wide gulf which separates the ideals of the "way of life" and the practical actualities of the situation as it affects some thirteen million black American citizens. Thus the substitution of "a dream" for a "way of life" softens the dilemma. The day of inevitable reckoning is still further postponed. In this connection it must be remembered that the feelings of guilt which lie just beneath the American consciousness are intensified by the knowledge of how the treatment the Negro receives differs from what is described in the American dream. This guilt is accompanied by fear—fear as to what is going on behind those dark faces; fear of what is being discussed and hatched in those dark and gloomy shacks where thousands of Negroes are forced to live; fear of what might happen if the Negroes organized their power, and no longer wanted to be kept "in their place." Moreover, fears of hardship from the economic point of view are not without a considerable importance. It is realized that not all of the Negro soldiers, especially those who have seen combat service, will be willing to return to a share-cropping existence, or struggle to make both ends meet in some dilipidated urban slum. Similarly, the women who, in some cases, have been earning good wages in the war industries may not be too willing to return to domestic service at a few dollars a week, especially as their absence from the kitchen has caused intense irritation in many a Southern household. Thus the prospect for the return to the good old times is not too rosy. Adjustments will have to be made, and they will not be altogether to the liking of hard-boiled Southerners, who doubtless will resist them and mutter something about the influence of "those damyankees."

It must not be imagined, however, that the South is remaining altogether static, and that the intransigence of some is reflected throughout the whole community. The average educated American, be he from the North or from the South, is aware that it is not possible: (*a*) to deport all "the Negroes" to Africa; (*b*) to segregate them in reserves somewhat similar

to those now occupied by the American Indians and New Mexican pueblos; (*c*) to form a Negro free State in the South; (*d*) to return to what would virtually be a policy of slavery, either marked or veiled; (*e*) to round up the Negro population, and distribute it all over the United States so as to avoid sections of the country becoming all black; (*f*) to accept the kind of racial doctrine popularized by National Socialist Germany and—which is more important—to implement it through appropriate action; or (*g*) to adopt at once the policy of Mexico, Brazil, or Hawaii, where a general amalgamation is taking place in which colour prejudice is almost wholly subordinated to caste or social distinctions which often have a colour background. The only other solution is to attempt to combine a culture in which Negroes and Whites live together side by side on a basis of mutual understanding, and where there is no discrimination or civic or political inequality, but where social equality does not extend to miscegenation as between the two peoples.

There seems to be some evidence that it is in this direction that the minds of both the black and white members of the educated classes are tending; and although attempts of this sort will certainly be made, it is premature to hazard a guess as to whether they can succeed. What is certain is that great dangers are impending, and the next fifty years will probably show what is to be the future of the Negroes in the United States.

In the South the changing picture is even more noticeable than in the North. Illiteracy is being tackled in earnest, especially in States like Louisiana, where the terms in primary and secondary schools were increased in 1939. In Georgia, grants to Negro education are on the up-grade and more attention is being paid to housing and medical facilities. The failure of cotton may bring even more industries into the South than it has already done; and more factories mean more work for Negroes as well as for others. Apart, however, from these factors—all of which make for the better relations between black and white—we have the deliberate attempts at interracial understanding and friendship, together with the work of organizations which exist solely for the benefit of the Negroes. Among the latter the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (N.A.A.C.P.) and the Urban League are perhaps the most important. The N.A.A.C.P.

was founded in 1909, and its operations are mainly directed towards legal and political issues; whilst the Urban League (founded 1911) is more concerned with education and advancing progress in housing, recreation for young people, and industrial amelioration in general.

In the South there have been recent signs of a fuller awareness of the tension inherent in the present situation, and welcome indications that steps are being taken to meet it. The Southern Regional Council (which replaced the former Commission on Interracial Co-operation) has its offices in Georgia, and is concerned mainly with the serious attempt to break down racial antagonism through education, research, and liberal use of the Press, where it can be made available. One step in advance which suggests the line to be followed in the future was the meeting in Durham, North Carolina, in October 1942. Here a group of Southern Negroes held a conference on the general situation of the Negro in the South and the changes which, in their opinion, would be beneficial, not only to themselves, but to the nation as a whole. In their statement, which is known as the Durham Statement, the group responsible pointed out how the war had sharpened the issue of Negro–White relations, and how these relations threatened to become more serious as time went on. Whilst accepting the principle of the paramount nature of loyalty to the nation during the war, it was not believed that this consideration precluded discussions of race relations in the South, of which the strength and age of its cultural pattern were recognized by Negroes living there. On the other hand, the group recorded its fundamental opposition to compulsory segregation, and regarded it as unfortunate that attempts made to correct social and economic injustice were still considered in some quarters as the " predatory ambition of irresponsible Negroes to invade the privacy of family life."

The possibility of evolving in the South a way of life which would be satisfactory to both parties is not ruled out in the Durham Statement. Indeed, the signatories say that they have both courage and faith in this respect; and the declaration ended by condemning the wicked notion that the struggle of the Negro for citizenship was opposed to the best interests of the nation. Such a doctrine, the statement declared, was " to deny the most elementary principles of American life and government."

In April 1943 a reply (the Atlanta Statement) was issued by a conference of White Southerners on race relations. Recognizing the spirit of goodwill which animated the Durham Statement, the conveners, whilst not attempting to make a full reply to the various points raised in the earlier declaration, admitted the justice of the points raised by the Negroes regarding the practice of discrimination on racial grounds in the administration of the laws. Moreover, Negroes have little voice in the making and enforcement of the laws under which they are compelled to live. Such a situation is a violation of the spirit of democracy.

With regard to the Jim Crow regulations, the Atlanta Statement showed no inclination towards abolishing them, but favoured rather the equalization of treatment of both sides, so that in travel, for example, accommodation, although separate, should be equal in quality. The declaration further considered racial antagonism to be a poison which, unless checked, would disturb and threaten the stability of the nation. What was to be avoided was a policy of drift. A positive programme was necessary so that, through evolutionary methods, co-operation and mutual respect might be attained.

In June 1943 a further declaration (the Richmond Statement) was issued by a collaboration committee drawn from representatives of the Durham and Atlanta Conferences. In this document, which is of quite peculiar interest, it is admitted that, apart from the war, the problem of readjustment in the South was the great crisis of the South and of the nation. For it was in the South that a great people was to be found; a great people "doing little things" and a good people "often doing bad things." Inexorably conditioned by cultural complexes, the White South was suffering terribly and needed sympathy and help, just as the Black South needed plenty of understanding and co-operation.

The Richmond Statement continued by urging the general adaptation of the principles outlined in the Durham Conference and, recognizing the importance of affirmative action, decided to recommend the collaboration committee to work out practical methods and means of approach. It is on these lines that the Southern Regional Council hopes to implement the decisions of the conferences and to continue their work.

It is not only committees and conferences which are meeting to lessen racial tension in the South. Private individuals are

forming new organizations, publishing militant journals, and in their everyday lives trying to demonstrate their disapproval of the more blatant form of discrimination and colour prejudice.

We have not here the space to deal with these in any detail, but a word must be said about the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching, which was formed in November 1930, and which has some 40,000 members and is backed by a large number of civic and religious organizations. The work of the Association is directed mainly towards strengthening the hands of local sheriffs and influencing officers of the peace and State officials in the required direction. If we accept the available statistics of *known* lynchings [1] there is no doubt that it is declining.[2] The year 1943 saw only three, whilst the figures since 1939 are:—

1939	3	(1 White:	2 Negroes)
1940	5	(1 „	4 „)
1941	4	(0 „	4 „)
1942	5	(0 „	5 „)
1943	3	(0 „	3 „)

With these years can be compared those between 1930 and 1939, when the difference is immediately apparent.

1930	21	(1 White:	20 Negroes)
1931	13	(1 „	12 „)
1932	8	(2 „	6 „)
1933	28	(4 „	24 „)
1934	15	(0 „	15 „)
1935	20	(2 „	18 „)
1936	9	(0 „	9 „)
1937	8	(0 „	8 „)
1938	6	(0 „	6 „)

[1] Opposition to a Federal law on lynching is often based on the theory that lynching would not be thereby abolished, but would be carried out much more secretly.

[2] It ought, perhaps, to be stated that the figures as generally issued and by the N.A.A.C.P. refer only to those cases which are thought certain, whereas it is alleged in some quarters that the real figures are much higher. Thus, for 1930 Tuskegee gave twenty-one, whilst the N.A.A.C.P. and International Labor Defense gave twenty-five and seventy-nine respectively. Similarly, for 1932 the figures were eight (Tuskegee), eleven (N.A.A.C.P.), and thirty-seven (League of Struggle for Negro Rights). Whatever may be the truth as to these discrepancies, I am inclined to think that (*a*) more lynchings do occur than those reported by Tuskegee and the N.A.A.C.P., and (*b*) that the total number recorded and unrecorded is declining.

Between 1886 and 1930 it is said that 4,297 persons had been lynched, but of these only 21 per cent. were claimed to be due to alleged crimes against white women. In 1943 the firm action of the officers of the law prevented nine threatened lynchings; and in another case a mob bent upon a lynching was finally prevented from doing so by concerted and joint action on the part of a body of white and coloured citizens.

It is this action by private individuals in the South which is beginning to show how mob violence is diminishing, and how the fear of reprisals need not deter a prominent Southern citizen from expressing his views on matters which deeply affect both his own honour as an American citizen and the good name of that part of the country in which he has made his home.

Perhaps one of the most remarkable of recent indications of what is happening in the South is the work of Lillian E. Smith, who is jointly responsible for the outspoken journal *South Today*, and whose book *Strange Fruit*, published in New York in 1944, and later in London, created a sensation. She was born in a small southern town in which there were more Negroes than Whites. Her father was a planter and owner of a mill some miles south of the Georgia border, in Florida. He was a local celebrity in a small way, since he owned the ice-plant, the town water-works, and was chairman of the Board of Stewards of the Methodist Church and of the Board of Education. After the first World War he retired to live in Clayton, in North Georgia, where Lillian Smith has since made her home.

After attending Piedmont College, in Demarest, Georgia, for one year, Lillian Smith went on to the Peabody Conservatory, in Baltimore, where she spent four years. After leaving Baltimore she went to Columbia University, where she remained one year, and soon afterwards she went to China to teach in a mission school, but returned to Georgia after three years and took up a position as an executive secretary to a city manager. In 1936 she and a friend of hers called Paula Snelling founded in Clayton a small, personal, quarterly magazine which she called *Pseudopodia*, and in which appeared some provocative articles. In 1937 it changed its name to *The North Georgia Review*, and in 1942 it was renamed *South Today*.

When the magazine first appeared, its circulation was 200; to-day it is said to be round the 5,000 mark. Indeed, Miss Smith's readers must be more considerable than the circulation

figures suggest, since one of her most provocative editorials, entitled "There are Things To Do," had to be reprinted from the magazine, and 125,000 copies were sold.

In her novel, *Strange Fruit*, Lillian Smith deals with the psychological situation in which white and black mingle in a small Georgia town, and in this context it naturally contains scenes of both intimacy and violence. Boston booksellers voluntarily banned the sales; and it is said that the Public Safety Director of Lawrence, Mass., immediately banned the sale of the book in Lawrence when he picked it up in a shop whilst waiting for a shave.

Since it was published, the book has raised to white heat the passions of many of those, both in the South and in the North, whose ideas on the racial question can never be fully reconciled. Nevertheless, the fact that Miss Smith is able to live in Clayton, Georgia, where she directs and owns an educational institution patronized by Southern families, is some indication of the changes that are going on in sections of the Deep South.

It is part of Lillian Smith's policy to speak openly and unreservedly about the Negro problem in the South, and to discuss the attitude that she thinks ought to be taken regarding it. Thus she has compiled a list of the simple things that anyone can do to improve relations, such as to stop using such derogatory words as *Nigger* and *Coon*, and accord to educated Negro citizens the titles of Mr., Mrs., or Miss when addressing or writing to them. Similarly, she urges people not to hesitate to write to the papers and radio [1] stations suggesting measures for better relations, and not to criticize people who stand out for better treatment of the Negro. Recognizing that the ordinary man and woman in the South, in spite of their many pretensions, know very little about Negroes except those they employ in some menial capacity, Miss Smith suggests that those who share their ideas should subscribe to a Negro journal and become acquainted with the various projects in education, hospitalization, health, and maternity centres, etc., which are on the way with Federal support or already under the ordinary State sanction. In this way, Miss Smith thinks, people can become better acquainted with the disabilities and injustices under which the Negro suffers, and thus themselves realize how such a situation not only disturbs mutual relations, but impoverishes

[1] *Cf.* I. K. Tyler, "Intolerance by Radio" (*American Teacher*, 1940, xxiv, 22–25).

the whites as well as the blacks, and thereby the nation as a whole. On the other hand, Miss Smith realizes that, when segregation is abandoned, the idea of white supremacy must go with it; and she is fully conversant with what that doctrine means to the South. She believes that the South is willing for the present situation to continue because it cannot endure to think of tackling the job, since it means giving up the idea of trying to force the Negro into the white man's pattern. It is not, Miss Smith thinks, so much a Negro problem for finding a way for black men to live with white men; it is, she insists, a problem for white people to *learn to live with themselves*. And it is just here that Lillian Smith shows herself a Southern pioneer of the most discerning type. For she sees clearly that what is torturing the South is that complex of unconscious fears and guilt with which it cannot come to grips or even diagnose. As Hilary St. George Saunders said, it is like a faulty tooth which now and then gives vicious twinges to awake the sufferer to reality.[1]

The fact that attempts are being made by private individuals and organizations to better relations is some indication that, at a later period, public opinion may come to grips with the more fundamental reasons for colour prejudice. Even if it be said that these attempts are merely palliative, there is little doubt that the results spread beyond the boundaries of the actual experiments. Thus in August 1944 the Rev. A. R. Low, a Vermont pastor, arranged for eighty-one Negro children from New York to spend a short holiday in the houses of white families in Vermont. The project seems to have been successful, and is one of the many similar schemes whereby young people of both colours may get to know each other, and, when the time for association has ended, may act as ambassadors of goodwill among their own folk, thus spreading the spirit of friendship instead of suspicion and hostility. A very similar idea underlies the work of the Neighbourhood-Home Festival scheme, where Americans of all types are invited to get together, become acquainted, and sink minor and even major differences in an atmosphere of comradeship and mutual enjoyment.

It is in work like this, together with the operations of such organizations as the Southern Negro Youth Congress and

[1] *Cf.* L. E. Smith, *Plain Talk for United States Whites* (Social Action, February 15, 1944); H. St. George Saunders, *Pioneers ! O Pioneers !* (London, 1944), p. 164.

similar social and educational bodies, that attempts are being made in the United States to improve racial relations and put an end to the wide difference between the theories of equality and justice as outlined by the Constitution and actual practice as seen in the Jim Crow regulations and industrial barriers. As might be expected, the popularity of a critic is not enhanced should he venture to touch upon the question, and thereupon intensify the feelings of guilt which are immediately aroused. Rational discussion of the problem is often impossible; and although many more reasonable people are to be found than when Mr. H. G. Wells summed up his impressions of the tragedy of colour in 1906, the answers to certain questions are still, as he put it, " usually in terms of mania." [1]

There is, however, no doubt that liberal-minded people are being listened to more and more; demagogues like Theodore G. Bilbo are appealing to fewer and fewer followers, as Eugene Talmadge, the " cowboy " Governor of Georgia, found to his cost when he was defeated in 1942. But unless plans are made in advance, the coming peace will not find the South prepared. Returning soldiers, white and black, will have conflicting interests; and the desire to push down " the nigger where he belongs " will be implemented by the formation of organizations featuring white supremacy, Jim Crowism, and " justice " attained through methods of violence. It may be true that Southern ideas cannot be changed overnight; it is also true that time waits for no man, least of all for those who, tormented by fears and regrets born of frustrated longings, fail to free themselves from romantic fantasy and face the cold, hard facts of a practical world.

In our discussion of the nature of colour prejudice it may be possible to indicate briefly how this situation developed in the United States, and to explain why colour prejudice generates so much heat both there and in the Union of South Africa, whilst in places like Brazil and the Dutch East Indies it is often regarded somewhat as a sign of ill-breeding and lack of good education. Meanwhile, it is time to pass on and glance very briefly at the colour bar as it affects certain people living in Great Britain and in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

[1] H. G. Wells, *The Future of America* (London, 1906), p. 269.

CHAPTER VII

THE COLOUR BAR IN GREAT BRITAIN

FROM the strictly official point of view there is no legal colour bar in Great Britain; neither have the Ministers of His Majesty's Government openly approved of any examples of it which have been brought to their notice. The British ideal has been quite clearly put forward on a number of occasions. At the Imperial Conference in 1921 Mr. Winston Churchill stated that there ought to be no barriers of race, colour, or creed which prevented any man of worth from reaching any situation if he were fitted for it. Similarly, on September 23, 1943, the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, Mr. R. S. Hudson, declared that he was against the colour bar; and on December 17th of the same year Colonel Oliver Stanley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, declared "in no unmeasured terms" that he was against it; and he added that in England it was a social question, and that it was difficult, by making laws, "to prevent a certain number of ill-mannered and ignorant people allowing ill-manners and ignorance to get the better of them."

Although Colonel Stanley might have inserted the words "badly brought up" between the words "ill-mannered and ignorant," the phrase is strong enough to indicate how colour prejudice and the colour bar are regarded in high-placed official circles. How far does this attitude affect the mass of the population? How much colour prejudice is there in England to-day, and how far does the colour bar operate in British society?

It is not easy to give a satisfactory answer to these questions, since an adequate scientific survey of the question has never been attempted. All we can do is to get a broad, general view, and then try to form a rough idea of what is happening and the probable trend of future thought and action.

Now there is some evidence, although I am not at all certain how far it ought to be accepted, that colour prejudice in England was less some forty years ago than it is now. There is certainly no doubt about it as regards much earlier days. *Othello* does not seem to have aroused any wild outburst, as well it might to-day were it not written by Shakespeare; neither do we read of many protests about the mixed marriages between

whites and the slaves who continued to enter this country in the eighteenth century until the Mansfield judgment in 1774. In those days, and even in the early twentieth century, people seemed less conscious of colour than they do to-day; and even among students there seems to have been less strain and more acceptance of obvious differences.

It must be remembered that colour prejudice is not innate, as some people are still inclined to believe. It may begin very early in a child's life and then gradually develop, but it has first of all to be implanted in the child's mind. It is therefore clear that these suggestions must be derived from the child's parents or teachers, or from varied or diffuse factors in its daily life. As might be expected, there is some evidence that suggests that student groups have less colour prejudice than those composed of non-students, and it is probably less among the French than among the British. Similarly, an inquiry among American children drawn from schools both in New York City and the South showed that the children of Communist parents showed no particular prejudice against Negroes, but rather a slight preference, thus vividly illustrating the importance of early parental education in negating the influence of external factors which might affect the child's future views of racial relations.[1]

In this country there can be little doubt that the ordinary education of our children regarding the non-white population of the world is one in which it is commonly presented as composed not only of inferior, but of conquered peoples, who are destined to remain subject to the economic and social domination of those who have vanquished them. Indeed, many older and even responsible people labour under the impression that Africans living in such places as the West African Dependencies (Nigeria, the Gold Coast, etc.) are wild and savage folk, who are likely to run amok and have to be carefully managed and controlled. For example, it is said that one commanding officer at a military hospital in India, to which a number of West African soldiers have been recently sent, actually inquired regarding their diet, and whether or not they ate their meat raw.[2]

[1] See E. L. Horwitz, "The Development of Attitude Towards the Negro" (*Arch. Psychol.*, 1936, nr. 194). *Cf.* J. P. Guildford, "Racial Preferences of 1000 University Students" (*Jour. Soc. Psychol.*, 1931, II, 179–204).

[2] See letter from Captain E. Broadbent in *The Spectator*, London, September 27, 1944, p. 384).

The idea that the coloured man, be he African or Oriental, is really inferior can readily be observed in action in many parts of the British Empire, and, indeed, on British ships going to Africa and the East. In 1907 the parks in Shanghai had notices to say that Chinese were not admitted, although the rule was relaxed when the said Chinese were *amahs* or nurses employed to look after European infants. This rule was later abrogated. Clubs are often the strongholds of colour prejudice; although I think that a case can be made out for Europeans, living in a country where the population is non-European, wanting a club reserved for themselves, just as the people of the country would be justified in excluding all Europeans from one of their own clubs.

In England the word "coloured" has not the technical significance that it has in the United States. It is used mainly for persons of black or brown skin, be they African or Indian, although colour prejudice is often extended to *any* person with a skin other than white, and it is possible that feelings against Southern Europeans such as Sicilians are connected with the darker complexions of these people.

As has been said above, while the colour bar has no legal or official sanction in England, it nevertheless operates in many directions both on the industrial and social levels. Its manifestations naturally differ from those we have been discussing in the United States. It is not so open; it is expressed with more subtlety and suavity and with less violence, and so is more difficult to grapple with and expose. Perhaps one of the most interesting accounts of what it means for an educated man of colour to be subjected to colour prejudice is that recorded by Mr. D. F. Karaka in his book, *I Go West*, which was published in 1938. When he vacated the Chair of the Oxford Union Society, of which he was the first Indian President, he delivered a slashing attack on the colour bar and what it had meant to him during his residence in England. When he first came up to Oxford he thought that he might visit Switzerland during the vacation, and he wrote to a tourist agency for tickets for himself and friend which were available for one of the inclusive trips. When he called for the tickets he found that his colour was an obstacle to his going with the party. His deposit was returned, for, as the assistant told him, "You may pass off as a Spaniard, but will your friend?" This incident remained an abiding memory in Mr. Karaka's

mind.[1] It festered, as well it might; and in his book he records a number of instances of how the colour bar operates in England, such as one which occurred before the Coronation of King George VI, when a coloured British subject was told he could not be served at a certain bar until after the Coronation because the Americans in the hotel might not like it. Cases of this sort are not uncommon, and but rarely attract public notice unless they are brought into the courts. One curious case occurred in 1919, when three South African native delegates to a conference, together with one student, were, on September 29, forcibly prevented from sailing on the Union Castle Liner S.S. *Edinburgh Castle*, at Southampton, because South African soldiers and civilians objected. This unfortunate occurrence caused a good deal of trouble; questions were asked in Parliament, and the case came into the Law Courts.

A number of inquiries have shown that it is difficult for coloured people to obtain accommodation in hotels and boarding-houses, not only in London, but also in the provinces. About 1931 the Joint Council to Promote Understanding between White and Coloured People in Great Britain, an organization connected with the Society of Friends, was directing its attention to this matter, and the Chairman reported that in the single locality of Bedford Place, London, fourteen lodging-houses out of fifteen visited were refusing coloured students. Similarly, in Cardiff, Dr. K. L. Little found that, out of the eleven hotels and boarding-houses questioned, eight said that they did not receive coloured guests. In 1932 such a case was the subject of a legal action. A West African, an Oxford graduate, having seen the address of a London hotel advertised in a West African paper, of which the chairman of the company owning it was his father, applied for rooms, but when the manager discovered that he was a coloured man he refused him permission to stay, although it was pointed out

[1] Mr. Karaka's attack on the colour bar as he found it in Oxford attracted a good deal of attention, especially at the Oxford Carlton Club, where it was said that Indians were not welcome. A member of the club was reported as having stated that a good many members of the Club dislike the idea of having coloured undergraduates as members. In a leading article on the matter, which was published in the University journal, *The Isis*, the writer said that all that one can say of a gentleman who made a statement of that kind was " that he evokes an atmosphere only comparable to the odour of bad drains."

that the hotel itself advertised in the paper published in West Africa.[1]

Another case of discrimination which excited much attention, in September 1943, was that of a young woman who wanted to join the Land Army. Miss Amelia E. King, aged twenty-six, and a British subject, with a father and a brother serving in the Merchant and Royal Navies, was called up for service in March 1943, and chose the Land Army. Difficulties arose, and she was told that farmers objected to employing her; and to find a billet with local residents would not prove too easy. The case was taken up by the Press, and a question was asked in Parliament on September 23. Mr. R. S. Hudson, the Minister of Agriculture, said, in reply, that it was likely to prove " extremely difficult " to find employment and a billet for Miss King, and under the regulations he had no power to force the farmer to accept any particular worker. In discussing the situation it was said that there was no colour bar in the Women's Land Army, and that there were already coloured workers enrolled in it; but the officials had no power to act in the matter where cases of difficulty arose. The publicity given to the case excited the interest of farmers without colour prejudice, and later in the year Miss King found employment with one of them.

A somewhat similar case was reported the year before as occurring to a coloured man who applied for work at a Labour Exchange. After some discussion he was, it is said, given a paper in which his application was refused and his colour specified. He took the case to a higher quarter, where further consideration was given to him, and finally he was accepted and was reported as being successful.

The same year that Amelia King was finally admitted to the Land Army saw another case which excited intense interest both in England and in the Colonies. Mr. L. N. Constantine, the West Indian cricketer, and at that time a Local Welfare Officer in the Government Service, was refused as a guest in a popular hotel in Russell Square, London, with the excuse that other guests from America and the Colonies might not like it, and thus it was better for him to go elsewhere, as the hotel existed solely for the requirements of the majority of its patrons. The case excited even greater comment than that

[1] See the *Evening Standard* (March 3, 1932) and the *Daily Herald* and *News Chronicle* for March 2, 1932.

aroused by Miss King's experience with the Land Army. In order to test the situation, Mr. Constantine, whose grandparents were slaves, took the matter to the courts rather than submit tamely to the unjustifiable humiliation and distress which he had suffered. Judgment was given for him on June 28, 1943, with nominal damages. Later in the year he was invited by the British Broadcasting Corporation to give a radio talk, which he did on September 9, telling of his life in Nelson, Lancashire, and how gradual was the process by which he became a popular and accepted figure in his own town.

It was early in 1941 that the Ministry of Labour and the Colonial Office began an experiment which consisted of a scheme whereby some 180 West Indian technicians were brought to England to assist in the war factories. The men were drafted to the North-Western Region, and the majority came from Jamaica, where each had had some experience in small workshops. Within a week the men had been placed in the various selected industrial establishments and had begun their work. As might have been expected, they were not all equally efficient at their new jobs, for the standards in repair and maintenance work on which some of them were previously engaged were not so high as that in the great war factories of this country. Moreover, cases of absenteeism were not infrequent, and for this the climate, and Britain's 1941 winter, after Jamaican sun, may have been partly responsible. Generally speaking, the experiment can be said to have had its successes, although disappointments and setbacks were far from unknown. Racial discrimination was lessened and the white workers got to know the coloured Jamaicans, and learnt at first hand of the kind of problems they had to face in their home country. But incidents still occur which show that colour prejudice is still active, especially where business might decline were discrimination not exercised. One such case came up at an appeal which was heard at the Liverpool City Quarter Sessions on August 1, 1944. In this case it appeared that a fine of £5 had been imposed, at the police court, on George A. McGuire Roberts, a West Indian, for failing to attend his Home Guard duties without reasonable excuse. When the appeal was heard, the Recorder, Mr. E. G. Hemmerde, K.C., reduced the fine to a farthing, and Mr. Roberts was given the costs of the appeal. It seemed that Roberts, who was an electrician in a war factory, had joined the Home Guard as a

volunteer; and when he was asked why he had failed to do his picket duty, he explained that he had been refused admission to a dance-hall because of his colour. When he returned, wearing his Home Guard uniform, he had again been refused admission. He had stayed away from his Home Guard duties, he explained, because he had been insulted when wearing his uniform.

In giving judgment the Recorder said that the case raised, in an acute form, a question which in the future would have to be faced. In this connection he was interested to hear Mr. Roberts explain that in the factories the better class of people could always be picked out because they did not believe in colour bars and other matters of privilege. Continuing, the Recorder said that he did not understand how any colour bar could exist, or "ever be allowed to exist by any Government that was worth the name of Government," when it was remembered how in the British Empire there were so many coloured people. He considered it an impertinence for any country to accept the aid of coloured people from any part of the world, and then to tell them that our laws did not enable us to deal with them on terms of complete equality.

It is interesting to note that this incident should have occurred in Liverpool, where, owing to the continued influx and exit of coloured seamen, colour prejudice is perhaps not so marked as it is elsewhere. But even there restrictions are rigid and well understood. The coloured population lives in an area in the south end of the city, which is overcrowded and little better than a slum. White people living there are familiar with coloured seamen and do not actively resent their presence, although opposition is shown if a coloured or partly coloured family attempt to move into a neighbourhood which is predominantly or wholly white.

Certainly some fifteen years ago the standard of life in the coloured section of Liverpool's dock area was low from whatever point of view we choose to regard it. As long as the people kept to their own quarter of the city, trouble was avoided; but if they moved out, or even if the seamen attempted to use the social facilities offered by the various seamen's institutes and hostels, trouble resulted. Indeed, these establishments used to be scarcely entered by the coloured men, for the white seamen apparently objected to them on the grounds of the possibility that they were taking jobs which could be filled by

whites, or on account of a certain measure of resentment due to the relations between the coloured seamen and white women. Thus, coloured seamen in our great ports are likely to patronize those places where coloured people only are catered for; and so the recent support given by the Colonial Office to hostels for these men has met with a wide measure of response. Apart from the seamen, whose stay in port is often transitory, there are others who remain in England, and who are often unemployed for long periods at a time. Moreover, the position of the half-caste children illustrates how the colour bar operates in England. As long as they are children they do not feel social ostracism to any great extent; but when they become adolescent, and future employment begins to be thought of, trouble begins. In the case of the young men, some may go to sea; but as to jobs for those staying on shore, the Fletcher Report states that a number of employers who were approached said that they were afraid to employ them, owing to the possible opposition of their white employees. One hundred and nineteen firms were approached, and, of the fifty-six which answered, forty-five replied in the negative. In the case of the girls the situation was much worse. Their moral surroundings, and the conditions of poverty under which they live, can hardly be thought to be a suitable training-ground for reliable workers, and thus they may fall into trouble of obvious kinds.[1]

Another inquiry conducted just before the outbreak of the Second World War showed what was perhaps a better state of things, although it is clear that the position of the half-caste child in Liverpool is by no means a satisfactory one. A similar state of affairs seems to exist among the coloured community in Cardiff, where, previous to 1939, wide unemployment existed, but where, since the war, economic conditions have improved. Even within this community, colour prejudice has been reported, inasmuch as men of darker colour are regarded less favourably by the lighter-skinned people; and in social status the Arabs seem to be held to be above the Africans. On the other hand, such terms as "Nigger" are regarded as taboo, the word (as in the United States) being used only in a friendly way when no possible offence is intended; and it is interesting to note that, as regards the word "colour," it is

[1] See M. E. Fletcher, *Report on an Investigation into the Colour Problem in Liverpool and Other Ports* (Liverpool, 1930).

rarely used to designate the light-skinned Moslems, of whom many are simply called Arabs.[1]

With the coming of the Second World War and the arrival in Great Britain of American Negro troops—who were often posted in places where many of the local inhabitants had never seen a black man—the colour problem assumed a new and somewhat ominous aspect. The question had to be decided as to whether British people were prepared to tolerate the kind of discrimination practised in those parts of the United States from which the soldiers came; and if so, whether they themselves would not be thereby favouring a method of behaviour which was hardly one which had ever received the approval of His Majesty's Government. On the other hand, it was recognized that it was manifestly unfair to the Negroes themselves to encourage modes of social behaviour which would not only infuriate white American soldiers, and possibly lead to violent clashes, but which would, in many cases, be misunderstood by the coloured men, so different was the position in their own country.

Generally speaking, considering the delicacy and complexity of the problem, the compromise arrived at cannot be said to have been wholly unsuccessful. In many parts of England the Negroes became popular, and the local inhabitants regretted the day when they were sent elsewhere. Their cheerfulness, simplicity, and good nature made them welcome visitors, and many people resented any attempts to discriminate against them in local entertainments or places of amusement. In other localities of perhaps a more sophisticated kind, especially in urban, inland, provincial areas, the white American soldiers succeeded in arranging for a certain measure of discrimination in taverns, hostels, and places of amusement, although little success was achieved in extending Jim Crowism to travelling facilities. The British, as befits a people of sturdy common sense, soon recognized that here was a question which could not at the moment be decided without some compromise on both sides: the issues were too grave to be fought over in time of emergency, as between Allies in arms; but they were quick to oppose any extension of measures which they considered had already reached the limits which they were prepared to

[1] See K. L. Little, "Loudoun Square" (*Sociological Review*, 1942, XXXIV, 12–33, 119–146) and *cf. The New Statesman and Nation*, December 19, 1942, p. 408.

sanction, and did not hesitate to prepare and circularize signed petitions when it was thought that some injustice had been done.

It is probable that the temporary residence of American Negro soldiers in England has awakened in many a realization of the colour problem which otherwise they would never have had. There seems little doubt that a number of the younger women of the middle and upper class, who have become acquainted with white American soldiers, have taken over from them a good deal of their colour prejudice, especially if they happen to have come from the South. This is true of many of the less intelligent among middle-class girls, who have never thought about the question, and who do not understand its implications and its more important bearings as regards the British Colonial Empire. On the other hand, among some of the more thoughtful of the younger people the whole question has received a new slant, and has aroused in them the determination to inquire more fully into the matter, since they realize the immense gain in strength and solidity which would accrue to the Empire, in the post-war years, were it possible to break down that barrier between our different peoples which is the inevitable and fatal result of colour prejudice. If the British Empire is to survive as a world-wide and progressive institution, it must exhibit a better power of social adaptation; and those who administer it must try to put aside that fear which amounts almost to a phobia, and which, as the late Lord Lugard more than once pointed out, is one of the root causes of colour prejudice. In this connection the behaviour and public opinion of people living in Great Britain are of great importance. If they support, and desire to see implemented, the repeated declarations of His Majesty's Government on the colour bar, then the Government itself will be able to resist pressure from outside when the problem is raised. But whatever may be the future attitude of the people of Great Britain regarding colour prejudice and the colour bar, it is clear that much remains to be done in the sphere of education, so as to teach children what are the basic facts with regard to race and colour, and how the possession of a white skin is in no way a guarantee of social or political dominance.

CHAPTER VIII

THE COLOUR BAR IN AFRICA

IT will not be possible in the space at our disposal to discuss or describe in any way fully the colour bar as we see it on the African continent. The territory is too vast, and the nature of the white and native problem too complex, to admit of anything but a sketch of some of the prevailing patterns as they are found in the different regions under the control or influence of British, French, Belgian, and other administrations.

With regard to the lands which have been subject to British influence, there is little doubt that there are two major factors which are mainly responsible for the presence or absence of colour bars which are to be found in widely separated regions. The first is to be seen in the work of the missionaries, who in Africa have, in many cases at least, steadfastly upheld the moral obligation inherent in the Christian view of the Brotherhood of Man; and secondly we have the fact that the whites, having once arrived and established themselves, were in the position of a small white minority surrounded by a huge black majority. Better armed, educated, and equipped, it was not too difficult a matter for them to become the dominant power; and once that power was firmly established, it could, it was thought, be maintained only by erecting rigid barriers against social equality, which might tend towards miscegenation and consequent swamping of the white minority. It is clear that this possibility was always in the minds of the early Dutch settlers in South Africa; and in regard to it, one writer, Capt. J. W. D. Moodie, says that both the Dutch and English colonists were "very partial to the female Hottentots," although this was carefully concealed from their womenfolk, as discretion demanded.[1] Moreover, the need for cheap labour in the development and industrialization of certain areas demanded native assistance and exploitation, and so we find the old dilemma between faith and practice cropping up again, and taking as ugly and distressing forms as we have already observed in the Southern States of North America. Indeed, it was clearly to be seen in the early days when the missionaries first

[1] *Ten Years in South Africa* (London, 1835), vol. I, p. 221.

came out to convert the heathen, and the influence of these Christian teachers has had a decided bearing on the moulding and consolidation of later Boer policy regarding the natives. Whatever may be said as to the work done by the missionaries, it cannot be denied that, generally speaking, they were a sincere although somewhat bigoted body of men who followed the light as they saw it. Philanthropic fanaticism was in their blood; and it is possible that some of them were influenced by the idea of the noble savage and the crimes being perpetuated against him. However that may be, the work of men like Dr. John Philip and Dr. Johann T. van der Kemp, both of whom were working for the London Missionary Society in the South, undoubtedly exercised great influence over native affairs both in Europe and in Africa; and their sense of duty towards the black man perhaps at times made them somewhat insensitive towards the position of the whites. For the missionaries the situation was clear; they had few doubts how the dilemma should be met; moral obligation must take precedence over material advantage, and thus the interests of the blacks must come first. Hence the doctrine that the interests of the natives must be paramount (a doctrine which has been put forward as part of official British policy in Kenya) accepts the moral obligation, although in practice there are weaknesses in the actual execution. As Mr. C. H. Grattan has said, verbal statements of policy are on a high level, but somehow there seems a failure to enforce decisions, a kind of slackening of the capacity to rule. Thus, whilst British verbal and written policy in Africa is to make the interests of the natives paramount, the policy of the Union is exactly the reverse; and thus the fear of the black man, that if Union influence creeps northward his own interests are in jeopardy, is a very real one.[1] Moreover, articulate African spokesmen are not slow to emphasize what seems to them to be the lack of candour behind the failure to implement the proclaimed policy. For example, Kingsley Ozumba Mbadiwe, the Secretary of the African Students' Association in the United States, believes that a " mandated territory " is simply a cloak and a nickname for a colony, and the various colonial policies merely palliatives or stalking-horses, according to the sincerity of the men who profess them. This point of view cannot be disregarded. It can be explained only if we clearly realize what is actually

[1] See C. H. Grattan in *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, April, 1943, p. 488.

happening not only in the development of tropical countries, but in the political and economic structure of Europe as well. With the rise of the great industrial civilizations of the white people, the dilemma was always present as to how far the conditions necessary for so-called industrial progress could be squared with those pretensions to humanitarian and Christian principles which were supposed to be held by the leaders of the white traders, the prospectors, and the captains of industry. Thus a conflict was always present. On the one hand we have the search for profits and for gold, for mining concessions, and for fresh areas to exploit; on the other we have the desire on the part of liberal-minded humanitarians to apply Christian principles in the development of primitive areas, and to see that the natives are not unjustly exploited. The history of slavery, and the motives and ideas of those supporting that institution, can be understood only if we realize the dilemma in which the Christian capitalist world is always involved. It is a dilemma which permeates all the political thought of our times. How far was it possible to regard Japanese aggression in China as an "incident" when there was always the possibility of the enormous Chinese market becoming open to British and American industrialists? How far was it possible to condone German and Italian aggression if there were a possibility of trade agreements being arrived at which would benefit the British manufacturer? How far is it possible to industrialize a tropical country without making use of abundant coloured cheap labour, when it is obviously impossible for white men to work in the unavoidable conditions of tropical life? How far is it possible to compel the coloured man to work for the white man when the "gospel of progress" blazons forth the news that the industrialization of whole continents is a necessary and unavoidable element in the progress of civilization? With regard to this question, let us see what is happening in the Union of South Africa.

1. The Colour Bar in the Union of South Africa

In the Union of South Africa the dilemma to which we have just drawn attention is being met by a series of fantastic expedients which satisfy nobody. Christian civilization demands that the coloured man be educated; industrialization plus the colour bar demands that his education should not

go so far as to make him a skilled worker and thus deprive a white man of his job. Humanitarianism demands medical help and a hygienic existence for native peoples; high profits demand low taxation, which can hardly be reconciled with social and hygienic reforms. The coloured man is to be kept virtually a slave; but the word "slavery" must not be mentioned, and he has to be given at least partial representation in democratic institutions. His birth-rate must not be kept down by force, yet any increase in the black population merely accentuates the difference between the members of white and black, and is always to be regarded as a menace by those Europeans who look upon Africa as a continent in which the white conqueror must ever remain, the dominant power. These are the contradictory elements from which it is hardly possible to disentangle the complex web of interest and counter-interest which make up the history of those parts of the continent where the question of the colour bar becomes more insistent every year.

The failure to deal with the situation became more apparent and more difficult to meet when the war aims of the United Nations were under discussion in the Union. For in this connection a double dilemma is to be remarked. Not only is there the moral obligation of professing Christians towards the natives, but there is also the contradiction between a society holding what is to all intents and purposes an idea of a Master Race (i.e., the White South Africa) engaging in a war against another nation which holds the same idea (i.e. the *Herrenvolk* of Nazi Germany). The Churches have not been slow to point out this difficulty to the people. In an appeal to the Europeans in South Africa a statement was issued on October 20, 1943, by an episcopal synod of the Church of the Province of South Africa, which represented fourteen bishops. The statement declared that the idea of a superior race was held by many in southern Africa, although it was wholly repugnant to the Christian religion. While racial differences and different standards had to be taken into account, forms of discrimination based on skin colour must be condemned, since they were contrary to the clear teaching of the New Testament.

The statement went on to affirm that the effect of colour prejudice was cruel, wasteful, and dangerous: cruel because the victims were deprived of using their capacities to the full, which caused both frustration and despair; wasteful because

the community was thus deprived of their help; and dangerous because when one section of the community is unjust to another section a resentment results and leads to conditions which cannot be foreseen.[1]

This declaration regarding the colour bar in the Union of South Africa is important from whatever point of view it is regarded, and illustrates the general Christian standpoint on the moral question regarding colour prejudice and its results. It will doubtless increase the dilemma which confronts not only the Government, but all those who profess and call themselves Christians. As we have already seen in the case of the United States, colour prejudice and the colour bar inevitably produce frustration and aggression, hatred and resentment. Even in the early days, J. W. D. Moodie records how the colonists despised and hated the native peoples; and he adds that, whether Dutch or English, their hatred "is always in exact proportion to the ignorance or poverty of their masters." [2]

Before proceeding to the description of some aspects of the colour bar in South Africa, a word must be said on the position of the Union in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and on the nature of the white and native population.

After the Boer War, which broke out in 1899, the two Republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State were annexed; but when hostilities finally ceased in 1902 the Boer leaders signed the Treaty of Vereeniging, whereby both the former Republics became Crown Colonies with the prospect of future self-government and the understanding that a non-European franchise would not be established before that time. The latter provision is interesting, inasmuch as it reminds us of the proclamation regarding no equality between black and white in Church or State which is included in the original constitution of the Transvaal, and which is still to-day the controversial core of South African politics.[3]

[1] *Cf.*, on the *Herrenvolk* theme, the charge of the Bishop of Johannesburg, the Rt. Rev. G. H. Clayton, on October 18, 1942 (*The Watchman*, November 1942, XVII, p. 8); and the late Lord Moyne to the Royal Empire Society, October 29, 1941.

[2] *Ten Years in South Africa* (London, 1835), vol. I, p. 176.

[3] Article 9 of the 1858 Constitution ("Grondwet") of the South African Republic reads: "The People shall not permit any equality of coloured persons with white inhabitants, neither in the Church nor in the State."

With the period of reconstruction came the gradual industrialization of South Africa and the development of the mining industry. Lord Milner, the High Commissioner, was working for a form of South African Federation, whilst at the same time doing everything in his power to develop the economic possibilities of the country. The importation of Chinese labour for the mines was but one of the drastic measures that he favoured, but in this case it proved a boomerang. Political interest and counter-interest clashed and bickered; and when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and his Liberal Government took office, in 1905, Chinese labour was stopped and the Transvaal was granted self-government in 1906, and the Orange River Colony a year later. A federation of some kind was now again in the air, and the South African political parties began to discuss the future with a greater assurance and on a firmer basis. Opposed to federation, however, was the idea of the union, which rapidly gained adherence; and in October 1908 the Durban Convention met and formally adopted the principle. After a draft convention was adopted it was approved by the Cape, Natal, Orange Free State and the Transvaal, and was passed in 1909, receiving the royal assent the same year. With regard to the non-European franchise, attempts were made to safeguard this in the Cape. It was, however, clearly recognized that the failure to ensure it elsewhere was a violation of the spirit of equality; but doubts were calmed and consciences assuaged by the pious belief that the Cape policy would be extended as time went on. Events have done little to confirm their hopes. Indeed, the segregation policy of General Hertzog made a continuation of the former system and its ultimate adoption clearly impossible—a fact which is always recalled when the question of incorporating the Native Protectorates of Basutoland, Swaziland, and Bechuanaland (which remained outside the Union) is discussed.

The original South Africa Act of 1909, which consisted of the amended draft constitution, was changed by the Status of the Union Act in 1934. By it the Union Parliament became supreme in the Union of South Africa, which is now completely independent of the British Parliament in London. It is thus that any criticism of the Union's native policy is regarded as interference in the internal affairs of the country, and is resented both by people of British stock and by Afrikaners.

At the same time, a policy so out of keeping with the oft-repeated statements regarding British imperial aims can hardly be regarded without misgiving as long as the Union remains in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the possibility of its influence extending northwards is envisaged.

The Union of South Africa covers more than four times the area of the British Isles, while the white settlers are outnumbered by coloured people in the ratio of four to one. In 1904 the non-European population was estimated at four million odd; in 1939 the estimate was almost double that number. According to the 1936 census, Europeans constituted but 20·9 per cent. of the population, and of these 56 per cent. had Afrikaans as their mother tongue and only 39 per cent. English.

The non-European population is made up of three main groups:

(*a*) " Natives "—of Bantu stock.
(*b*) " Asiatics "—mainly Indians.
(*c*) The so-called " Coloured "—which comprise the Cape Coloured and also the Cape Malays, the Bushmen, the Hottentots, and all persons of mixed parentage having coloured blood.

In May 1936, when the last complete census was taken, the total population of the Union of South Africa was 9,589,898, of whom 2,003,857 were European and 7,586,041 were non-European. Of the non-European peoples, the Bantu were assessed at 3,312,651 men and 3,284,038 women, the Asiatics 119,151 men and 100,540 women, and the Coloured 387,431 men and 382,230 women.

Among the " Natives " are all those persons of Bantu stock who are classified as belonging to the aboriginal population, and not those who were brought into the country later. The Asiatics are any of those who, generally speaking, have been brought into Africa from Asia, and of whom the Indians (especially in Natal) comprise the principal group. Among the " Coloured " are included persons of mixed parentage, of whom the bulk are, perhaps, the so-called Cape Coloured people, who are the product of mixed parentage and have an admixture of Malay, Bushman, and Hottentot blood.[1]

[1] In the Orange Free State the words " Coloured People " are often used for the Natives, and vice versa. The Natal Law XV, of 1869, defined a coloured person as " a Hottentot, a Coolie, a Bushman, a Lascar, or any other people commonly called Kafirs."

The Bantu peoples are themselves immigrants who have drifted down from the north, and who are to a large extent a mixture of Hamitic and of Negroid elements. They now live in that half of the continent southwards from the Equator, and are mainly farmers keeping cattle in the eastern and southern portions of the land they inhabit. Before they came, the country was inhabited by the Bushmen, Hottentots, and other tribes who were found there when the whites first entered the country. Among the Bantu there are some 200 different languages, and this multiplicity of tongues makes the task of unification practically impossible. Some educated Bantu leaders think it would not prove difficult to unite the Bantu languages in South Africa into two main groups; and they point out that English must be the main language, whilst the proposed two principal Bantu languages will be secondary.

The Cape Coloured community has now been in existence for over 200 years, and there has been little mixture with native Bantu. Its numbers are increasing, and it is said that in Johannesburg the number of Coloured is about double what it was fifteen years ago. Alliances between European and Coloured are not uncommon, especially in coastal districts; and the resulting children are legally classed as coloured, although numbers pass for white, and are often accepted as such even when their parentage is known.

The position of the Coloured people as regards their relations with the Bantu on the one hand, and the European on the other is a very difficult one. Apart from those who are simply apathetic, there are some who believe themselves superior to the Bantu, with whom they have little in common and yet are inclined to regard the Europeans as their superiors. Others are resentful of the attitude of the Europeans towards them, and a former hope that the Europeans might help them to move forward has changed into a tendency to look to their own ranks for leadership. One major difficulty which has to be faced by the Coloured population is their chronic state of poverty and malnutrition. Some estimates assert that, of the Coloured householders in Cape Town, 70 per cent. live below what is commonly recognized as the poverty line, whilst conditions in the country are probably worse. They have to face economic competition both from the Bantu and the European lower-grade workers. Moreover, the so-called "civilized labour policy" has encouraged European at the expense of

Native and Coloured labour; and the main effect, both of the Industrial Reconciliation Act of 1924 and the Wages Act of 1937, has tended to depress still further the prospects of the Coloured people.[1]

Before the Union the Coloured men in the Cape were politically equal to the European; but afterwards it was enacted that, whilst the condition of the male franchise remained the same, no coloured person could enter the House of Assembly or the Senate. When, in 1930, the white franchise was extended to women, no change was made in the case of the Coloured population, of which the women remained excluded.[2]

Before examining the more immediate causes and effects of the colour bar in South Africa, it may be convenient to remember that this country is an example of that form of society where the dominant white group has necessarily tended towards adopting an exclusive attitude through which its own power might be sustained and extended. The feeling of insecurity; the idea that hostile elements are always waiting to overthrow what has been so painfully gained—all factors such as these tend to harden the idea of the conqueror towards the subject peoples, especially in the case when the latter are in the majority and of different stock. Thus we can see that racial intolerance becomes a part of the general group intolerance; and, as MacCrone has emphasized, religious attitudes (especially among the Dutch) were early marked by the exclusiveness, which only gradually gave way to what was substituted for it—namely, an attitude based on "white" and "civilized" dominance as opposed to "black" and "pagan" subservience. As one writer has put it, the "Divine Right" of the Dutch frontiersman's religion gradually changed into the "Divine Right of White Skin." The fact that skin-colour to a large extent coincided with the latter group favoured the constant emergence of colour prejudice, since children from their youth up were instilled with ideas which tended towards the assumption that "blacks" were basically inferior beings, doomed to perform menial tasks which no white man could lower himself to touch. Social equality, even in the sense that we know it in England, between different strata of

[1] See J. M. Tinley, *The Native Labour Problem of South Africa* (Chapel Hill, 1942), pp. 61, 182 ff.

[2] Coloured persons have no vote in the Transvaal, Natal, or Orange Free State.

white society, becomes impossible; the colour bar is absolute among the great majority of the population, and a kind of segregation is practised, even though in many respects it is segregation only in name.

In the Union of South Africa the legislative power is vested in a Parliament consisting of the King, a Senate, and a House of Assembly. There is a Governor-General and an Executive Council in charge of the departments of State. The Governor-General has power to summon and dissolve Parliament when such a course is considered necessary. Of the forty members of the Senate, eight are nominated by the Governor-General in Council, and four of these are selected for their acquaintance with the non-European peoples. The Representation of Natives Act of 1936 set up machinery for the representation of the Native population, and made provision for the election of four additional senators, each of whom would represent one of the four electoral areas. The Act, however, changed the position regarding Native representation very considerably. In the Cape Province, for example, non-Europeans had previously the same franchise as Europeans; but the effect of the new Act was that those whose names were on the Electoral Roll were transferred to a special list, on which appeared from time to time the names of those who, before the Act, possessed the necessary qualifications. Those who appeared on this list (the Cape Native Voters' Roll) can elect three members of the House of Assembly and two members of the Provincial Council, but the regulations compel those elected to be Europeans.

One result of the system of representation envisaged by the Representation of Natives Act was the establishment of the Natives Representative Council, the function of which was to report and consider proposed legislation and any other matters referred to it by the Minister of Native Affairs which concerned general or specific questions relating to Native interests. The first session of the Council was opened by Field-Marshal Smuts, who was at that time Deputy Prime Minister, and in his speech he called the institution of the Council "a notable advance" which might become a landmark in happier relations between European and non-European peoples. Although there has been a great deal of criticism of the Council and its work by Native spokesmen, there seems little doubt that the Council has stimulated a good deal of discussion of African affairs,

and has even been in the forefront of those who stressed the need for increasing the spirit of liberalism when dealing with the Native peoples in the Union.

Another body dealing with Native affairs is the Native Affairs Commission, which was established in 1920. It acts mainly in an advisory capacity, its three to five members being appointed by the Governor-General and presided over by the Minister of Native Affairs. It is in his hands that the authority of the Administrative Executive over Native affairs really rests. With him are the Permanent Secretary, the Under-Secretary and the general staff of the department. For the purpose of administration the Union is divided into five areas, controlled in each case by a Chief Native Commissioner. The Native Administration Act of 1929 (amended in 1939) consolidated the system then existing, and certain Native laws and customs were recognized in special courts.

Generally speaking, education, as provided for the Native, is of two kinds: (*a*) State and State-aided education controlled by the Provincial Administration; and (*b*) that under the control of the Missionary Societies. Owing to lack of funds, and other difficulties, higher educational institutions are few; and although Native students are not actually barred from taking courses at the European University institutions, few in fact do so. The only Native institution doing work of university standard is the South African Native College at Fort Hare, in the Cape Province, which enjoys a Government grant and has about 150 students, who sit for the examinations of the University of South Africa, taking the degrees with Europeans (thirteen obtained the B.A. degree in 1938).

Moreover, inquiry has shown that some 95 per cent. of former students have been, and are, engaged in excellent occupations with their own peoples; and with the opening of a new School of Social Science, in Johannesburg, it is to be hoped that younger people will soon be ready to take their share in social work, as possibilities begin to emerge under the pressure of public opinion.

Bantu education is largely financed from the funds derived from the Poll Tax and other sources, which are paid into the Native Development Fund. The amounts involved show a decided increase since 1925 (£340,000), for in 1943 it was hoped that the sum would reach the million mark. Educated Bantu opinion inclines to the view that the proper controlling authority

should be the Union Education Department, since it is thought that, were the control to pass to the Native Affairs Department, colour prejudice and the policy of segregation might influence the educational programme to the detriment of those opposed to them.

How far the Christian basis of Bantu higher education is likely to be affected by changing conditions it is not easy to say. Clearly, any full understanding of even elementary sociology will cause questioning and suspicion among those intelligent Natives who look around them, and who are anxious about the future position of Africans in Africa. Education cannot be shackled, or be subjected to conditions. If its results be not free inquiry and independent judgement, its true purposes have not been fulfilled. It is fear of the results of educational advantages being afforded to the Africans that prompts the opponents of any schemes for raising the physical and mental standards among the Natives. It is also for this reason that even those who do not pretend to be Christian themselves hesitate before condemning the educational work which is being done by those centres under the control or administration of the Missionary Societies. Even if it be obvious to the intelligent and awakened African that the dominant culture in the Union, when judged by Christian standards, scarcely fulfils those conditions which might be expected, nevertheless the attempt by persons of goodwill to approximate, however slightly, to Christian ethical conceptions can hardly be anything but useful from any point of view. Indeed, the fact that many of the missionary personnel are themselves fully aware of the lamentable failings in both duty and practice among the white population, especially in regard to such questions as the colour bar, would be in itself a factor towards fuller appreciation among Africans that Christians, nominal or otherwise, cannot always be justly accused of hypocrisy and as being prompted by ulterior motives.[1]

We must now pass on to a consideration of various aspects of the colour bar as seen in the Union. Let us begin with the

[1] The general policy of the British Missionary Societies was put forward in a statement issued in March 1945, under the auspices of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland. Headed "The Colour Bar and Race," the statement emphasized the Christian view of race and colour and, endorsing a statement of the Episcopal Synod of the Church of the Province of South Africa, declared that the "effect of colour prejudice is cruel, wasteful, and dangerous."

idea of *segregation*—that dream of the white South African politician, who often uses the word without any real understanding of what he means by it. He fails to express himself, not only because he does not know what he means, but because he does not dare to say openly what he thinks he really does mean. For the core of the segregation idea in South Africa is that segregation shall be carried only up to a certain point; and that point is where it no longer serves the white man's interest to enforce it. Ever since the passing of the Natives Land Act (1913) the policy of the segregationists has been to confine the opportunity of advancement to the native within certain limits, but those limits were always set with the welfare of the white man kept firmly in view. The cry goes up to segregate the Bantu, but it is not proposed to withdraw him from the mines; the desire to let him " develop on his own lines " is largely forgotten when the question of cheap farm labour is being discussed. Mr. H. R. Abercrombie, former President of the Pretoria Chamber of Commerce, puts the thing in a nutshell. Why, he asks, do segregationists not object to the natives in the mines? The reasons, he says, are many. Low-grade mines can be worked more profitably by cheap, unskilled labour. Mining means death ultimately to the miner, " and is not a healthy white occupation. It gives the native the cash which he so ardently desires." [1]

Although the facts show, as clearly as anything can be shown, that segregation cannot be achieved in any complete sense, and is less likely in the future ever to be achieved, its South African supporters still cling to it rather than face the dilemma which confronts them, and which cannot be surmounted as long as they continue to nurture their colour prejudice and exaggerated forms of nationalism.

Since the form, at least, of segregation is the policy of the Government, it may be as well to take one or two instances of how this principle actually works out in practice. Segregation

[1] H. R. Abercrombie, *Africa's Peril* (London, 1938), p. 70. Segregation rarely means anything more than what General Hertzog implied when he used to speak of a measure of " home segregation "—*cf.* L. E. Neame, *General Hertzog* (London, 1930), p. 256. From the industrial point of view the natives must go on working in the white areas, as General Smuts said in his speech, in London, in May 1917. In other words, as Mr. W. A. Cotton has said, it is their hands that are wanted, not them. (W. A. Cotton, *Peasantry or Proletariat* (London, 1929), p. 12.)

in its radical form is clearly an impossibility, whatever extreme societies like the Council of Europeans of Africa may say. As understood in the Union, it is really nothing more than a policy of racial discrimination, partial exclusion, and a standard by which the black man is " kept in his place." It is true that such a policy produces a double conflict in the minds of those who follow it, for on the one hand the prosperity of the country depends on coloured labour, and on the other dependence means a growing fear of competition and an increase of hatred and distrust which such fear generates.

An instance of how an attempt at segregation works can be well seen in housing administration. For instance, the Natives (Urban Areas) Act of 1923 defined and described the powers with which local authorities were provided so that they could set aside land for the accommodation of Natives, and at the same time prohibit them from acquiring other sites without the approval of the Governor-General. With certain exceptions, these laws contained propositions for compulsory residence in Native locations for all non-Europeans residing in the said areas. Such a segregation was not actually an innovation, since compulsion had been applied some years before. By 1938, housing of this sort had been applied to large portions of about seventy-six towns, which included nearly all the larger cities. Moreover, entry of other Natives in the areas, and travel generally are rigidly controlled by pass-laws in a number of districts—a restriction of movement which is much objected to by those having to submit to it. In many cases the areas allocated to Native occupation are outside the towns, thus forming " black belts " around the centre of the town, where the Europeans live. Insanitary conditions, lack of elementary hygienic precautions, insufficient attention to the disposal of garbage, and unchecked disease, are all factors which make the existence of these black belts a menace to European inhabitants. Yet it is from these areas that the Europeans draw their employees, both for industrial and domestic service.

Recent events have shown that the Natives' patience regarding conditions in these areas is not inexhaustible. On March 25, 1944, some of the sub-tenants in Orlando township, near Johannesburg, began moving and carrying their belongings and various articles of household equipment out of the district. Turning off towards Orlando West, they started to put up rude tents of hessian, corrugated-iron, and mealie-sticks. They had

decided to squat on municipal ground until the authorities saw fit to act—which was very shortly afterwards, when some single-room breeze-block dwellings were hastily erected for occupation, although it was only later that doors and windows were fitted.

The existence of these townships—where conditions are far from satisfactory, and where the Natives are segregated according to declared policy—is beginning to arouse alarm among certain sections of the community, who have proposed, in one instance at least—namely, that of Alexandra township—to "abolish" the settlement; which affects not only the lives of 50,000 Africans, but also in some cases their private property, since a few of them have become standholders. The fact is, that these townships in which the Natives are crowded have few of the amenities which make even a tolerably decent life possible. A writer in the Johannesburg *Sunday Times* for May 23, 1943, drew a harrowing picture of the conditions in Sophiatown. Describing the townships as "festering sores," he said that the majority of the streets are unmade, drainage is absent, and, when rain falls, the streets become quagmires. Seeping alleyways lead to the backyards, where the people crowd around the braziers, against which children fall and get burnt. Many rooms have only space enough for one bed, in which the whole family sleeps. In Newclare he found that in each of sixty-six rooms five people were living; and the rent per room at one time was 30*s*. per week, although this has now been reduced.

Digressing for a moment, it is interesting to note that very similar conditions exist in such a widely advertised watering-place and holiday resort as Miami, Florida. Here exists one of the most insanitary and malodorous Negro estates that can be found anywhere in the United States. Tuberculosis and venereal diseases abound; dengue is well known, and in one outbreak some 300,000 white people in Florida were said to be affected. Yet from these congested areas, piled high with garbage, and with totally inadequate sanitation, the rich people and palatial hotels draw their domestic staffs. These, engaged even in culinary and nursery occupations, then pass on the diseased condition to which they are constantly exposed through the inability of the white population to realize that, by condemning persons of a different-coloured skin to live in poverty and degradation, they are exposing themselves to the natural concomitants of such conditions, besides increasing taxation and their own expenses, both medical and otherwise, in order to

meet the results of this deplorable attitude. Precisely the same thing occurs in San Francisco. There the tubercular ratio, in Chinatown, is three times that of the rest of the city.

Apart from areas in South Africa around the towns where the Natives live, there are, of course, the so-called Reserves, where, according to the 1936 census, nearly three million of the Bantu population live. These Reserves, where the people make their living by poor farming, are the parts of the country where only the Natives may own land and where poverty forces many of the adult men to seek work outside, thus making the Reserves pools from which European industrialists can draw their labour. Attempts at establishing industries in the Reserves have come to very little, and it appears highly probable that there is no real desire on the part of the Administration to foster independence and internal prosperity in these areas, lest they cease to be districts from which cheap labour may be drawn. On the other hand, it must be remembered that, as long as grinding poverty exists in the reserved areas, healthy labourers will not be drawn from them; and unhealthy, badly nourished labourers are merely an expense to the industrialist, as the Transvaal Chamber of Mines discovered when it made an inquiry into nutritional problems in the Reserves.

Again we see the conflict with which every person has to struggle if he permits himself the luxury of colour prejudice. On the one hand, the Native must be " kept in his place," and his " place " is in conditions under which Europeans would not think of living. Were the conditions to be changed, education to be improved, and the social status of the Native raised, he might then become a competitor in the European market, and might even aspire to political or social equality. Nevertheless, in spite of the inferior position of the Native, both in housing and education, he remains a person who can still be taxed. The pass-fee—although only a small percentage of this is actually paid by the Natives—is a form of tax, and there are also general and local taxes which always come up in argument when the political representation of the Natives is being discussed. The General (Personal) Tax of £1 is paid by all men from eighteen to sixty-five, and then there is a hut tax of 10*s*., which, with certain exceptions, is also claimed. The whole system of tax-collection is unsatisfactory, and will have to be revised. Indeed, a departmental committee made the subject one of its terms of reference in an inquiry in 1937.

Native labour in the Union is recruited under conditions set out by certain legal decrees (*cf.* the Native Labour Regulation Act of 1911). The Director of Native Labour has his office in Johannesburg, and it is he who issues licences to agents, employers, and compound managers. The Union's industries are largely dependent on non-European workers, who are drawn from rural locations, European-owned farms, urban areas, and also from territories outside the Union proper. Although almost all the unskilled work is done by coloured labour, the situation is becoming complicated by the fact that, since the economic slump of 1920, white workers entered occupational circles which previously had been regarded primarly as those exclusively occupied by Natives. Moreover, it is generally admitted that the commercial prosperity of South Africa depends largely on the supply of relatively cheap, unskilled, non-European labour. Without it, industry could not be carried on and the mines would have to close down. Thus, in 1939, in the Witwatersrand Gold Mines, the ratio of coloured to white labour was 7·4 to 1. In the coal mines of the Transvaal and Natal the ratio was more than double that of the gold mines—namely, 16·3 to 1.

In the early days, before the chaos created by the starting of the gold (1886) and diamond (1870) industries, labour did not constitute a major problem. But with the demand for cheap labour initiated by the new industries, urbanization proceeded apace, and with it rose a whole complex of interwoven difficulties which threaten to become more acute every year, and of which the solution seems more remote than ever. In 1940, about 516,658 persons were employed in the mining industry of the Union, of whom 459,699 were non-European; and this proportion has remained fairly constant in the last twenty years, although the ratio varies according to the different branches. In the goldfields the average yearly wage paid to the European was about £404, in 1938. The non-European worker received about £34; although it must be remembered that native workers in gold and coal receive food and quarters and medical care in addition to the wages paid in cash. In the diamond mines the European, in the year 1938, received about £326, and the Native £44 (out of which food has to be bought), whilst in the coal-mines the European wage is about £403 and the Native £28. Looked at superficially, these figures would suggest that the Native workers are grossly underpaid; but it

should be pointed out that, since most of the unskilled work is done by them, it ought not to be expected that their pay should equal that received by Europeans. Nevertheless, the wages received are a constant source of trouble, and the situation (as among some of the United Mine Workers of the U.S.A.) is complicated by the fact that they are often forced by circumstances to trade at the companies' stores.

How far prices at these stores are controlled, it is difficult to say. The cost of compound services to the Chamber of Mines per Native per shift is estimated at just over 1*s.*; but it is claimed by the companies that if the services were purchased privately they would cost at least 1*s.* 6*d.* per head.

It is hardly necessary to comment upon Native life in the compounds attached to the mines. It is clear that when workers have to live under these unnatural conditions, the results, apart altogether from the physical ill-effects suffered by the miners, are deplorable. To attempt to uphold any decent moral standard is an impossibility, especially in the diamond mines, where workers usually have to remain in the compounds till the end of their contract. Professor R. L. Buell, however, thinks that they are thus spared a few of the vices in the world outside.[1]

With the increase both in mining and industrial development an actual shortage of labour began to be felt in 1937. Although strikes among coloured workers have not been frequent, it is clear that they are beginning to insist upon better wages and conditions, using the scarcity of labour as a means of supporting their demands. In 1939 a Committee appointed by the Minister of Native Affairs came to the conclusion that the demand for labour "substantially exceeded the supply," and a number of proposals were advanced to meet the changing circumstances. Along with the growing scarcity of non-European labour is the gradual dawning of consciousness as to the desirability of trade unions for coloured workers. In 1919 and 1920 the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union (I.C.U.) was built up, but has since been dissolved. This organization had a considerable membership—estimated by

[1] See R. L. Buell, *The Native Problem in Africa* (New York, 1928), vol. I, p. 39. For vices inside, see W. A. Cotton, *Peasantry or Proletariat* (London, 1939), p. 11, and *cf.* R. L. Buell, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 48. For a vivid account of life in the Rand Mines, see L. M. Nesbitt, *Gold Fever* (London, 1936).

some at about 30,000—and had as one of its objects the formation of an all-embracing union. It stressed the racial aspect of the struggle: just as the Communists had previously done before their influence had begun to diminish, and just as they are still doing to-day in those quarters where they are reported as being active.

In 1928 the Federation of Non-European Trade Unions was founded. Since the Act regulating wages, however, defines a Trade Union as a body of "employees," and since Natives, who have to carry passes, are excluded from this definition, they can form only unregistered bodies.[1]

The whole question of wages in the Union is further complicated by the fact that the mining industry, in paying high wages to skilled and administrative white labour, has forced up the general level to a point at which secondary industries find it hard to reach and maintain profits. Moreover, the lower wages paid to the unskilled European and non-European labourers tend to diminish purchasing power, thus lowering the demand for consumer goods generally and hence encouraging poverty and meagre use of what might otherwise be produced in large quantities.

This aspect of the question was forcibly pointed out by Mr. M. Alexander (Cape Town, Castle) in the Joint Sitting of both Houses of the South African Parliament on March 3, 1936, when the Representation of Native Bills were being discussed. One reason, he said, why manufacturers were crying out for customers was because six million people in South Africa cannot afford to buy the articles produced.[2] But even here the diffi-

[1] The latest approximate figures for African Trade Unions in South Africa are 119, with a total membership of 158,000.

[2] There seems little doubt that this question is being more and more seriously considered by business men and others who are beginning to doubt if the native policy of the South African Government is a wise one. For example, Mr. F. E. T. Krause, formerly Judge-President of the Free State, has said that South Africa was disregarding its most valuable asset—namely, native labour—because the natives were not paid sufficient wages to keep them above the bread line (see *African World Annual*, 1942, p. 45). Similarly Mr. G. H. Beatty, who in 1944 presided at the Annual General Meeting of the Johannesburg Consolidated Investment Co., said bluntly that the country could not afford to indulge itself in luxuries which gave only an emotional satisfaction. Thus they had a situation where the country believed in prohibiting large numbers of its population from acquiring the skill to produce and the opportunity of producing to the best of their ability (*cf. South Africa*, November 25, 1944, p. 351).

culties do not cease. Since in every community there exist considerable numbers of persons of low mentality and general incompetence, it follows that a percentage of Europeans will always tend to fall into the unskilled class, and thus must always face the competition of non-European workers of higher intelligence. Moreover, since custom and tradition dictate the theory that it is derogatory to the white man to do unskilled jobs, which are left to blacks, it follows that the " Poor White " problem arises, with which it seems almost impossible to grapple as long as colour prejudice keeps the ideas active and alive which are at the root of the problem. It is far from easy even to determine the number of persons in the Union who can be fairly classed under the term of " Poor Whites." Mr. Calpin, in his book *There are no South Africans* (London, 1941), states in one section that there are at least 400,000, of whom 90 per cent. are of Afrikaner descent, whilst elsewhere he gives 300,000 as the number.

The Carnegie Commission Report estimated some 300,000 as the " very poor," although not all these could be classed as " Poor Whites " in the technical sense.[1]

Whatever may be the truth of these figures, there is no question that two forces are constantly at work which are tending to increase the number of persons who may be classed in this category. The one is always tending to draw certain classes of Europeans into the non-skilled group, thus (according to colour-bar doctrine) debasing them; and the other tends to draw non-Europeans into the higher skilled groups, hence weakening the doctrine of white supremacy in the upper groups.

To meet this dilemma unskilled Europeans are being more and more employed in positions which were formerly held by natives; and since they are paid at higher rates than those whose places they have taken, the costs both of production and manufacture rise, prices increase in accordance, and the purchasing power of the masses is further diminished. This is interesting from the psychological point of view, as we can see that in this case economic interest, powerful as it generally is, is unable to overcome a prejudice so harmful to wealth and property; and this suggests strongly that this prejudice has deep-seated emotional and traditional roots which have but little to do with the material well-being of those who are anchored to them.

[1] See *The Poor White Question in South Africa*, 5 vols. (Stellenbosch, 1932).

These are, then, some of the intangible, almost unanalysable, elements which, while maintaining the colour bar in South Africa, are upsetting the whole material and economic structure of the country. Were the mining industry to collapse, or its raw materials to become exhausted, then the very basis on which the unsound economy of the Union rests would crumble to pieces. This is a possibility that is constantly haunting the minds of South African economists and sociological writers, but owing to the dilemma over colour which paralyses them, little has been done to face the problems squarely. Expedient after expedient is tried and found wanting: everywhere the road is blocked by the fatal and inescapable fact of the colour bar. Moreover, the problem is not one solely concerned with the Bantu. There are the Asiatic population and also the Cape Coloured people to be considered; and of these the Indian population in Natal deserves brief comment, since it affords an excellent example of how, under the modern economic system, problems are created by private persons and are then left for later generations to attempt to solve.

The history of the Indians in Natal is, as has been stated, an illuminating example of how economic enterprise, when uncontrolled by any far-sighted Governmental control, tends to create a "colour problem" which is entirely due to those who later complain of its existence. In 1860 Indian indentured labourers were introduced into Natal by the sugar-planters, who were dissatisfied with the work hitherto done by their Zulu employees. It seems that they hoped that at the end of their period of work the Indians would be glad to return home; but the latter did not oblige, remained firmly rooted in Natal and took up both trading and market-gardening. By 1891 they had increased from about 6,500 to 35,000, reaching about 180,000 in 1936, there being some 250,000 all told in the whole of the Union, of whom it is said that nine-tenths are South African born, many being third generation. Moreover, unlike the Natives, they had the franchise and soon threatened to overtake the European vote. From that date to the present day there has been one long and painful struggle to solve what is sometimes described in South Africa as the "Indian Menace." In 1893 the Parliamentary franchise was withdrawn in Natal, and twenty years later came the Indian Immigration Act, which aimed at stopping any new immigrants except the wives and children of Indians already previously

settled. In 1924 the Municipal franchise was withdrawn; and a year later began the discussions on the so-called "Class Areas" Bill, which, among other proposals, dealt with segregation and stricter regulations regarding immigration. By 1940 the agitation regarding the alleged infiltration and penetration by Indians came to a head, and in 1943 was passed the "Pegging" Act, which dealt with questions of land purchase and its regulation. The Native has, generally speaking, little instinct for commercialism: the Indian, on the other hand, is a keen and bargain-loving trader, and thus competes with Europeans at their own game. Moreover, as he does not hold any rigid[1] theories about colour, he serves his Native customers willingly, and the Native as obligingly buys from him. Round Table Conferences and Commissions have failed so far to solve the problem; restricting legislation seems merely to act as an increasing irritant; and the trouble is always threatening to become acute and to involve the Government of India in complicated negotiations with the authorities in South Africa. Indeed, the friction on the ownership of land is especially harassing. The "Pegging" Act, which dealt with restrictions on the purchase of land by Indians, and which passed its third reading in the Senate on April 26, 1943, and the House of Assembly on April 21, has been the cause of much perturbation, which it will be somewhat difficult to allay. Protests have already been made in many quarters, and the actual withdrawal of the Indian High Commissioner has been urged as a mark of protest and disapproval. Conversations with the Indian Government do not appear to have led to any decisive result; and the Indians have pointed out that part of the residential difficulties in Durban have been caused by the municipality itself, which has failed to provide suitable sites where Indians may live. On April 28, 1943, the Government of India, in an official statement issued after the passing of the Act, expressed its "profound regret and concern," and added that disappointment had been caused by the failure of the Union Government to adopt its suggestions. The Bill itself is a temporary measure for three years only, and a Committee is to be set up to inquire into its provisions and to make recommendations where

[1] For a note on Indian views on the inferior position of Bantu and Coloured, and consequent difficulties in the formation of the proposed United Non-European Front, see the article by Dr. L. Sundaram in *The Cape Standard* for December 19, 1944.

thought necessary. Mr. Amery, on June 3, 1943, in the House of Commons, stated that Indians had been invited to serve on this Committee, but from what has happened in the case of previous inquiries, it is unlikely that any decisive results will be achieved.

In the middle of 1944 further trouble broke out owing to the discussions on what was called the Natal Property Ordinance, which provided that, in a case where a European wanted to sell to a non-European a residential property which was situated in a quarter mainly occupied by Europeans, the Natal Housing Authority was at liberty to purchase the property instead of letting it pass into the hands of a non-European. This measure was especially aimed at Indians, and was greeted with a chorus of protest, not only by Indians on the spot, but by speakers in the Central Legislative Assembly at Delhi. Retaliatory measures were threatened, economic sanctions urged, and one speaker declared that General Smuts and Dr. Malan were no better than Hitler or Mussolini. So much heat was generated at the debate that another speaker roundly declared that he wished that it were possible for India to declare war on South Africa.

In a book entitled *The Tyranny of Colour*, published in 1942, Mr. P. S. Joshi has dealt in detail with the Indian problem in South Africa from the Indian point of view. He maintains that the arguments brought forward by opponents of the Indians are merely rationalizations in order to cover up the chief objection to them—namely, that their skins are brown (p. 293). He points out that the Natal-born Indian is usually in advance of his parents both socially and from the point of view of education, and since they have accepted the standard of Western civilization, "it is sheer injustice to treat them as enemies of that civilization." In support of his theory Mr. Joshi emphasizes the total inadequacy of the reasons given for the common fear that white dominance would be endangered should the Indians be granted the kind of equality they want. As the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri pointed out, when he was Agent of the Government of India to South Africa, the Indians have no desire for supremacy, are not aiming for it, and even if they had it, have neither the numerical strength nor the political power requisite for the purpose. As regards their civic position, Mr. Joshi declares that 85 per cent. have been born in South Africa, and by no stretch of the imagination can they be called

either foreigners or aliens. All these charges, he maintains, are due to colour prejudice. They reek "with the miasma of racial hatred" (p. 299). Should South Africa grant equality to Indians, then, he thinks, it will enhance the strength and status of the British Empire. For not only would it win the hearts of Indians, but also their active co-operation. But little can be done until the question of the colour bar has been solved. Jews from Palestine and Syria are admitted to South Africa in spite of their Asiatic origins, and are accorded equal privileges with whites. South Africa, concludes Mr. Joshi, judges men by their colour.

There is, however, another side to the Indian question, and it is one that ought not to be shirked. In spite of the fact that the Indians trade with the Natives as with anyone else, there is some evidence that suggests that in many cases they do not like the African any more than the European does. The Native is inclined to sense this latent hostility and to resent it. But he finds it difficult to do anything about it. His outlook is so different from that of the Indian that he cannot cope with the problems involved. The clever Indian trading in cheap goods, and the thrift and frugal living of the Indian store-keepers, are not qualities in which the ordinary African can compete. Meanwhile suspicion and dislike increase. Brown against black: black against brown; and white against them both. Such is the other aspect of the Indian problem in South Africa.

We must now sum up briefly the general situation as regards colour prejudice and the colour bar in the Union of South Africa. As we have seen, the core of the matter is that we have in South Africa a small white island of Western civilization in the centre of a black sea, of which the inhabitants are at every stage of cultural level, but who at the same time are necessary to the white dominant class as labourers and industrial workers. The conflict is obvious and patent. The dilemma is inescapable. Frankly, the interests of the natives and of the white immigrants are incompatible as long as the present economic and political systems remain as they are. Moreover, it must again be pointed out how the dilemma is inextricably connected with the moral values which the whites profess. Anyone who reads the debates in the South African Parliament cannot fail to be struck by the constant reiteration of the same theme. It permeates all South African thinking, just as it does in the United States. As Dr. E. H. Brookes has often put it, borrow-

ing from another critic, it is really what can only be called "a lie in the soul." [1] It promotes dishonest thinking, timidity, fear, and conflict. Injustice is taken for granted; and the inner consciousness of persistent wrongdoing poisons the whole moral life of the community. The helplessness of the responsible authorities when faced with these almost insoluble problems is well illustrated in a recent report of a speech by Field-Marshal Smuts which was published in the Johannesburg press. In response to a deputation from the Christian Council Emergency Committee, on January 13, 1943, Field-Marshal Smuts spoke of the needs of Africans and the question of putting Native employees on the same basis as other employees. In the course of his statement the Prime Minister said that if Native trade unions could be formed "along sound lines" it would be one of the best steps forward; and he was in favour of it, and accepted it "with both hands."

The difficulties in which he found himself when trying to deal with the points raised by the Christian Council are well exemplified in his concluding remarks, which illustrate the hesitation and evasiveness which characterize the dealings of the South African Government with all matters where the colour bar is called into question. Field-Marshal Smuts, in addressing the delegates from the Council, after stating that "we cannot sit by and merely use force against our Africans," tried to meet the delegation by telling them—

> "Just at this moment things have become more difficult and in future they may become still more difficult. I am anxious that we should do what is fair and just, and my colleagues have the same outlook. The whole matter is under consideration.
>
> "You may say that what I have said is unsatisfactory in view of the strong case you have made out and which actually exists. My answer may seem rather non-committal, but in some way you must accept the will for the deed. The good will is there. Sympathy with the African people committed to our charge is great and growing. The deed may not follow immediately, but we shall have to see whether we can approximate to something that will ease the public conscience. It has become a matter of conscience."

[1] *The Colour Problem in South Africa* (Lovedale, 1933), p. 166.

Little more need be said when the Prime Minister himself was only able to meet the delegates from the Committee by words such as these. Thus it is clear that, as long as Europeans hold their present views on the natural inferiority of coloured peoples, and as long as they are dominated by an economic system which impoverishes millions, both white and black, the solution of South African difficulties cannot be found.[1] The view that the Natives are intrinsically inferior is, as we have stated, due to a variety of causes, but in modern South Africa the opinion in its rationalized form seems mainly due to the fear of economic competition. African progress is to be permitted only so far as increasing social and educational advantages do not advance to a stage where the possibility of equality becomes realizable. The native is to remain the basis on which the whole edifice is reared, but he is not to have any great part in enjoying the fruits of his labour. His land is grossly insufficient; the taxes he has to pay compel him to leave the Reserves and labour for European employers. His home life disintegrates under the compulsion of working, for example, for the mines, and under the conditions of a celibate existence cramped in compounds. The pattern of his tribal life slowly disappears.

If the principle of trusteeship is to give way to one of partnership, then it must be real partnership like that to which Dr. Aggrey used to refer. With regard to trusteeship, Field-

[1] The position as regards Afrikaner racial policy was made quite clear at the end of 1944, during the Congress at Bloemfontein. Mr. Jansen said that it was a matter, not of politics, but of self-preservation. There might be differences of opinion, but Europeans in South Africa would agree, he thought, on the following points:—

1. There must be no equality.
2. The mixing of blood must be prevented.
3. The European population must not follow a policy that could lead to the government of the country falling eventually into non-European hands.
4. Europeans must bear the responsibility for the welfare and development of the non-European population.

In the meantime it is interesting to see what Dr. H. J. van Eck, the head of the Industrial Development Corporation, had to say, in November of the same year, regarding the production of food in South Africa. He declared that malnutrition was one of South Africa's biggest social problems, and in the majority of cases was simply another name for semi-starvation. Instead of feeding its own people, what was happening was that South Africa was paying heavy subsidies to the producers to export food which was then sold overseas at a loss.

Marshal Smuts, in his address on January 21, 1942, declared that the basis of trusteeship was that the whites and blacks should be in relation of guardians and wards. Although Field-Marshal Smuts recognized that isolation in South Africa had gone for good, he realized that the mobility of the native peoples in the drift towards urbanization was a movement which could not be stopped. But he was entirely unable to give any idea as to what could be done to mitigate the evil results of these revolutionary changes. Carefully avoiding any discussion of the colour bar, all he could do was to hope that " where we have both Europeans and Africans, and where they will always be," the future pattern of Africa might be built up, and that both races will manage to live together " in a spirit of helpfulness and co-operation."

It must not be imagined that the kind of helplessness and avoidance of fundamental issues which unfortunately characterizes so much of what the Prime Minister said is shared equally by all responsible persons in the Union of South Africa. For example, the Institute of Race Relations is constantly at work trying to educate public opinion and eradicate the more blatant forms of prejudice. It was established in 1929 through grants made by various agencies, such as the Phelps–Stokes Fund, and was incorporated in 1937. The Institute is the embodiment of an attempt to approach the racial problems of South Africa in a scientific and co-operative spirit and, as it states, to apply the results of research to the practical problems of everyday life. The work of the Institute is an example of the kind of constructive work in which many of the officials of the various missionary societies share, and which shows an attempt, however feeble, to combat the pernicious effects of the colour bar as seen in social life and legislation.

Whatever may be the outcome of the present situation, there is not the slightest doubt that explosive forces are being generated in South Africa. Even yesterday murmurs could be heard above the din of war. To resist such forces and to try to stem the tide by a policy of evasion, or even of violence, is futile. As General Smuts is reported to have once said in another connection, " You might as well try to sweep back the ocean with a broom " (Speech in Capetown, January 21, 1942).

On the other hand, General Smuts, on March 14, 1945, is reported to have declared that the fixed policy of the Government was to maintain white supremacy. It was true, he said,

that the economic and social revolution could not be prevented, but natives could be diverted from the towns to the farms, and "dangerous persons" attempting to interfere with these proposals could be removed.

2. The Colour Bar in British Colonies and Protectorates in Africa

We have seen, in the preceding discussion of the colour bar in the Union of South Africa, what are some of the features which support and preserve it. Apart from the psychological factors involved in the nature of colour prejudice itself, these are mainly economic, and centre on competition and the regulations regarding employment as between white and black.

In the other parts of Africa these features are also to be found, diminished or intensified according to local conditions and the scope and opportunity for gainful employment.

Moreover, a social bar, in addition to one based on economic considerations, is present in certain urban areas, where coloured people are more prosperous and better able to avail themselves of opportunities for recreation and amusement than those living in rural and more isolated areas.

Before briefly considering the scope and nature of the colour bar as it exists outside the Union of South Africa, it ought perhaps again to be emphasized that, officially speaking, both the Colonial Office and His Majesty's Government do not stand for the colour bar either in Great Britain itself or in any of the Colonies (see reply to Mr. Creech Jones by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons in March, 1943). Indeed, the British Government has always, on paper, and in official pronouncements, showed its desire to prevent explicit mention of colour bars in legal and statutory documents. But there is often a way to be found whereby such disapproval can be ignored and its results circumvented. There is no need to be explicit about a colour bar. It can become simply a conventional way of life based upon popular usage and the opinions of the white population, which can be ignored only at the risk of economic loss or social position. Such, in fact, is how the colour bar operates in many parts of the British Commonwealth.

Generally speaking, in all the British territories in Africa

outside the Union, anything resembling a colour bar exists only where white people can live permanently as farmers, settlers, artisans, or others, and fear black competition. Thus, in West Africa there is no indication of any serious attempt to impose the colour bar in its technical sense. Africans holding the proper qualifications as officials, medical men, lawyers, barristers, engineers, etc., can apply for Government posts or employment in private firms. In all the territories Africans sit on the legislative councils, and it is doubtful if there is any Government department, bank, or business concern which has not a number of African officials or employees. Africans and their wives are regularly invited to Government House functions, where they eat and dance with white people, and the same applies to the houses of white officials or business people. Social intercourse between white and black, in the northern or Mohammedan territories of West Africa, is necessarily restricted by the tenets of Islam, which keep women shut in and away from the public gaze; but there have been many instances of the wives of officials and others having social intercourse with the native women in the Harem.

For an example of how the unofficial colour bar makes itself felt in the economic field, let us take the position of the so-called Copper Belt in Northern Rhodesia. This is a region of the country where there is an extensive copper-mining industry in which many Africans are employed. In March 1940, one day after a strike by European workers in the Nkana and Mufulira mines, some thousands of African miners struck and demanded higher wages. A riot began in Nkana, and the military opened fire on the grounds that protection had to be given to the compound offices and those who had sought protection within them. Seventeen Africans were killed and sixty-five wounded. Here the question was not only equal pay for equal work, but also the whole problem of how far African labour is to displace European labour and upon what levels. Semi-skilled operations can be performed equally well both by Europeans and by Africans who have the necessary training, which, in many cases, is not arduous and is easily acquired. The position regarding the skilled occupations is not so pressing, for here long training and apprenticeship are necessary, of which the average African has had little opportunity, so far, to avail himself. But in the semi-skilled jobs the wages the European expects to receive, and those the Africans are

willing to accept, are very different. Indeed, it may happen that in the one case pay is at the rate of £7 10*s.* a week for a European doing a job for which an African would be thankful to get a pound. Moreover, the dilemma in which the owners and managers of the great industrial undertakings are placed is rendered all the greater by the fact that, on one hand the profit motive impels them to save the £6 10*s.* a week, whilst on the other the employment of African workers may suggest to some that what is really happening is an attempt to exploit European workers and lower their wages, and consequently their standard of living.

It was clear as early as 1936 that the influential Northern Rhodesia Mine Workers' Union would try to hinder Africans from undertaking skilled work. Indeed, the Commission which was appointed to inquire into the disturbances of the Copper Belt in April, 1940, stated that it was desirable for the mine managements to confer with representatives of the Union in order to discuss the question of how far the African workers should be encouraged to advance in industrial status. There is little doubt what advice the Union will give in this matter. The Northern Rhodesian Mine-Workers' Union was from the first closely associated with the South African Mine-Workers' Union, the Secretary of which visited Northern Rhodesia in 1936, and indicated quite clearly that his views on the colour bar were those prevailing in the Union, but which are not a part of British official policy in Northern Rhodesia.

How far the development of African Trade Unions would alleviate the situation does not concern us here. The growing factor of stabilization as industry develops may assist the growth of such bodies rather than hinder them. Tribal life, for many of the families resident on the property of the mines, is finished. It no longer exists in any meaningful sense, since to all intents and purposes the Africans have made their homes where they work.

It must be remembered that the situation in Northern Rhodesia is different, inasmuch as it has been affected by the colour-bar rules obtaining in the South African trade unions to which railway workers and others in Rhodesia belong. The Government has said it is strictly against any colour differentiation; but it is powerless in the case of the railway, where white personnel belong to the South African trade union, and insist that the rules of the latter be followed. The same applies to

the mine-workers in that area. In the territories of Bechuanaland, Swaziland, and Basutoland there is no colour bar except what comes in from the surrounding Union territory; and it is rare to find, in any of these territories among the white people, officials and missionaries, any strong feeling of colour prejudice.

The case of the Copper Belt, in Northern Rhodesia, is a striking illustration of how, in the face of official pronouncements by the British Government, the colour bar can be introduced and openly embodied, not in precise legal phraseology, but in custom, convention, and practice. There are naturally all kinds of methods of doing this, and it is difficult to see how it can be prevented short of drastic methods of interference which would scarcely be contemplated by the British Government.

Southern Rhodesia, which, unlike Northern Rhodesia, has responsible government, and thus does not come within the Colonial Empire, is nearly twice the size of Great Britain. The 1941 census showed that, of a total population, about 68,900 were Europeans, whilst over 1,372,900 were natives.

Although again there is no legal sanction for a policy embodying the colour bar, there is no doubt that in practice this is widely developed in a variety of directions. The influence of the Union of South Africa has been strong in industrial matters, especially on the railways, and in questions of land there has been a great deal of criticism as to the justice or otherwise of the Land Apportionment Act, which came into force in 1940. By this measure natives are restricted in many ways; their movements are regulated by a pass system, and natives living in white areas are gradually to be transferred elsewhere. Rather more than half of the area of the country is assigned to the white population; yet the natives outnumber the white by twenty to one.

In Southern Rhodesia, as elsewhere, native labour is not only employed in the mines and farms, but in private white households as well. The average European settler has usually a couple of native men to cook and do the housework, together with a small picanin whose age is anything from ten to fourteen. Women are gradually entering domestic service; and as the majority of the Europeans living in the country are not familiar with the native languages, such as Ndebele or Shona, they talk a kind of pidgin English which is commonly called "kitchen Kaffir."

The future position in Southern Rhodesia will cause many a headache both to the settlers and those in London who will have to try to resolve the differences inherent in the situation. Their task will be difficult. It is not easy to square the circle.

In Tanganyika a similar problem exists. The Europeans number over 16,700, whilst there are over 5 million natives and some 45,000 Asiatics. Nevertheless, partly owing to the policy of indirect rule, and partly to local agricultural and industrial conditions, the situation is much more favourable to the Africans than elsewhere. Officials from the West Coast, with its different standards as regards colour, have had much to do with the administration of the territory, and Africans are encouraged to participate more and more in the life of the country and in its general management. Similar advances have been made in Nyasaland and in Uganda, where the colour bar as we have seen it elsewhere is practically non-existent.

For some years there has been talk of joining Nyasaland with Northern Rhodesia, talk which has been connected with the amalgamation of the two Rhodesias[1] and the absorption of the Protectorates of Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland. The objections to the scheme, which are often voiced in both Press and Parliament, are largely based on the certainty that, should such an idea be realized, the natives would inevitably become subject to the colour bar as practised in the Union and in Southern Rhodesia. There is no question that pressure will later be brought to bear upon the British Government; and those who believe the colour bar to be injurious both to black and white will have to make their wishes known to their Members of Parliament, so that public opinion may be aroused and thus influence the course of events. The danger lies in the possibility that various promises and guarantees might be made regarding the treatment of the natives on condition that the territories are handed over, and that, when this has been accomplished, the colour bar will be introduced and practised in exactly the same way as is the case to-day in Southern Rhodesia.

Before summing up the facts regarding the colour bar in

[1] Amalgamation is warmly supported by the Labour Party of Northern Rhodesia. Its leader, Mr. Roy Welensky, recently introduced a motion in the Legislative Council to this effect, but was opposed by the Chief Secretary and others.

British Africa, a word must be said on Kenya Colony, which is part of British East Africa and which is 225,000 square miles in extent, of which the larger part of the more fertile regions has been appropriated by the European settlers. The Europeans in Kenya are outnumbered by the Natives, Indians, and Arabs to the extent of 200 to 1, and thus the division of the land has caused a great deal of bad feeling and resentment.

Here in Kenya may be seen colour prejudice and the colour bar in full bloom. Here the idea of a Master Race has full scope; and it only remains to give Kenya responsible government to see the same thing happen that we saw was happening in the Union of South Africa. The fact is that Kenya is a fantastic country. Some writers have been so amazed by what they found there that their descriptions are sometimes frankly unbelievable unless one knows them to be true from personal observation. One observer declares that Kenya is the saddest place in Africa, and that it can be regarded only as a kind of *opéra bouffe* or a burlesque of colonization. Another describes it as a kind of unrestrained suburbia exalted to feudal domination over the native population, for it must be remembered that in both Rhodesias, as in Kenya, white dominance has become a matter of political faith. Governmental affairs are almost wholly carried on by persons of European ancestry, and native representation is hardly considered. It is true that native councils with advisory functions exist, but their influence on the government of the country, and on such matters as segregation, scarcely carries any weight. Meetings may be held and conferences convened, but the resolutions passed depend on the will of the white minority when the question arises of carrying them into effect. Any question of increased colonization in Kenya[1] or the Rhodesias is assumed, tacitly or openly, to be for the advantage of the white settlers. Influence from the Union of South Africa gradually creeps northward, and the kind of regional plan now being advanced must strengthen the hands of the local white authorities and weaken the directive power of the Colonial Office. African influence in the legislative Councils is never sufficient to change radically the prevailing situation. For example, in Kenya the Europeans have eleven representatives and the Africans two, and neither of them coloured, although

[1] For a summary of the Kenya Government White Paper on the reorganization of the administration, see *The Times*, July 10, 1945.

in October, 1944, the Governor nominated Mr. Mathu to be the first African to sit in the Legislature. A standing Advisory Committee on Local Native Councils has also been recently set up, which is composed of the two European members of the Legislative Council representing African interests, and five Africans. Similar conditions, in which the African is hindered and discriminated against, are found in almost every department of public life. Only recently it was stated in the House of Commons that subsidies were being paid from Government funds to Kenya farmers, the African cultivator being excluded for the reason that " the difficulties they (i.e., the subsidies) were intended to meet do not occur in the farm operations customarily carried out in Native Reserves " (Colonel Oliver Stanley, November 3, 1943). In 1943 £90,000 was granted for the breaking down of new land, and £20,000 for the requisition of fertilizers. The question of land is, as all over Africa, one of the most pressing problems which have to be faced. Discrimination—a form of colour bar in itself—has led to widespread trouble, and its history and results are too well known to be recapitulated here. But apart from the question of land acquisition by Europeans and Africans, there is the question of soil conservation, which promises to become more acute as the years pass. Attempts to meet the deterioration, due as it is to a multiplicity of causes, have not met with the success that must attend them if the deterioration is not gradually to assume serious proportions.

The question arises as to whether this is possible under the conditions now prevailing in Kenya. Mr. C. Maher, the official who is in charge of Soil Conservation in the colony, is dubious on the point. He is not inclined to believe that any policy is practicable as long as the present system of life remains as it is. Indeed, he is reported as saying that " under existing social and economic conditions the efforts to preserve the land and check the continual deterioration must prove ultimately futile." All attempts such as payment of subsidies, forced labour, and legal enactments *re* the granting of land are but palliatives of no lasting value. Drastic reorganization of the whole Kenya way of life is thought to be necessary, not only by critics at home, but by men on the spot who know the conditions and are able to foresee the inevitable outcome of a policy of inaction.

We cannot discuss here the question of how far the subsidies

may be connected with forced labour and with the impositions of penal sanctions for failure to perform contractual obligations. Such problems, although doubtless connected with the crucial problems of the colour bar, would lead us too far from our central theme. All that need be said is that as long as European settlers hold a doctrine of innate racial superiority scarcely distinguishable from that advocated in *Mein Kampf*, then all these problems will not only constantly arise, but will grow in complexity and bitterness. The whole future of Kenya is bound up with the proposals for regional groupings as put forward by General Smuts on November 25, 1943, and which, as he was forced to admit, can be considered only in connection with the " problem of race and colour, which is the root problem of our Empire."

It is this root problem which must be tackled if any real progress is to be made. The policy indicated by General Smuts, with its hesitating and almost groping approach, is little more than a policy of drift. Yet it is a policy which it is hard to avoid under present conditions. The whole principle of trusteeship is one which it is difficult to maintain as long as the colour bar is enforced. In the famous White Paper (Cmd. 1922) of July, 1923, on the Indians in Kenya, it was expressly stated that " the interests of the African natives must be paramount," although later interpretations made it clear that the word " paramount " does not imply that the interests of the white population are to be endangered, as long as these interests do not radically conflict with principles underlying the conception of trusteeship. Again, the Dual Mandate is of immense difficulty as long as the present economic system of private enterprise is linked with a colour bar of varying intensity. Naturally, the problem varies in complexity as the conditions differ in the different territories. In West Africa the same questions do not arise in the acute form that they are found in Kenya and the East, since the country is not suitable for white residence on a large scale, and the natives themselves play a considerable part in community organization. Certain elements desire a larger share in the administration, and a scheme whereby the present status could gradually pass to Dominion government was proposed by the West African editors who visited this country in October 1943. The demand for a larger part in administering the territories has long been voiced in diverse quarters, and the response has been in the

form of admitting Africans to the Legislative Councils, Civil and Medical Services, and similar concessions. On the Gold Coast the Aborigines' Rights Protection Society has been active for over forty years, and the National Congress of British West Africa was formed after the last war, and is controlled almost entirely by coloured leaders from the Gold Coast.

Moreover, agriculture, which is the principal pursuit of the majority of West African natives, is largely in their own hands, although the attempts, during the war, made by the West African Produce Control Board to deal with the cocoa position has not been an outstanding success. It is probable that, as the shipping position improves—thus assisting the export of cocoa beans, which otherwise run a good chance of deteriorating in a storage—the West African native will again begin to sell cocoa on a large scale, since the demand, after the war, for this valuable food product must be very considerable. In this way the standard of living will rise, and with it better chances of social advancement for the native.[1]

It is possible, therefore, that with the spread of education, in the development of which the cinema and radio will obviously play an increasingly important part, the colour bar will begin to fade in those parts of Africa such as British West Africa, where already progress has been achieved. But in those parts where the social and economic life of the community is dominated by groups of white settlers, of whom the majority are quite out of touch with the problems of the modern world, little, if any, progress can be made without the most drastic reorganization of the whole country based upon the principles which have so repeatedly been emphasized by His Majesty's Government. How far the influence of the Union of South Africa will spread northwards it is at present impossible to say, just as it is unprofitable to speculate upon the future development of Kenya or the Protectorates. In the latter case there seems little doubt that any incorporation in the Union will arouse strong opposition, for as early as 1934 an assembly of chiefs of the Native Advisory Council of Bechuanaland recorded their disapproval of any such move being made. Were such incorporation to be agreed upon, then one result would be to extend the influence of the colour bar, and increase

[1] *Cf.* the Colonial Office White Paper (Cmd. 6554) of October 1944, and for a short discussion see *The Economist*, March 24, 1945.

the areas under which it operates, whereas the policy of His Majesty's Government, as affirmed on many occasions, is to weaken it and refuse to countenance its operation. The danger of such encroachment is specifically mentioned in the Labour Party's Memorandum (March, 1943) on its post-war policy for the African and Pacific colonies. It states that it is " absolutely opposed to the colour bar operating in political or economic spheres " (p. 7). Specific instructions regarding it should be issued to all Colonial Governments, the Memorandum advises, and eight points to be followed in dealing with it are recorded. These are:—

(1) Discrimination, directly or indirectly involving inequality in political machinery, representation, and responsibility on the grounds of race, must be progressively abolished.

(2) All racial discrimination in the fiscal system should be abolished.

(3) All restrictions on the right to own, buy, lease, or sell land on racial grounds (other than restrictions devised to protect the Natives as backward peoples) must be abolished.

(4) State funds shall not be granted to any school or educational establishment entry to which is restricted upon racial grounds.

(5) Safety regulations, in so far as they are used to keep a colour bar in force, should be amended.

(6) Registrations of Trade Unions imposing a colour bar should be refused.

(7) Colonial Administrations should be instructed to set an example in Government services (postal, telegraphic, etc.) of good wages and conditions for Africans, and to provide technical education and training for Africans in order to break down the economic colour bar where it exists and prevent its extension to other colonial territories.

(8) Grants of imperial funds should not be made for schemes which benefit the economic interests of small racial minorities.

It is therefore clear that at least one political party in Great Britain is opposed to any imposition of the colour bar which would result from the policy of the Union of South Africa extending northwards, and thus it is committed to the view of

the inadvisability of any incorporation of the Protectorates under present conditions. It is difficult to see how this opinion could be resisted by the Administration in the face of the repeatedly emphasized policy of the Colonial Office. Nevertheless, in view of such decrees as the Southern Rhodesia Land Apportionment Act of 1941, which was consented to by the British Government without adequate discussion in Parliament, it is clear that changes may be made in local conditions which not only imply the existence of colour bars, but which may extend them and make their removal more difficult. It is often thus that the colour bar operates and is perpetuated. Situations arise locally and decisions are taken which in themselves appear to have little relation to racial discrimination or prejudice. It is only later, when the position has been established, that it is recognized that another link in the chain of racial oppression has been forged; and by a policy of drift the chain is lengthened until the operation of breaking it becomes a factor of major policy, which if initiated by the Government at home is met with strenuous resistance by the local administration of the area concerned. Thus the need for a long-view policy, in which these factors are given due attention with a full understanding of the points involved, is apparent. As long as financial, mining, and commercial interests are allowed to profit mainly through the low wages paid to the local African workers, a certain amount of colour bar will remain. Indeed, the whole question of a colour bar in Africa is so closely linked up with the economics of private enterprise, and its relation to public duty and administration, that it would be a mistake to attempt to separate them. How long the British taxpayer at home will consent to shoulder many of these wholly unnecessary burdens remains to be seen. What is clear is that more and more people are beginning to realize that the situation in such countries as the Rhodesias and Kenya can never be adequately dealt with under the present social and economic system. The hope that things will gradually improve as education advances, and that, if and when responsible self-government is granted to Kenya, the settlers will be ready to accept its implications, is almost wholly illusory. With regard to the nature of this "self-government," it has to be remembered that, as Lord Hailey has so forcibly pointed out, since the majority of the population are African, then it will be they who "will ultimately have the

principal share " in the administration.[1] Is this an ideal which would be likely to receive a warm welcome in Kenya or in Southern Rhodesia? Is it likely that the settlers will be so keen to educate the native African to take their places in the Legislature? Such notions have only to be put on paper to be rejected. The solution, if there be a solution, does not lie in directions such as these. There are some situations which demand drastic action. It is probable that Kenya is one of them.[2]

3. The Colour Bar in French, Belgian, and Portuguese Africa

We must now glance briefly at colour prejudice and the colour bar as they exist in those parts of Africa under the control of European Powers other than Great Britain.

As regards France, her influence is mainly in the north and west; and French views on the position of native peoples are largely coloured by the political ideas which have acted as directing forces on the French colonial system.

Unlike the British system, that of the French Colonial Empire is much more centralized; and although local administration has naturally a part to play, the main source of legislation has been in Paris, where plans are made and courses of action laid down. The natives in the French colonies are regarded, theoretically at least, as children of France; and thus the earlier views, which arose from the doctrine of equality

[1] Broadcast on the B.B.C. African Service, 1943.

[2] The literature, both official and unofficial, on Kenya is enormous. To obtain a fairly balanced view on the general problem the reader should consult *Kenya—White Man's Country?* (London, 1944); E. Huxley and M. Perham, *Race and Politics in Kenya* (London, 1944); and for curious sidelights on Kenya life, see A. Davis and H. G. Robertson, *Chronicles of Kenya* (London, 1928), and E. Bigland, *Pattern in Black and White* (London, 1940), pp. 128 ff. Of all the Government Blue Books on East Africa, the best short survey of the British position regarding the country is the Memorandum on Native Policy in East Africa, published as a Command Paper (3573), in 1930, at the price of 3*d*. Here will be found a highly condensed summary of previous policy regarding Kenya and a discussion of the plans which His Majesty's Government has from time to time set forth regarding the position and treatment of the natives. This was the paper which the Brazilian anthropologist, Gilberto Freyre, described as a turning-point in the history of anthropology, transforming it from an abstract into an applied science incorporated into the curriculum of Colonial administration.

proclaimed in the French Revolution, tended towards assimilation and the treatment of the natives as French citizens possessing both the civic and political rights provided by the law. Difficulties, however, arose regarding the franchise, and thus began the system by which a distinction is made between *citizens* and *subjects;* although some natives, by fulfilling the required conditions, can obtain full citizenship. Thus is built up what is really a kind of upper-class native stratum composed of men who, through education and training, have become French in outlook and general mentality, and who in this way can act with the French white administration in free association and collaboration. This system is now giving way to that outlined in the Sarraud declaration of 1920; but since the doctrine of equality makes no distinction between white and black, the native in French territory is not subject in theory to any colour bar, and the educated black man is treated as a Frenchman, and does not feel, as he so often does in British colonies, that his education has merely made him unacceptable both to his own people and to the Europeans. On the other hand, the French colonial system uses native councils merely in an advisory capacity: real power is withheld; and this is gradually becoming recognized by the more discerning natives, who see their own way of life disappearing without any compensatory mode of existence taking its place. It is this feeling that is leading more French colonial authorities to reconsider the whole question of how far native institutions can be preserved, and how far their preservation is compatible with the demands of modern development and industrial progress.

The absence of any official or conventional colour bar in French policy makes a certain kind of progress much easier than in the British possessions. The French live with and marry native women, and their children are not ostracized as social lepers, but are treated almost as if they were white. But there is another side to the picture. French local colonial administration is often entrusted to men who, in their own country, would occupy minor official positions without much power, whereas in Africa they wield considerable power over thousands of helpless natives. Moreover, many of the Agents of the Civil Service, who work under the administrators and who are often recruited locally, are men of narrow outlook, with little real interest in native problems and the future of the colonies in which they serve. Their position is apt to lead

them to assume superior airs; and the results are often more deplorable than when this attitude is supported, and at least partially controlled, by legal decrees. Thus, in Dakar, travellers have reported that the colour bar is just a recognized part of conventional social life, although it is probably rather more of a class barrier than one founded purely on skin pigmentation. The fact is that in many of the French colonies the natives, apart from the educated class, are in the position of people without any clearly defined legal rights which they could enforce by appealing to impartial judicial authorities. From recent accounts of what occurs in the French colonies, such as those by André Gide, Albert Londres, and others, it is clear that the gulf between theory and practice as regards treatment of the natives is as great as, if not greater than, that which exists even in such places as Kenya and Southern Rhodesia. The belief in the superiority of French methods of colonization over the British system, in relation to the native problem, is not founded upon anything which could be called a solid foundation. It is true that, having no legal colour bar, the situation might tend rapidly to improve under change of method in the administration. But until this takes place it cannot be said that the British have very much to learn from the French way of dealing with the African native.

Before passing to the Belgian possessions a word must be said on French Equatorial Africa. When, in June 1940, the France of Pétain, Laval and Weygand capitulated, the call went out from General de Gaulle to continue the fight and not to acquiesce in the demand for surrender which had been sent out by the Vichy Government. Among those who answered the call was the Governor-General of French Equatorial Africa, M. Adolph Félix Sylvestre Eboué, who early entered the French Colonial School, and who in 1911 went to Africa as a Civil Servant. In 1936 he left Africa, and was promoted to be Governor of the French West Indian island of Guadeloupe; but at the outbreak of the Second World War he was recalled, and sent to the Chad Province of French Equatorial Africa, where he was made Governor-General. Apart from help given to the United Nations by French Equatorial Africa, much work has been done by M. Eboué on native affairs and the reform of French colonial policy. For not only was the Governor-General a devoted Frenchman; he was an anthropologist as well, and an outstanding colonial administrator

into the bargain. To him the gradual and progressive development of native participation in local self-administration was what had to be aimed at. He did not believe in making the educated natives coloured Frenchmen, with the whole of their inherited ideas and traditions swept away to make room for the European conceptions and mode of life. In this he struck a new note in French colonial policy, and one which, had he lived, he might have implemented and more fully discussed. Moreover, he was opposed to any wholesale recruitment of natives for factory or plantation work. If these were desirable, then, he thought, they should be carried on by native co-operatives; or, if labour was essential, then the workers and their families ought to be moved, and thus the compound system of the South African mines could be avoided. His death, in May 1944, was a blow, not only to those who had hoped to see French Equatorial Africa become prosperous and contented under his administration, but also to many of the natives, who had come to trust him and to realize that he coupled his love of France with his love of Africa; for Governor-General Félix Eboué was an almost coal-black Negro, who was born in French Guiana in 1884.[1]

With regard to the Belgian Congo, little need be said. It is a country of some 920,000 square miles, including the districts of Ruanda and Urundi, which were formerly in German East Africa and are now a Belgian mandate. The native population is estimated at over 10 million, whilst the whites number about 26,500. The country has had one of the worst records of native ill-treatment for the profit of industrial concerns; and the policy and practice of King Leopold II, with the resulting horrors of native labour in his domain, are still too fresh in the memory of students of African affairs to need any recapitulation here.

Since the former Free State was annexed by Belgium, in 1907, and the Colonial Charter came into existence, abuses have markedly declined and the Commission for the Protection of Natives has done something to uncover and expose cases of illegal treatment. Nevertheless, the policy regarding native labour in the Belgian Congo was still being subjected to much criticism some twenty years ago; and it is probable that, with

[1] See the abbreviated translation of some of his Memoranda in *Sudan Notes and Records*, 1943, xxv, Pt. II, and cf. *Foreign Affairs* (October, 1944, pp. 105 ff.).

the development of the mineral resources of the country, demand for labour will tend further to draw native workers to the mines, with results which cannot be foreseen. Forced labour is forbidden, but, as labour has to be obtained, other means are used which can be imposed without violating any legal enactments dealing with the subject. Such "encouragement" is too well known to need any detailed treatment here; and from the industrial point of view the call for labour is especially insistent in a country where depopulation is proceeding owing to the inability of the native inhabitants to adapt themselves to what is called the civilization of the West. Moreover, under a system of private exploitation of the country's resources, what is looked for is immediate profit, without any regard for the ultimate fate either of the workers or of their country. What is wanted is, as elsewhere, a system of long-time Government planning based upon the realities of the total situation as it affects the whole community. The alternative is that, as some Belgian writers have pointed out, the native population may become so diminished that, instead of a flourishing colony where prosperity has been attained, all that will remain will be a country where the original inhabitants have disappeared, and where it is not suitable for white men to take their place. Broadly speaking, it is probable that the position in the Belgian Congo as regards the colour bar is similar to that in the French West African possessions; although within recent years a good deal has been done to improve the position and material well-being of native labourers without in any way infringing on the superior status of the white employers and overseers. Housing is, in some cases, better than in South Africa; but the completely artificial conditions under which the workers live is not one in which the evils inherent in the system can ever be easily eradicated.

The Portuguese possessions in Africa consist of Portuguese West Africa (Angola), Portuguese East Africa (Mozambique), and the Islands of Principe and San Thomé, in the Gulf of Guinea. The Portuguese have never held any rigid colour prejudices; and although their treatment of native people has at times been open to severe criticism, it cannot be said that it was ever the result of any officially expressed opinions on the innate inferiority of coloured peoples. The scandals which were exposed towards 1906, and which were concerned with the methods of recruitment and treatment of native workers

in the cocoa plantations, were not abuses connected with industrial colour bars, but were part and parcel of the process of obtaining labour for plantation work which brought profits to the producers. The natives were got together from the interior and shipped off to the cocoa plantations in Principe and San Thomé under the system of contract labour, which was little better than slavery. As the conditions, both of obtaining the natives and employing them, began to leak out, the public became shocked, and Mr. Cadbury, and others engaged in using the products grown, visited the islands for a personal investigation. Mr. Cadbury found the system indefensible, and on March 17, 1909, his firm, together with others, sent out a notice to the Press in which they announced that they had ceased buying San Thomé cocoa; whilst the German cocoa firm of Stollwerck issued a similar statement the next day.

Since then, conditions have improved; but the scandal is interesting inasmuch as it shows that, even in countries where colour prejudice is lacking, that is no guarantee that native peoples will enjoy better conditions where profit and the power of concealing the facts regarding their employment are concerned.

In the Portuguese colonies, children of mixed parentage receive European status; and in towns like Lourenço Marques, the capital of Portuguese East Africa, the absence of the colour bar in hotels, restaurants, and places of amusement is apt both to surprise and annoy visitors from the Transvaal or from Southern Rhodesia, where people are wholly unaccustomed to this freedom on the part of coloured folk. On the other hand, there are the usual distinctions based on economic status; and thus the poorer classes, who are often of purely native or of mixed origin, have not the same privileges as those in the wealthier strata of the population.

Portuguese policy regarding the future of the natives is far from clear, although the education provided tends in the direction of substituting a semi-European mode of existence for that which would have been followed had there been no external interference. Latterly, attempts have been made by Portuguese colonial administrators to learn more of the British system; and it is probable that changes will be later initiated, which will make for better efficiency in the general management of the Portuguese Colonial Empire, although it is

unlikely that any colour bar on a considerable scale will be introduced.

In the above brief sketch of the colour bar in Africa an attempt has been made to give the reader a broad, general picture of the situation as it exists at the time of writing. Changes are continually taking place, and the impact of the war upon African territories has done much to alter the economic pattern, as well as to awaken afresh African aspirations towards a freer and less hampered existence. Generally speaking, what we find in Africa are conquered peoples dominated largely by small white minorities, who, through their mastery in the realms of technological achievement, are able to impose their will on the natives who are compelled to work for them and minister to their needs. The customs of one area may differ as much as West Africa differs from the Union of South Africa, but the general picture shows certain similarities, and its main feature is, as we have indicated above, the domination of white over black. In those localities where the colour bar is weak, such as in the Protectorates, the principal fear of the natives is that through the influence of the Union, Kenya, and the Rhodesias, they may be absorbed, and thus may become subject to the restrictions which hitherto they have escaped. As Chief Tshekedi Khama of Bechuanaland said in 1935, what is greatly feared is that, if any transference is effected, " our people will come under the hateful ban of the colour bar," and he challenged any white man to deny that these fears were justified when the treatment of the natives in South Africa was considered.[1]

It is not generally realized by the British public at home how determined is the opposition to control from Whitehall by such people as the white settlers in Northern Rhodesia or Kenya, and how openly is expressed, in the South African House of Assembly, the determination to keep the native down and preserve white supremacy. We will close this chapter by considering just two examples of this attitude.

On December 9, 1935, Mr. (now Sir) Leopold F. Moore spoke during one of the North Rhodesian Legislative Council Debates. He declared that " our constitution is archaic, and belongs to three hundred years ago." It must be got rid of, and " if we can possibly get rid of it without going to absurd lengths, and causing riots and troubles, resentment and all

[1] *News Chronicle* (London, July 31, 1935).

that kind of thing," it was their determination to do so. Mr. Moore went on to say that the settlers did not want to use "anything in the way of objectionable force"; and that the trouble was that they did not wish to rap the British Government over the knuckles, so they could thereby obtain their freedom. These remarkable statements can only be understood if it be clearly realized that many of the white settlers do not think that there is any justification for criticism of their treatment of the natives. Such ideas as equality of treatment in the direction of self-government as between the natives and the white population are, they think, only a point of view favoured by those who have little knowledge of the factors involved. Indeed, Captain J. Brown has stated, in a debate in Northern Rhodesia, that the white settler there "has behaved in a way that is exemplary to every civilization."

With regard to the Union, the dilemma which confronts every South African politician when he considers the results of educating the natives is sometimes squarely met and dealt with in no uncertain terms. For example, Mr. Johannes G. Strydom, at one time co-leader of the Reunited Nationalist Party, speaking in the House of Assembly on May 17, 1939, opposed the estimates for Native welfare, and declared that such a policy was suicidal. If the European in South Africa, he said, goes on in this way providing money for the Natives "in a way which I regard as an unnatural way, to uplift and civilize the Native economically, then it goes without saying that the European himself will eventually be the cause of those Natives being uplifted and raised much more than would be the case in the ordinary course of events." Mr. Strydom then added that in that case "the European will no longer, to the same extent as in the past, be the master over them." Certainly that is one way of looking at the problem, although Mr. Strydom does not seem to have carefully considered the results of his policy. Whether it is one which is likely to appeal to the Colonial Office, or to the British public, if it be applied to Crown Colonies as a line to be followed is another question. Time will show.

CHAPTER IX

THE COLOUR BAR IN THE WEST INDIES

GENERALLY speaking, the colour bar in the British West Indies may be said to vary from island to island. It is by no means confined to a line drawn between Whites and Coloured, but exists as between persons of different shades of colour. Basically the barrier is one of class and social status, although the subtle and unwritten codes of behaviour are present here as in other parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations. There is little question that the existence of the colour bar is becoming more and more emotionally felt every year; and the many factors which are connected with it tend to make the problem one of increasing urgency.

The basic problem of the West Indies is that of poverty. How to alleviate it and how it is connected with the economic system operating in the islands do not concern us here. But it is as well to point out that if poverty is one of the barriers to the development of self-government and social responsibility, then the colour bar is another and even more unnecessary hindrance. As the dominant white minority sees the advancement in political consciousness increase among the better-educated coloured people, so rivalry, resentment, and oppressive tendencies develop, with the natural result that frustration and bitterness arise on the other side, and the explosive forces we have seen so much of elsewhere are generated.

One indication of how the coloured population is beginning to organize itself can be seen in the rise of popular parties and the growth of the idea of trade unions. There are indications of a rising tide of dissatisfaction among the coloured workers which led to the disturbances which have recently been reported in Barbados, Jamaica, and Trinidad, and which may be the prelude to further upheavals in which the colour question may become very serious. Hitherto the riots have been primarily caused by the low standard of wages, coupled with unemployment and a rising price scale. There are, for example, startling discrepancies between the wages of those who perform manual as opposed to clerical work. Moreover, the profits made, for

example, by the great oil companies in Trinidad tend to suggest that more of the money might be distributed to those who work the oil-fields rather than be sent away to absentee shareholders. However that may be, it is obvious that any agitation of the kind recently carried on in Jamaica might well take on a "racial" and anti-white tinge in which the whole question of future good relations between white and coloured might be jeopardized. Indeed, the riots may well be regarded as the beginnings of widespread and increasingly organized agitation for better wages, housing, and general conditions. Trade unionism in the islands has reached a very elementary stage; and the lack of leaders of suitable experience and training makes their growth slow and full of difficulty. Nevertheless, the development of such unions on sound lines is encouraged and foreseen by the West Indies Royal Commission of 1938–1939, and it is recommended that laws should be enacted whereby such unions, when established, should be protected as regards picketing and similar actions. In order to cover the period before such unions are developed, the Commission recommended the formation of Labour departments, or officers, who could act as intermediaries between the employers and the workers. Wages boards also could be set up whereby differences and claims might be adjusted.

One of the earliest attempts at a working-class organization in Trinidad was that begun by Mr. A. Cipriani many years ago. He formed what was called the Trinidad Working-men's Association, and it had a decided political slant. Later attempts began to awaken in the minds of the authorities an inkling of what was happening, although they still remained unprepared to meet the more aggressive of the new leaders who started to make themselves known in the islands. Thus, in Trinidad we find A. Rienzi and Uriah Butler; in Jamaica, Alexander Bustamente (whose father was Irish) and the lawyer, Norman Manley, who leads the People's National Party; and in Barbados, George Adams, who sponsored new housing measures in the Legislature, and Clement Payne, who was the centre of a disturbance in 1937 when several people were killed and injured.

It is probable that Jamaica is the island where the colour bar is least conspicuous. But even here, where the new Constitution, the efforts of Jamaica Welfare Limited and Bustamente's victory in the elections of December 1944, are straws in the

wind indicating the trend of events, the condition of the bulk of the people is still deplorable. They are ignorant and superstitious, ill-fed, ill-educated, and ill-housed, and are not, as a population and taken as a whole, one of which British administration—already in operation for nearly 300 years—has reason to be proud. The slums of Kingston have been compared with those of Port Said; tumbledown hovels roofed with corrugated iron abound; sanitary conditions are primitive, and the average housing density is estimated at about five persons per home, it being understood that in many cases the word "home" can be taken as "room." But there is no doubt that the problem of the colour bar is not so acute as it is elsewhere. The vocational barrier is less, and the existence of peasant holdings in rural districts tends to diminish it. Moreover, here, as in Grenada and parts of Trinidad, businesses are becoming controlled by coloured persons; but outside the Government services, the Church, and the medical and legal professions few good opportunities for coloured people, except in the social services, exist.

Colour prejudice, however, is not absent even in Jamaica. As might have been expected, the upper-class "white" Jamaican, especially if there be a suspicion of black blood in the family, is often somewhat prejudiced. An amusing tale has been told about a young man of good family in Jamaica, who, having fallen in love, decided to visit the Record Office to look up the ancestry of the lady in question and see if there were any colour strain in her family. He found none; but, to his horror, he found a very decided streak in his own.[1]

With the growth of the American tourist traffic before the war, and the building of the American bases during it, a new element was introduced into Jamaican life which brought the question of colour prejudice into sharp focus. The attempt to introduce colour prejudice into the island was much resented even before the last war, although friction on a wide scale was happily prevented. During the period of rioting and unrest, towards 1937, however, the colour question became important, and coloured Jamaicans began to assert their rights in the face of American opposition. Similarly, during the building of the bases the coloured people decided not to permit the customary behaviour of American soldiers from the

[1] *Notes and Queries*, March 12, 1934, CLXVI, p. 332.

Southern States towards Negroes. Incidents occurred, and finally the Americans had to compromise with their feelings and admit that, in Jamaica at least, they had to mix with coloured people whether they liked it or not.

In Trinidad, where the mixture of stocks is almost as great as in Hawaii, the colour bar is more openly exercised than in Jamaica. Harmony as between white and coloured people may and does exist in many a Government office, but when the day has ended and the staff departs the barrier is raised and distinction appears. In recent years there has been a growing tendency to appoint Europeans, with knowledge of industrial affairs as liaison officers between employers and workers. It seems, however, to be generally admitted, by those who honestly face the situation, that the tendency of such Relations Advisers is to react more favourably towards the employer than to the coloured men who work under him. In view of the nature of things, and of human nature in particular, this is as might have been expected, and the social life and opportunities of Europeans who are not willing to fall in with the prevailing white pattern of thought and behaviour can be severely limited and curtailed. Thus an added danger is to be noted, since the idea might easily be spread, by agitators and others, that these Labour Officers and advisers were merely the tools of the employers, hiding their real nature beneath an official status. Hence the situation, instead of being relieved, might be exacerbated, and growth of trade unionism retarded and relations between employers and employed still further embittered. The whole question is one of extreme complexity, and it is just these intangible elements which make any solution difficult; although the root of the trouble is in the whole conception of colour bars, and in the delusion that human degrees of equality are linked with the pigmentation of their skins. In two special articles in *The Times*, of London, for October 29–30, 1943, a correspondent pointed out that the young official who comes out from Britain finds himself helpless, however well intentioned and free from colour prejudice he may be. On account of his position the town's most exclusive club is open to him. If he avails himself of it, his social orbit becomes well defined; but if he does not, he cuts himself off from the company of his own people. It is this vicious circle which, as *The Times* correspondent says, " must somehow be broken, and it is time to consider whether Colonial

Office officials should not in future be forbidden to belong to clubs which impose a colour bar."

Between the white upper class and the black workers there are the clerks and shop assistants, who form a kind of buffer-element; and it is still quite uncertain which side they will favour when real trouble begins. They are torn by conflicting emotions. Economically and socially they tend to gravitate towards the whites; emotionally, and through their blood and history, they tend to sympathize with the blacks. Generally speaking, the class structure in Trinidad—and to a greater or less degree in the other West Indian Islands—is topped by the white population; and then follow the coloured bourgeois class of professional and economically successful people, who consider themselves well above the lower grades of coloured workers, the East Indians and other Asiatic elements. Thus there always tends to exist friction between the various elements, each striving to reach the next rung of the ladder, and possibly marry into a lighter-coloured family so that their own children may not suffer the handicap of a dark skin, which is nearly always associated with the lower-grade workers. It is these conditions which influence politics in the West Indies and that sometimes surprising allegiance which certain of the upper-class coloured people show to the dominating white element.

In Barbados, perhaps the most patriotic of the islands, where an exclusive and colour-conscious society is particularly noticeable, the same scene is presented; and although political rights can now be reasonably freely attained, a gradual growth of what may become acute political consciousness among the coloured people is beginning to be felt, whilst at the same time the opposition of the planter class is already strong, and under the present economic system may become very effective and difficult to shake. Nevertheless, Barbados exhibits a form of society in which the coloured population can move freely and enjoy all those advantages of which their economic condition admits. The franchise is open, and black and white meet in the schools on equal terms and discuss together in the House of Assembly. It is here, better than anywhere else, except perhaps Jamaica, that we can see how political advancement can be achieved only through the economic improvement in the life of the people, and how a population suffering from chronic poverty and malnutrition cannot be expected to

take much interest in political rights which their material condition prevents them from enjoying.

In the French West Indies very similar conditions exist as elsewhere within the French Colonial Empire; but in Cuba and Haiti the colour question is of sufficient interest to warrant more than mere passing mention.

Although Cuban statistics are not entirely to be relied on, especially as regards racial origin in census returns, it is generally agreed that Negroes constitute anything from 25 to 50 per cent., according as to how the word "Negro" is defined. Although Cuba has a slave tradition, like the United States, colour prejudice has never gone to the lengths it has in North America. The people of Cuba live fairly harmoniously together; and such regulations as Jim Crowism or educational segregation are unknown. The franchise permits coloured members in the Chamber of Deputies, and the various political groups contain representatives drawn from all parts of the population. The Cuban Army and Navy have both coloured officers and men, although it is said that a certain amount of discrimination has been practised in relation to the Air Force.

Colour prejudice in Cuba, as we have seen is the case elsewhere, is much more of a class prejudice, and some Cubans believe that influence from the United States is becoming increasingly strong in the direction of extending this prejudice to other and higher levels. Already the tendency has become apparent to look with disfavour on Negroes living in the better-class apartment blocks; and in Caibarién, on the northern coast of Cuba, it is reported that separate divisions for white and coloured bathers have been established on the beach. Such developments show the general trend of events in Cuba; although, as long as the republic has Presidents like Fulgencio Batista y Zaldívar (a man of mixed and complex ancestry), the colour bar as it exists in the United States or in the Union of South Africa is impossible. For the former Cuban President, Batista, came from the people, and he distrusts the wealthy upper classes and their prejudices and lack of any real acquaintance with the lives of the poor, among whom Batista lived when he was a child. To him colour prejudice is a mark of ignorance, and is fundamentally irrational; he does not understand how Americans, with their practical outlook on things in general, can be influenced by it to the extent that they are. Ex-President Batista had no Puritan ancestors.

In Haiti, a black Republic, which is again coming under the influence of the United States, the colour question is of quite peculiar interest, since we can see here how the class and caste structure of society is linked with colour. The lighter-skinned mulattoes are usually to be found in the upper levels of society, whilst workers and peasants often have the darker skins. A dark peasant woman who has ambitions for her children might not in some cases be averse from the attentions of a white man, since thereby the resulting offspring would have the lighter complexion which would be a decided advantage when its future prospects were considered. Economic status and education are thus linked with social position, and this in turn is often associated with the degree of skin-colour. Moreover, through dependence on the United States, the upper strata of society try to take over some of the American prejudices; although by doing so they achieve but little, since the American officials and visitors see little difference between the mulattoes in Haiti and those in the United States. To them they are all "just Niggers." [1]

The future of the West Indies depends to a certain extent on how far the coloured peoples take their rightful place in the administration and development of the islands. But before the submerged masses can be expected to play any active part, poverty must be reduced and malnutrition remedied. The whole economic framework on which the islands depend will have to be revised. Vested interests are strong; and there is always the suspicion that the officials who run local affairs are in many cases merely the mouthpieces of the industrial interests. Certainly in a number of instances the local authorities have been elected by the votes of property-owners and others, who, whatever their qualifications may be, represent but a small percentage of the population. The condition of the poor in Trinidad is deplorable. Yet no one can say that the island itself is poor. The dividends from oil alone give the lie to any such assertion. The West Indies are not basically poor; but the people who live there are poor, and it is the lower-grade coloured folk who are the poorest. Immense wealth is taken every year from these islands, where the people as a whole never enjoy a balanced diet or eat the proper amounts of good

[1] For a comparative study of Negroes in Haiti, the United States, and Puerto Rico, see J. C. Rosario and J. Carrión, *El Negro : Haiti–Estados Unidos–Puerto Rico* (San Juan, 1940).

food necessary for health. The Resolutions of the Hot Springs Conference of 1943 have been accepted by His Majesty's Government and are commended to the Governments of the Colonies, Dependencies, and overseas territories. Since the main object of the Conference was to try to ensure freedom from want, and above all from want of food, it is clear that, if the promises made are to be fulfilled, it will be necessary to examine the whole economic pattern of West Indian society, and eliminate those sources of weakness which are at the basis of the poverty of the inhabitants. There is not the slightest doubt that widespread malnutrition causes not only an immense amount of suffering and disease, but also impairs efficiency and hinders employment. How far the great industrial concerns will co-operate in remedial measures remains to be seen. Their record in the past is not one which would lead the unbiased observer to be too optimistic as to their actions in the future.

CHAPTER X

THE COLOUR BAR IN INDIA AND THE EAST

IT may well be that one factor which embitters our relations with India is colour prejudice. The people of India are a conquered people, and their country is under white domination, so the pattern of inferiority and superiority is clearly marked. It is true that things are changing for the better. At one time English people travelling in India sometimes used to demand that Indians should be ejected from a first-class railway carriage in which they wanted to travel, and the guard would often oblige; but now such a thing would be rare. Notwithstanding these changes in procedure and practice, the basic attitude remains, and the situation is not improved by the caste system among Indians themselves, and by the general attitude of the Moslems and their relation to the Hindu community. But above all these internal divergencies stands the white man and his creed of superiority, and its resulting aloofness. Indians who know what is happening in the world do not forget that Mr. Gandhi, when in South Africa, was turned away from a Christmas service because he was Asiatic; they do not forget that their civilization was old before the West had mastered the technology which has made it supreme in the arts of war.

It is perhaps in the provinces that the attitude of the officials is most marked. Their position certainly is not easy: it is always difficult to combine authority and the respect which that authority demands, and at the same time to extend social equality to those over whom control is being exercised. Moreover, white women are much to blame for their attitude and lack of any balanced sense of responsibility. Many of them go out to India with that sense of importance which the authority of their husbands engenders within them; and their consequent behaviour and air of aloof superiority but ill conceal their own inadequacy, ignorance, and timidity. One of my correspondents, who has lived in India many years, declares that these Englishwomen rarely make any serious attempt to study any of the languages through which they could make contact with the Indian women, and, like so many other white

people in foreign countries, fail to take the opportunity to make themselves acquainted with the culture of those among whom they are living. Moreover, the attitude of veiled contempt, coupled sometimes with a kind of lordly benevolence, is to be noticed even on the vessels bound from Europe to Indian ports. The same correspondent, in a letter received only just before these words were written, tells me that in voyages back and forth to India there has not been one trip which was not marred by the bad manners and contempt shown by English travellers to educated Indians returning to their own country.[1]

Generally speaking, the attitude of the British and Americans towards Oriental peoples is tinged with the same kind of prejudice and superior aloofness that they display towards Africans, although perhaps not to such a marked degree. The Dutch, on the other hand, have done much to lessen colour prejudice in their dealings with the people of the Netherlands East Indies. Assimilation was regarded with favour, and Dutch officials were not prevented from intermarriage, thus avoiding the half-concealed and shame-faced unions which are common in, for example, Sarawak (Borneo), where, since the arrangements are temporary, marriage is discouraged and irregular alliances are condoned.

In the Netherlands East Indies the Eurasians are able to reach any position which they are competent to fill, whilst on British plantations in, for example, the Straits Settlements it used not to be usual for Eurasians to be employed in anything but a subordinate capacity; and even educated Chinese were rarely permitted to lunch or dine in the British Club, even if a member wanted to bring one in as a guest. Such a system does little credit to those who control local affairs, and who, by their example, might bring to an end what the Dutch call "the silly colour prejudice" of the ordinary British settler or minor official. They might with advantage ponder on the words of André Gide when he was travelling in the Congo. "The less intelligent the white man is," he writes, "the more stupid he thinks the black." [2]

One result of Dutch policy regarding intermarriage and the European status of the offspring is that in the Netherlands East Indies there is far less of that master–servant complex the

[1] Cf. *Contemporary Review*, 1931, CXXIX, p. 353.
[2] *Travels in the Congo*, London, 1930, p. 14.

British have fostered in their possessions. On the other hand, the Dutch have inclined towards the French policy of association rather than total assimilation. The mass of the people are not educated so as to become coloured Dutchmen; only a certain number who show promise are given full access to an education which would fit them for the higher positions. It is true that through this method a class division is established between the bulk of the native population and those chosen to rise above them; but the alternative is not regarded favourably by the Dutch, who believe that, by their system, better relations are established all round. It is possible that the results prove that they are right, although in the years following the war with Japan the Dutch will have to consider how far the native populations under their rule will be able to enter more fully into the administration of their own territory and enjoy the fruits of the labour and industry which they have put into developing it.

Before leaving the subject of prejudice in India it ought to be recalled what was said earlier in this book regarding the caste system and its relation to colour (see p. 19). It is not only the white peoples of the world who cherish these racial and colour prejudices, as some would have us believe. The fact that the fairer invaders of India from the north subdued the natives they found there, and that these peoples were dark-skinned, at once caused that division between conquerors and conquered, fair and dark, that we have seen elsewhere. Whatever may be the origin of caste, it is clearly connected with colour; and its gradual breakdown and disintegration in India are due, partially at least, to the more democratic life brought in by the British, with their emphasis on liberty and the rights of man. Many of those who clamour for what they call "freedom for India" do not sometimes seem to realize what the tyranny of caste is and what are its effects. Had it not been for British influence it is unlikely that its hold would have been in any way weakened, or that such men as Jyotirao Phooley would have been able to begin those attempts at reform with which his name is associated. However much we may dislike the superior attitude of the white planter or official in India, that attitude is nothing compared with that adopted by the Brahmins towards the untouchables. Even in modern times a Brahmin physician, when feeling the pulse of a Sudra patient, will wrap a piece of material around the wrist so that

he may not suffer defilement from coming in contact with the patient's skin. Moreover, the segregation of the depressed classes, or untouchables, is similar to that suffered by the Negro in parts of the United States, although the natives in India suffer regulations which are much more rigid. In India there are cases where an untouchable has to carry a pot round his neck into which to spit, lest a pure-caste Hindu might possibly tread upon the spittle on the road and thereby be polluted. Such is caste prejudice in action in India.

CHAPTER XI

THE COLOUR PROBLEM IN BRAZIL

FOR any study of colour prejudice, and the problems of assimilation and culture-contact, Brazil is probably one of the most important countries in the world. In area extending to about 3,275,000 square miles, this vast country has a mixed population of some 43,500,000, of whom perhaps 60 per cent. are White, 20 per cent. Mulatto, 10 per cent. Mestizo (half-breed, European and Indian), 8 per cent. Negro, and 2 per cent. Indian.

In Brazil the Negroes, descendants of the millions of slaves imported from different parts of Africa, are more numerous than in any other of the South American States. For example, Bahia still possesses a large Negro colony where not only are there people still to be found in a relatively pure state, but where many of their cultural traditions and dances are still preserved. Before considering the question of colour prejudice—or rather the lack of it—that we find in Brazil, a word must be said on the history of Brazilian colonization, which has had an important bearing on the subsequent history of the coloured population.

It was in 1500 that Brazil was first discovered by Admiral Pedro Cabral, although the Portuguese had established certain rights in the New World some years earlier. With the subsequent colonization and the importation of Negro slaves, commerce began, and it was here that the Portuguese showed themselves in a different light from that of the Spaniards. The coastal districts were the first to be occupied, and intermarriage between the immigrants and the Indians already living on the continent was soon established. In these matters the Portuguese do not seem to have had the same kind of feelings as others from the Old World. The Spaniards, fired by missionary zeal coupled with military ardour, tended to be imperialistic and domineering, whereas the arrivals from Portugal preferred rather the ways of peaceful trade and a way of life animated by the philosophy of live and let live. They were adaptable and easygoing; assimilation came more easily, and with it a fading of any tendency towards dominance and

superiority, which so often disfigured the results of colonization among other peoples, and which was far from unknown in Brazil as long as slavery lasted. The result of these factors on the developing colonization in Brazil was that intermarriage and concubinage became common, for, as has been pointed out, Portugal never caught the colour prejudice of modern European imperialism and, retaining mediæval tolerance, it bequeathed to Brazil not only a capacity for assimilation, but a priceless heritage of the belief in human values based not on skin-colour, but upon individual worth.

In modern Brazil the people are singularly free from those neurotic conditions which are apt to beset a society founded upon Puritan and Protestant prejudices. They are friendly, kindly, and hospitable, hating to be fussed, not caring overmuch about the private affairs of their friends, and not ashamed to enjoy life and show that they enjoy it. The idea that men are equal, in the sense that humanity is one, did not come to Brazil as the result of revolutionary theorizing; it grew out of the original foundations of Brazilian culture, and was extended and intensified as its civilization developed. Moreover, the tropical sun was not without its effect on the population. A Brazilian is not the kind of person who can afford to waste time upon wondering whether a dark skin is due to the influence of blood or the effect of the blazing sunlight on his country. What he values is the *man himself*, without any hard-and-fast distinctions as to his origin or hereditary traits. Such concepts as the Nazi ideas inherent in the doctrine of " Race, Blood, and Soil " are simply not understood, and, if they were, they would be rejected with hostility. Where colour distinctions are found at all in Brazil they are fundamentally *social* rather than what is called *racial*; and the fact that Negroes (especially in congested areas like Bahia) are lower in the social and economic scale than lighter-coloured citizens is often responsible for that degree of discrimination which is to be found. This lack of colour prejudice is one of the things in Brazil that strikes both North Americans and British colonial citizens with especial force. Indeed, it has been reported that Theodore Roosevelt once declared that the difference in this respect between the views of Brazilians and those of the United States was complete. Moreover, the less rigid sexual morality of Brazil, as compared with the chaotic sexual *mores* in the United States, makes for informal unions between whites and

mulattoes, whereby blood is continually being intermingled and new strains are being produced.[1]

Mancebia (union outside legal marriage) is by no means unknown even in Bahia, where a white married man may run two distinct establishments and have two distinct families. Indeed, this plan is favoured by the darker-coloured women, since through it their children will be lighter in colour than themselves, and thereby may be likely to rise both in the social and economic scale. This process is often called " improving the blood," or sometimes " cleansing the race," for the tendency is always for the lighter-coloured elements gradually to absorb the blacks.

The tendency seems to be eventually to produce a population of a more or less uniform colour, with the possibility in view that the very dark elements may finally begin to disappear altogether. It is the same idea as that put forward by some persons in the United States when they talk about the possibility of a future " Brown America " if miscegenation is not carefully prevented, above all in the Southern States.

Pure Negroes in Brazil are, generally speaking, *socially* inferior to the whites, and the degree of *social* position often goes along with the degree of skin-colour. The elements of a caste system are to be discerned, and there is some danger that the *fact* of Negroes often possessing a low social status may tend to become interpreted on racial lines, as is always being suggested by the North American cinema productions for home consumption. However this may be, the social position of the Negroes is such that there always exists a desire (as in Haiti) for the darker-coloured to produce children of lighter hue, so that they may rise in the social scale, and gain positions to which their parents could not aspire. This, as has been said, is one of the incentives towards the miscegenation and illicit intercourse which are favoured by the Negro women.

In Brazil the various shades of colour are denoted by a variety of terms. White or very light-coloured persons are *brancos*; brown-skinned people are *pardos*; whilst blacks are *pretos*. *Morenos* are light coffee-coloured; and women of this type are especially admired for their extreme beauty. Very black Negroes are called " black as ink " (*pretos rentintos*),

[1] *Cf.* G. Freyre in his *Brazil: an Interpretation* (New York, 1945), in which he says that the African element is one of the best in the Brazilian population.

whilst other terms are used to describe the many intermediary shades. Browns tend gradually to increase as the whites decline; and, with the decline of the whites, the blacks also tend to diminish. The word " Negro " itself is not encouraged. It corresponds to such derogatory terms in our language as " Wop " for the Italian, " Greaser " for Mexican, and " Dago " for any Latin European. Moreover, it calls up memories of the old slave days, which the white population wants to forget and the black to avoid thinking about. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the word " Negro," especially when used in the expression *meu negrinho* (my little Negro), is occasionally used as a term of endearment, thus recalling the old days of the intimate personal relationships of the plantations.

In his admirable study of the Negro population of Bahia, Pierson [1] gives the result of a small questionnaire on the reasons a *branco* (white) may have for not marrying a *preto* (black). Some of the answers given throw a clear light upon the social reasons underlying the little colour prejudice that exists in Brazil. Thus, one or two of them suggested that the reasons for their objection to marrying a black person were that blacks rarely had social standing and were ordinarily lower in the social scale; that such a marriage would tend to lower the upper-class person, and that it would be better for both parties to be on the same social level; and also that being socially inferior it would be likely that the black person would probably be cruder in outlook and more stupid intellectually. In other words, the pure Negro does not possess the necessary *class*.

But although as a general rule the blacks are not yet high in the social scale, a good many prominent citizens are very dark, with pronounced negroid characteristics, and yet are fully accepted by the whites, and are admitted by the clubs and learned institutions without question. They have, to use an American expression, " made good." What matters is not their skin-colour, but their characters, their personalities, and their achievements. They are accepted because they have made themselves acceptable. Another and ready way of judging if a person is to be accepted or not is to see if his clothing conforms to the current standard. Kasimir Edschmid [2] tells a story, quoted by Pierson, of an incident in a tramcar in

[1] D. Pierson, *Negroes in Brazil* (Chicago, 1942).

[2] *South America: a Continent of Contrasts* (London, 1932), p. 370.

Brazil which illustrates in a vivid fashion the prevailing indifference to skin-colour and attention to clothing when the question of travelling first or second class had to be decided by the conductor. In this case distinctions were made on the grounds of whether a passenger was wearing a collar or not. Everybody without a collar, regardless of whether he or she was coloured or not, was sent to the second class. For example, a black man with a collar, but wearing neither boots nor shoes, was put into the first class; whilst an Englishman who had on merely a low-cut jersey was sent to the second class. This insistence on a collar as a badge of social status seems to be found in certain parts of the West Indies, where the present writer found that by not wearing a white collar his social status was not only lowered in the eyes of the white inhabitants, but was regarded by the coloured people with some surprise, and even on one occasion with a good deal of suspicion, since he was detained by the local police for questioning, and his movements in the interior of the island notified to the various police-stations in advance.

How far a " colour problem " will ever make its appearance in Brazil itself is hard to say. Brazilian resistance to immigration has never been great; and it is probable that what there is in regard to Japanese settlers is due to the fact that it is feared that they will remain isolated groups and resist that assimilation into the general population which is desired by the Brazilian Government. It is unlikely that the Brazilian will ever be as much influenced by North American prejudice as the Dutch officials appear to have been in the Netherlands East Indies, where, before the war, ominous signs were to be discerned due to the behaviour and ill-mannered attitude taken up by American tourists, visitors, and commercial representatives. Recently, however, reports have been received that, in those large hotels and other establishments where American influence is strong, a colour bar is being imposed upon coloured travellers and visitors. Thus, one Negro writer from the United States reports that when arriving at Rio de Janeiro he was refused admission to several large hotels, such as the Copacabana, Natal, Pax, Gloria, and Palace.

Among Brazilian intellectual writers and theorists Oliveira Vianna is almost the only one who seems to have absorbed some of the racial mysticism current in Germany and in the United States, and who fails to distinguish accurately the

problems underlying the biological and cultural factors in the building of character, intelligence and cultural potentialities.[1] Such difficulties as these do not worry the average Brazilian. The tradition of intermingling since the early colonial period is too strong; and moreover it agrees with the tendencies of the people. To absorb and to assimilate has been the custom during four centuries in Brazil; and it is hardly likely to be changed by any crack-pot " Aryan " theories or neurotic complexes so common in the north, which are completely alien to the happy, more human, and sunnier disposition of Southern peoples. Even if industrialism spreads still farther in Brazil, assimilation has gone so far that it can hardly be considered likely that colour prejudice will ever become a major problem in domestic and foreign politics. The psychological foundations for it are non-existent, and without these no emergence is possible. Although Brazil is very far from being a " classless " society, it does not seem probable that there will ever come into being large downtrodden groups of " poor whites " as exist in the Union of South Africa and in the Southern States of North America; neither does there seem to be any fear that the coming brown majority will ever seek unfair social or economic domination over the dwindling majority of whites. Indeed, it would appear that the absence of colour prejudice in Brazil will be a potent factor in the development and successful progress of this vast and richly endowed country.

Although it is true that the above sketch of the general picture in Brazil is tolerably accurate, that is not to say that in certain parts of the country, and in some of the urban areas, colour or racial prejudice may not be found and may exercise a considerable influence. Brazil is so vast a country that generalizations about it are especially dangerous. The make-up of the population varies in the different zones, one section being predominantly Indian, whilst another may contain a majority of European immigrants.[2] It cannot be expected that all these immigrants would drop any racial prejudice they might have merely because they had entered Brazil. Moreover, their desire to improve their social and economic status would incline them towards associating as far as they could with the upper social levels (light-skinned), rather than the

[1] *Cf. Raça e assimilaçao*, 2. ed. (São Paulo, 1934).

[2] Over four million immigrants entered Brazil between 1884 and 1941 the predominating nationalities being Italian, Portuguese and Spanish.

lower, levels where the darker-skinned people are more numerous. We should expect some colour prejudice to become apparent under these conditions, and there is some evidence that it exists. But much more detailed and statistical surveys will have to be made before we can describe the position in terms which would be accepted as a scientific contribution to the problem. What is certain is that Brazil shows far less colour prejudice than does the United States or elsewhere, and that the reason for this is clearly connected with the history and psychology of her people. In the section on the meaning and psychology of colour prejudice we shall deal more specifically with this question, and show how, if certain suggestions be accepted, a profound colour prejudice is not likely to be found in countries like Brazil.

CHAPTER XII

THE COLOUR BAR IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

COLOUR prejudice in Australia and New Zealand is interesting from the point of view of this study, since in the first case it illustrates how the feeling can be closely connected with problems of immigration and the preservation of the standard of life, and, in the second, how a conquering people can, when animated by honourable motives and using their common sense, become associated on terms of civic and political equality with the native peoples.

Australia is a vast country of nearly 3 million square miles, with a total population which in 1938 was estimated at nearly 7 millions—or less than that of Greater London. In the 1933 census the European population was some 6,579,993, whilst the non-European (excluding full-blood aboriginals, who numbered some 52,000 in 1938) was very nearly 23,000.[1]

Immigration is regulated by the Commonwealth Constitution Act and other ordinances, and the general policy, which is often called that of " White Australia," is to prohibit Asiatics or coloured immigrants who desire to settle in the country from coming into it. In the 1933 census the largest number of non-Europeans in the country were the Chinese (10,846, followed by natives of India, who numbered 2,404, and Japanese), who were estimated at 2,241. Between 1926 and 1930 considerable numbers of Italians, Greeks, and Yugoslavs were admitted to Australia, but since 1937 the tendency has been for non-Europeans to depart rather than to arrive.

The history of the White Australia policy goes back to the middle of the nineteenth century, when labour was needed and the experiment was tried of introducing Indian coolie labour. Although the proposal was opposed by the British on the grounds, among others, that it might cause future difficulties from the racial angle, many colonists reacted favourably to it; but towards 1839 the experiment petered out, and it was not till some ten years later that Chinese labour began to be

[1] Half-castes are not included in these figures.

imported. Owing to the undesirable class of immigrant which arrived, this experiment had also to be abandoned, and the next phase was an idea to get labour from the Pacific Islands; but this, too, was not a success. One reason why opposition to Asiatic immigration grew in Australia was because the incoming people showed no inclination towards assimilation (even if this were encouraged, which is doubtful), but lived their own life and followed their own customs. Moreover, the Australian workers soon saw that the influx of Chinese would affect the standard of living, and in 1855 an Act restricting immigration was passed. Difficulties in its application arose, and the Buckland River riot, in 1857, showed that further legislation would have to be attempted, and the next few years indicated a hardening against all Asiatics and the evolution of the theory that Australia had no need of inferior people through whose immigration it might cease to be a white man's country. By 1888 an almost prohibitive legislation was decided on, and, at the Intercolonial Conference of that year, steps were set out to implement it. By 1891 the proposals had begun to take shape as a definite policy for the future, and from the Chinese the ban gradually extended to other Asiatics, including Indians, and thus began further difficulties concerning the exclusion of British subjects. By 1896 a full policy of restriction for all Asiatic immigrants, except in special circumstances, was developed (in spite of the fact that by so doing British subjects would also be automatically prevented from entering the country), and thus, in accordance with the findings of the 1896 Intercolonial Conference, certain " Coloured Races Restriction and Regulation " Bills were passed.

In his address to the Premiers of the self-governing Colonies, during the Queen's Diamond Jubilee celebrations in 1897, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, whilst showing that he understood the reason why the Bills had been adopted, asked the Australians present to bear in mind the traditions of the British Empire, "which makes no distinction in favour of, or against race or colour." To exclude Indians, or even other Asiatics, on account of their colour would not only be offensive to the people concerned, but would be most painful to the Queen herself were she asked to sanction it. It was the character of the immigrants, Mr. Chamberlain went on to say, which had to be considered. It was not the colour of a man which made him an undesirable

immigrant, but other reasons which could be enumerated and defined. He hoped that arrangements could be made which would avoid hurting the feelings of any of the Queen's subjects, whilst at the same time protecting Australia from the entry of undesirable elements.[1]

In an attempt, partially at least, to meet the clearly expressed wish of the Mother Country, tests were devised which, it was hoped, would fulfil the dual requirements suggested by Mr. Chamberlain. But the attempts failed, partly because there was little uniformity in their application, and partly because there was no real desire on the part of the Australians to weaken their policy of a White Australia. The question of Japanese immigration had been especially acute, and the whole problem came to a head during the drafting of a proposed racial equality clause in the League of Nations Covenant, in 1919. The Japanese had studiously prepared the ground, and the proposal was carefully worded and phrased. "The equality of nations," it read, "being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the High Contracting Parties agree to accord, as soon as possible, to all alien nationals of States, members of the League equal and just treatment in every respect, making no distinction, either in law or in fact, on account of their race or nationality."

The proposal caused a sensation. Mr. Arthur Balfour consulted Colonel House. Colonel House talked to President Wilson. Mr. Balfour said that he did not believe in the truth of the statement of the American Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal. An impasse had been created. Nevertheless, Baron Makino and his colleagues formally brought the proposal forward, at the final meeting of the Commission, by way of an amendment to the Preamble in which the principle of the equality of nations and the just treatment of nationals was stressed. Lord Robert Cecil refused to accept the amendment, acting on the instructions he had received from the British Government. The discussion, however, continued—with Lord Robert taking little part in it, although he remained seated with his eyes lowered and fixed on the table.

President Wilson found himself in an awkward situation. He knew, as did Colonel House, that, were the Commission to pass the proposal, it would raise the whole race issue through-

[1] *Proceedings of a Conference*, etc C. 8596; *Accounts and Papers*, 1897, LIX, 631 ff.)

out the entire world; and above all in America, where the Negro problem was always a thorn in the side of the United States. In his speech, therefore, the President was vague, but his words clearly showed that he was against the ideas propounded. The amendment was, however, pushed to a vote, but only affirmations were taken. Japan, France, Italy, Brazil, China, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia were in favour of it. The President announced that the amendment was lost, as unanimity was essential. What happened behind the scenes has never been fully disclosed. Mr. W. M. Hughes, the Australian Prime Minister, urged President Wilson to back up the British—which he did—although what was the precise influence Mr. Hughes actually exercised he has declined to tell. Doubtless he informed the President that the White Australia policy was an integral part of the national life, to which the only alternative was racial extinction. He regarded the racial equality clause as a farcical move on the part of the Japanese. The Australian policy was the only possible one for him to follow, since it was not feasible to assimilate the coloured immigrants, and their mode of life was entirely different from that followed in Australia. It was this, rather than the colour of their skin, to which Mr. Hughes objected. It is said that during the discussion of the clause he told the Japanese bluntly that the Australians did not regard them as inferior, but that frankly they did not blend with the white population and it was not considered desirable that intermarriage should take place. In short, they were not wanted, and steps would be taken to resist any proposals to weaken the restrictions already in force.

Such, in brief outline, is the history of the White Australia policy. How far it will be strengthened or relaxed after the war remains to be seen. Powerful interests are opposed to any weakening of the present restrictions, and colour prejudice was strong enough in 1925 to make a Melbourne paper describe the proposed Italian immigration of that year as an "olive-skinned influx." [1]

Little need be said regarding the aboriginal population of Australia. They number some 50,000 full-bloods, and are scattered over the whole continent, the greater part of them living in Western Australia. Of full-blood natives, some 11,000

[1] Quoted by F. Chidell, *Australia—White or Yellow?* (London, 1926), p. 76.

were employed in 1937; but thousands still live an almost purely nomadic existence. The children of those who attend the mission schools show fair ability; and a recent report states that those who teach them " very soon discover that they are no whit behind any other race in mental capacity, and that they can master the lessons that white children learn, quite as quickly and completely as they can." [1] Nevertheless, it can hardly be claimed that, whatever may be the reason, the Australian aborigines to have attained anything approaching the high level of the New Zealand Maoris, to whom we shall refer a little later.

The history of these Australian natives, since the arrival of the whites, has not been a happy one. The treatment accorded to them, although often with the best intentions, was not founded upon the requisite anthropological knowledge, and decay and disintegration slowly set in. The Australian natives do not take kindly to having to live in houses, wear clothes, and behave like white people. Moreover, it is interesting to observe that the " settler attitude " is to be noticed in Australia just as we have seen it work in Kenya. For example, in 1927 an inquiry was started into the killing of some natives at Kimberley, in Western Australia. It was suspected that the police themselves were guilty, but sufficient evidence was not obtainable owing to the refusal to co-operate on the part of both the police and the settlers. Similarly, a report on the position of the natives, which was undertaken in 1934, showed that the condition of the half-caste population was deplorable, and that some of the camps set aside for the natives were in a disgraceful condition. On some of the properties, however, especially on those devoted to pasture, they were well cared for and were living a reasonably contented existence in spite of the drastic changes that had been made in their life.

The problem of the half-castes (25,712 in 1939) is one of the most disturbing. Few succeeded in overcoming the disadvantages due to their position, and little was being done to check breeding them or to educate them properly when they were born.[2] Later measures showed that the authorities

[1] See Rodolphe S. Schenck, *The Educability of the Native* (Perth, W. Australia, 1936). For further information on the mental capabilities of the Australian aborigines, see S. D. Porteus, *The Psychology of a Primitive People* (London, 1931), and *cf.* W. Lloyd Warner, *A Black Civilization* (New York, 1937).

[2] *Cf.* X. Herbert, *Capricornia* (Sydney, 1938).

were beginning to realize the true nature of the situation, and steps are now being taken to remedy many previous abuses. But the outlook for these delicate and nomadic people is not bright. If they are to be preserved, then the authorities must rely upon the information to be derived from consulting scientific anthropologists. What is wanted above all is the *will* to preserve them and to study their culture and way of life. It may well be that this will is, and is likely to remain, lacking on the part of the white Australian population. If steps be not taken and decisions implemented by firm action, then the Australian natives will go the way of the Carib and Arawak peoples of South and Central America and vanish from the world.

The history of racial prejudice in New Zealand is similar in many respects to that of Australia, although the former country has made an outstanding success in the partial assimilation of the Maoris and their incorporation into the civic and political life of the community. It is in the modern rejection of certain forms of immigration, and above all of Asiatic immigration, that Australia and New Zealand have shown racial prejudice of great intensity; although the origin and nature of these feelings are almost entirely economic, untinged, except here and there, with traces of objection based upon racial inferiority or skin-colour.

The story of the objections to Chinese immigration begins during the period when the desire to raise the standard of living for white labour was shown in the clamour to restrict the immigration of those who exhibited no tendency towards permanent residence or assimilation, but rather a wish to use the country for personal advantage and send home any earnings which could be saved. This was especially true of the Chinese, who proved formidable competitors in such enterprises as market-gardening, minor catering, and petty trading. As early as 1876, restrictions began to be laid down, and later ordinances were such as to provoke some friction between New Zealand and the Colonial Office. Nothing daunted, however, the New Zealand Government continued its operations, and further Acts were promulgated in 1896 and 1897. Modern legislation regarding the question is based largely upon the Immigration Restriction Act of 1908, together with its amendments and the so-called Undesirable Immigrants Exclusion Act of 1919. Apart from certain specified exceptions, all

persons not of British birth and parentage (unless possessed of permits) are prohibited from landing in New Zealand; and this even excludes any " aboriginal Native or his descendant of any of His Majesty's possessions except New Zealand." Through these provisions it is clear that immigration with a view to settling in the country is practically impossible except under certain conditions, which are rigidly scrutinized before permission to land is granted. Recently there has been an increase in the number of European immigrants who have fled from Europe, the peak year being 1939–40; but these have now fallen off, and the numbers entering are comparatively small. The 1936 census showed that, of the principal alien people in New Zealand (including those of mixed ancestry), the Chinese topped the list with 2,899, followed by Syrians (1,235) and Indians (1,157). Ten years previously the figures were 3,374, 951, and 978 respectively.

From the complex web of factors which enter into the policy of a White Australia and New Zealand, let us pass to a brief consideration of the history of the New Zealand Maoris and their present place in the life of the Dominion. The Maoris (pronounced *Mowriz* with the *ow* as in *cow*) are themselves immigrants to New Zealand from neighbouring Polynesian islands, although the date of their first arrival is uncertain. They are a tall, well-built people, with straight or wavy hair, and skins which vary from light to medium brown. The face is often oval, the shape of the head varying from long to broad, whilst the nose is usually straight rather than curved. They have always been a capable, artistic, energetic, and warlike people, competent both on land and on the sea, and their reputation as warriors in the First and Second World Wars has been second to none.

In 1839, when the colonizers from Europe were arriving and the country was annexed by proclamation, the Maoris may have numbered some 100,000. The first important measure which concerns both Maoris and colonists was the Treaty of Waitangi (1840), whereby the Maoris accepted the sovereignty and protection of the Queen, and at the same time were guaranteed the full and exclusive possession of their lands and properties as long as it was their wish and desire to keep these in their possession. As is common in legal documents, the precise meaning of many of the terms and expressions used was far from clear, and it was obvious that they were com-

pletely beyond the comprehension of the Maori chiefs who were persuaded to affix their signatures. One result of the treaty was that interminable discussions ensued, although the principle of admitting the land titles of the Maoris proved a precedent of great value in subsequent years. In spite of the land clause in the Treaty of Waitangi, the agents of the New Zealand Company (a powerful joint-stock corporation) were acquiring considerable territorial areas in North Island, and the desire of the colonists for land tended to obscure their sense of obligation to the Maoris, with the result that troubles began. Had it not been for the work of that great imperialist, Sir (then Captain) George Grey (1812–1898), these troubles might have been much more serious. As it was, Captain Grey, who combined in a remarkable way the mind of an autocrat with a devotion to the ideals of the French Revolution, succeeded where a lesser man would have miserably failed. Grey realized that to win over the Maoris he must know and love them; hence he learned their language, and with that keen sense of values which so many coloured peoples show, the Maoris, for their part, felt that they could rely upon his integrity and reputation for fair and just dealing. When representative institutions were granted, in 1852, and published in New Zealand by proclamation the following year, it was Grey who laid the foundation for the successful accomplishment of the design.

The general question of the Maoris, however, had not been fully settled. In 1860 they held a great part of North Island, and feeling against the European immigrants became gradually exacerbated owing to land seizures and a policy of infiltration. The same year actual hostilities broke out. For ten years there was strife and bitterness, but it was clear that there could be only one ending. By 1871 the Maoris knew that they were beaten, and the process began by which they were admitted into full partnership with the whites in the administration and development of their country. To-day they number over 97,000, out of a total population of over 1½ millions. In 1901 the total Maori population was some 45,000; so the idea that they would gradually die out has been completely falsified. As regards mixed breeds, three-quarter and half-castes are counted as Maori, whereas among the non-Maori population are included Maori–European quarter-caste and also other mixtures, such as Maori–Polynesian, Maori–Chinese, and Maori–Indian.

Turning to the franchise, Maori electors are now granted the same privileges, in exercising their vote, as European electors when it comes to choosing Maori representatives for their own districts. Four Maoris sit in the House of Representatives: three for North Island, where the majority live, and one for South Island. Among them was Sir Apirana Turupa Ngata, probably the most distinguished of the New Zealand Maoris, who has done more for his people than any other man, and to whom we are indebted for much work on the social, religious, and artistic life of the people whom he has so ably represented. From 1909 to 1912 he was a member of the Executive Council in the Government of Sir Joseph Ward, and Minister in Charge of Government Insurance in the Ward Cabinet from 1928 to 1930. He was also in the subsequent Cabinet of Mr. Forbes, and was Acting Attorney-General in 1930, but in the 1943 election he suffered defeat at the hands of the Labour candidate. He has been closely associated with the Young Maori Party (Te Aute Students' Association), which tried to combine what was best in the old native culture with the civilization of the white man from Europe. Native arts and crafts were encouraged, and the school for these industries in Rotorua is a concern which interests all those who have been dealing with such experiments elsewhere.

The question has now to be asked as to how far colour prejudice in New Zealand is directed against the Maoris. The question is, however, not an easy one to answer in view of the equality of opportunity which is granted to both peoples. Yet the truth is that probably a feeling exists that complete social equality is not entirely desirable, since it might encourage young white New Zealanders to marry into Maori families more often than they already do, and that the half-caste children might not be altogether welcome. It is true that there are many cases where this is done and a successful outcome is achieved; but the old feeling still persists here and there, although without much of the bitterness and contempt that are to be found in other countries. Perhaps one of the reasons why the Europeans regard the Maoris in so favourable a light is that some of their qualities are those which are highly esteemed in Europe. Superb physical types, they excel in warlike pursuits and sports, and anyone who pauses in the Court of Honour at the War Memorial Museum, near Auckland, and looks at the examples of Maori carving and art, will hardly

fail to conclude that they are a people who would have left the world poorer had they suffered the extermination or slow degradation that has been the lot of others.

The position of the Maoris in New Zealand, and the attitude of the Australian and New Zealand Governments regarding Asiatic immigration, bring us to a point where a brief discussion of the problem of the policies of a white Australia and New Zealand can scarcely be avoided. To begin with, it is as well to bear in mind that the opposition to Asiatic immigration is not due solely, or even principally, to any form of colour prejudice. Australians and New Zealanders do not, for example, object to the Chinese because they are yellow, or even because any fixed and ineradicable belief is held that the Chinese civilization is inferior to the Western variety. The desire to restrict such immigration is due almost entirely to the belief that if unlimited numbers of Asiatics be permitted to land and to live in the country, then not only will the effect on the development of Australian and New Zealand democratic ideals be harmful, but also that the standards of life and conduct, which have been so carefully built up, will be lowered and possibly degraded. It is not as if Chinese and Japanese settlers came into the country prepared to make their homes there and gradually to become assimilated. Even if they were to do so, the objections would remain. The Chinese are a hard-working, exceedingly tough and adaptable people, who are prepared to adopt a standard of life far below that which is commonly aimed at in Australia and New Zealand. There are, of course, plenty of good Chinese citizens in both countries: but, taking a broad, general view, the Chinese immigrants have been inclined in the past to keep to themselves and follow their own way of life, and, being mostly men, have had no opportunity to raise Chinese families of which the second generation would form a block of Chinese–Australians or Chinese–New Zealanders. Moreover, the history of the last few years shows that, when exaggerated forms of nationalism arise, these immigrant groups may form islands of unrest and dissatisfaction which cannot fail to weaken the structure of the society to which they have become attached. Is it not, for example, possible that, had Australia permitted unrestricted Japanese immigration, her position during the Second World War might have been even more precarious and critical than it was? Is it not true that, even in the United States, where

assimilation has been carried farther than elsewhere, we can see certain of the foreign-born minority groups forming blocks, from which proceed political propaganda on matters affecting their homelands? Such considerations as these cannot fail to weigh heavily with those who proclaim the doctrine of a White Australia and a White New Zealand. On the other hand, it is true that there are people in both countries whose support of their "white" policy is undoubtedly tinged with a definite colour prejudice which, as is so often the case, has become connected with the economic consideration mentioned above. Thus we have writers declaring that any relaxation of the policy might lead to a "piebald Australia"; and certain rhymes such as the following, which were published towards 1901, suggest the same feelings:—

> "White evermore,
> Inland and shore,
> White in its dealings and white at the core!
> Alack for the coddlers of Black and of Brown!
> The *colours* they loved—and their colours are down."

The use of the word "white" in the third line is especially to be noted, since it illustrates how the term can be used in the sense of *honourable* or *well-bred*, and thus suggests that these qualities are part of the make-up of a white-skinned man.

Criticism of the words "White Australia" has recently become more vocal on these grounds. It is pointed out that the words are both offensive and provocative, implying as they do a kind of racial superiority which impedes good relations between the Australians and Asiatic peoples. Moderate Indian and Chinese critics do not suggest that Australia is not justified in controlling immigration, just as is the case with Canada, New Zealand, and the United States; but they object to the policy of almost total exclusion, and incline to the view that a quota system might be established as in the United States, where the laws regulating Chinese admittance have recently been modified (see p. 97). It is possible that the discussion which was showing lively features early in 1944 may tend towards a revision of Australian regulations, and thus help to lessen racial tension in the Pacific area in the post-war years. In the meantime the dropping of the term "White Australia" would do something to soothe ruffled feelings, and be a graceful gesture towards improvement in the present relations between Indians, Chinese, and Australians.

It is not our purpose, in this short survey, to offer any suggestions towards the solution of the racial problems that both Australia and New Zealand will have to face now that the war with Japan is over. It is obvious that serious attention will have to be paid to the difficulties regarding immigration, and the possibilities of initiating a quota system by which the numbers entering may be adequately controlled, and those elements which are not likely to benefit the national life may be effectively excluded.

We will now proceed to glance at a country which, although it is not confronted by any pressing problems of immigration, nevertheless has many different national stocks within its boundaries, some of which were in a very primitive condition only a few years ago. Moreover, it is a country the Constitution of which proclaims the equality of all its citizens, irrespective of nationality and race, and which declares that any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness is punishable by law. We refer to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

CHAPTER XIII

RACE AND NATIONALITY IN THE U.S.S.R.

IN the preceding pages we have seen how colour and racial prejudices operate in a few selected regions of the world. We have now briefly to discuss the question as it is understood in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Racial prejudice of the kind that we have seen elsewhere was never very pronounced in Russia. The country was too vast, and embraced too many varying human groups, to make such a tendency likely to develop, and many of the essential psychological and economic factors were lacking. It is true that the Jews suffered persecution under some of the Tsars; but the hardships they experienced were not really due to any direct racial policy (except perhaps under Alexander III), but rather to their resistance to the general policy of Russification and assimilation which began early in the nineteenth century and had its roots in the years before. In the decade following 1882 the Jews in Russia were handicapped by numbers of restrictive regulations, and outbreaks of violence were frequent, together with attacks by excited mobs. The restrictions on their mode of life weighed particularly heavily on the younger people, who joined revolutionary organizations, and thus the percentage of revolutionary leaders among the Jews showed a high figure as compared with the total Jewish population. But even then the persecution that they suffered was not racial in the sense in which the term is used to-day. As has been said above, racial prejudice was never very pronounced even in the old Russian Empire; and when the Soviet power came into being, an altogether new policy was initiated regarding the whole problem of State, race, and nationality.

Before we examine further these new developments, a word must be said on the general problem of the minority groups in Soviet Russia. The U.S.S.R., besides including the great Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, with its population of possibly over 108 millions and area of 6,442,750 square miles, comprises a number of other Republics, such as the Georgian S.S.R. (26,750 square miles), the Azerbaidzan S.S.R. (33,000 square miles), and the Central Asian Republics of the Turk-

men, the Uzbeks, the Tajiks, the Kirghis, and the Kazakhs. Where different stocks are found within these Republics, regions with autonomous areas have been set up for the benefit of the minority groups living there. One single Union citizenship exists for all citizens in the U.S.S.R.; and in the case of the Union Republics each citizen is automatically a citizen of the U.S.S.R. All citizens, men and women, who have reached the age of eighteen (with the exception of those pronounced insane or those who have been deprived of electoral status) have the right to vote and to be elected deputies to the various Soviets. Thus, under the Soviet system, not only have the people economic power—inasmuch as the ownership of the implements and means of production are under public ownership or control—but they also possess a measure of political power, with which they can exercise a choice of representation and self-government; although they lack what we have been led to think are certain essential elements of political freedom.

The problem of welding a multi-national State into a single federated whole was one which the Soviet set out to solve, and he would be a bold man who would deny that it has not been successful to a degree which is frankly astonishing. According to Soviet ideas, national movements are determined to a great extent by diverse local factors, such as the existence of an agrarian question, or problems related to civic, religious, and political freedom. But, above all, the economic question looms largest in Soviet eyes. Where society is divided into the two groups of the possessors and the dispossessed, there will be found the seeds of national rivalries and prejudices, the policy of "divide and rule" being used by the possessing class in order to strengthen its hold upon the workers generally. It is thus, according to Soviet writers, that minority groups find themselves oppressed and incited to hatred of other groups on the basis of their economic and social position.

With the coming and consolidation of Soviet power these factors disappeared. The oppression of nationalities vanished along with capitalism, and, as Stalin said, the question of dominant and subject nations, of colonies and mother countries, is being consigned to the archives of history. In the U.S.S.R. the nationalities possess equality of rights and opportunities, although, owing to the heritage of the past, they obviously suffer from a measure of economic, political, and cultural lag. The key to the national problem has, according to Soviet

spokesmen, been found, and the future has been firmly established upon a basis of equality and voluntary consent. Nevertheless, it has not been claimed that the problem has been fully solved, and that all difficulties have vanished; for let it be remembered that there are some 180 nationalities in the U.S.S.R., with over 150 languages. Moreover, the stocks are so diverse, and their previous religious, traditional, and cultural backgrounds so varied, that it was a stupendous task to attempt, within a quarter of a century, not only the industrialization of vast areas which had previously, in many cases, been hardly productive, but to bring the primitive populations—some of whom did not even possess a written language of their own—into a condition of living in which they could begin to take advantage of the opportunities offered to them. Doubtless such a mass drive towards education and industrialization demanded a policy which was resented and resisted by the persons who were in authority under the régime of the Tsars. Similarly, many of the older people could never hope to share in the new life which was opening for their children. The gradual unveiling of the Moslem women must have seemed as sacrilegious to the sincere followers of Islam as did the appearance of Kemal Pasha's wife unveiled and riding a horse. But these changes are not, as some propagandists try to make out, the result of Bolshevik tyranny over helpless peoples who only wanted to be left alone. They are part of a general world movement towards an awareness in backward peoples of the surging life outside their borders. Just as the object of the revolution in Turkey was to bring to the country a modern and progressive spirit, so the object of the Soviet power is to bring their own backward nationalities into the general framework of the Socialist State which they are constructing. For this purpose such anti-social forces as anti-Semitism or racial prejudice had to be sternly discountenanced. The opinion of the Soviet authorities on the question was succinctly put in Article 123 of the 1936 Constitution of the U.S.S.R. This reads:—

> The equality of the rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all fields of economic, state, cultural, social, and political life, is an irrevocable law.
>
> Any direct or indirect restriction of these rights, or

> conversely the establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of the race or nationality to which they belong, as well as any propagation of racial or national exceptionalism or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law.

This statement is merely the logical outcome of the four principles laid down in 1917, which were:—

1. Equality and sovereignty of all the peoples of Russia.
2. Rights of these peoples to free self-determination, including the right to secede and form independent states.
3. Repeal of all national and religious privilege and limitation imposed by the former régime.
4. Free development of all national minorities and ethnographic groups inhabiting the territory of Russia.

With these may be compared the statement of the 1918 Russian Soviet Constitution, which read:—

> The Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, recognizing the equality of all citizens before the law, irrespective of race or nationality, declares it contrary to the fundamental laws of the Republic to institute or tolerate privileges, or any prerogative whatsoever, founded on such grounds, or to repress national minorities, or in any way to limit their rights.[1]

Here we can see principles which, if carried out, illustrate the gulf which separates the way of life in the U.S.S.R. from that in the colonies and dependencies of the great capitalist States. The people of the Soviet Union have skins of almost every colour, from the fair Russian, in the West, to the members of the Negro Soviet in the Abkhazian A.S.S.R. (Georgia). Such a thing as segregation is unknown; all are educated together, sharing the same transport, staying in the same rest-houses, using the same libraries, enjoying the same cinemas. At the same time they are encouraged to develop their own

[1] Provisions in the penal codes of the various Republics are also concerned with questions of racial hostility. Thus, in the Code of the Russian S.F.S.R., which is ten years earlier than the Soviet Constitution, we find both propaganda and agitation which is intended to cause racial enmity condemned; and even the possession of literature of this type is a punishable offence. In times of emergency such action is considered so serious that the death penalty may be applied.

folk-culture, but not to carry on those elements of their cultural life which belong to the past and which were rooted in traditional modes of behaviour and religious ideas. Thus the Jews—above all, those Jews who still cling to the precepts of Judaism and the idea of a national home—are not particularly happy in the Soviet Union. Similarly those whose devotion to Islam is paramount in their lives look askance at a form of development which ignores so much of the teaching of the Prophet. It is naturally something of a shock suddenly to be asked to substitute Moscow for Mecca, and the elder generation cannot be expected to survive it. But it is to the young that the Soviet power looks to the building of a new civilization; and just as in Turkey it was the young who cast off the chains of their servitude, so in the Soviet Union it is the young who are in the forefront of cultural and industrial progress. It was not Lenin or Stalin who declared that all absurd superstitions and prejudices must be rooted out of minds and customs. It was Mustapha Kemal, the President of the new 1923 Turkish Republic; and he added that the only true congregation is that of the great international confraternity of civilization.[1] In such a confraternity it is obvious that there will be no room for colour prejudice and racial discrimination. That is why the Soviet Union has no longer any use for a *Russian* State, and why the very word *Russia* was removed from the title of the Union. Although Russia proper (i.e., the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic) comprises some 90 per cent. of the country, it is but one of the Soviet Socialist Republics. To call the country Russia might suggest dominance on the part of one of the Republics. Such an idea was not favoured by the Soviet authorities.

[1] In this connection it is of interest to note that " racial " propaganda is still being carried on in Turkey, as the results of the high treason trial in the autumn of 1944 show. In this case it seems that certain doctrines were being spread among high-school and university students which proclaimed that only Turks of " pure " Turkish ancestry should rule in Turkey, and that the " racial purity " should be reckoned as sound if the applicant had three generations of such pure ancestry behind him. Moreover, not only was it taught that only " pure " Turks should rule in Turkey, but others who were not able to fulfil the necessary requirements should be expelled altogether from the country. When the authorities took action in the matter it was revealed that the meetings of the organization had sometimes taken place in the apartment of a woman who, when trouble arose, left the country, and, as might have been expected, quickly made off to Germany.

It may be of interest at this point to take a look at one or two of these Soviet Republics and see what kind of progress they have made under the new economic administration. First of all it must be remembered that probably between 70 per cent. and 80 per cent. of the people of the Soviet Union are Slavs, the whole of the central and northern parts of European Russia and a large portion of Siberia being populated by them. Mixture, of course, has taken place; but, generally speaking, Slavs occupy some two-thirds of the whole territory of the Soviet Union. The minority peoples have had a long and chequered history under the Tsars, and we shall not attempt to deal with it here. Some of them, especially those which came under the influence of Islam, enjoyed, at least in the urban areas, a culture similar to that of Mohammedan communities elsewhere. Others, living in regions with ill-defined boundaries, maintained a nomadic existence, and in some cases had not progressed as far as to have a written language. It was the task of the Soviet power to weld these varying groups into one basic economic unit and to preserve, as far as was practicable, their popular national and cultural activities, but to eliminate those elements in their life which were rooted in the past and connected with their general religious, theocratic and hierarchical traditions. In order to achieve this stupendous task it was necessary at times to be insistent, and certainly ruthless; youth had to be converted into new ways, and it was to the young people and their enthusiasm that the propagandists of the Soviet Union looked for the gradual transformation which was the starting-point for further progress. As we have said, it was the same with the Soviet Union as it was with Turkey. Youth only wanted a little help to escape from the old ways and crabbed living, and to join in the hectic, pulsing life which was heralded by the October Revolution.

Let us take one or two examples of what was happening. A bare thirty years ago the territory which is now part of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (area: 25,900 square miles) was part of the middle Russian province of Kazan, of which the capital of the same name stood at the confluence of the Volga and the Kama, some 270 miles east of Gorki (the former Nijni Novgorod). Even in those days there was a certain amount of trade, due to the position of the province, and the capital itself was developing a measure of

industrial activity. The population was mixed; but the Tatar element was well represented, especially in the agricultural districts, where poverty was common and where some 80 per cent. of the people were illiterate. The word "Tatar" (or Tartar, as it is sometimes spelt) is a somewhat loose term, but is generally used to denote a group of Turki peoples whose original home seems to have been the western region of Central Asia. The Kazan Tatars are one of the several groups of Tatars in the Soviet Union, and before the Revolution their number was said to be round about the million mark. They are of medium height, with dark hair, and skin yellowish to brown. The head is high and broad, the nose usually straight, and the cheek-bones high. They speak a form of Turkish, and before the Revolution were mainly Moslems. In 1932 Mr. and Mrs. Sydney Webb visited Kazan, and thus had an opportunity to see for themselves what was going on, and thus get an idea of how the facts compared with the published descriptions; and also, perhaps, to get an inkling of similar developments in other Republics in Soviet Asia and elsewhere. They found, according to their report, over 1,700 elementary schools in operation, with 99 per cent. of the children of school age on the register. The higher educational establishments they found to be full of young Tatars, whilst veiled women had practically disappeared, the women themselves taking an active part in a rapidly developing public life. A State Health Service had been established (the infantile death-rate has been halved), and women doctors ran a number of small hospitals and infirmaries. The peasants were linked up in a series of collective farms, whilst in industry the planned output amounted to an ambitious total. A State printing establishment provides for the publication of many Tatar books and pamphlets, whilst the people have their own theatres, cinemas, and small libraries. It is thus that in less than thirty years the Kazan Tatars have taken their place in the Soviet Union.

The same story can be told of Tajikstan (54,950 square miles), the Seventh Republic of the Soviet Union, which touches the frontiers of Afghanistan and India and which was established in December 1929. The modern Republic was once part of that vast territory of Turkestan, of which Bokhara was one of the most important sections. The population was very mixed, the Tajiks being mainly concentrated in the towns. These people, from whom the Republic takes its name, are some-

what mixed with Turki elements, although their language is a Persian dialect and they are mainly of Iranian stock. They are a fine people, with complexions varying from light to ruddy or bronze, and with wavy or curly hair. The face is often long, the eyes are light-coloured, and the nose inclined to be narrow. Apart from the Tajiks themselves, many other stocks live in the country; and as a good deal of the land is desert, an immense task had to be done in the way of irrigation works and similar projects. As in the Tatar Republic, the influence of Islam was strong, the Tajiks themselves being mainly Shī'ahs, or that division of the Moslems which differs from the Sunnīs on the question of who were the legitimate successors of the Prophet. Since the Revolution, Tajikstan has made the same stride forward as have the other Republics in Soviet Central Asia. An immense cotton industry has been developed; great agro-industrial works like the Vakhshstroi established; petroleum refineries set up, and the usual social amenities put into operation, such as schools, hospitals, and cultural institutions. Apart from industries established to meet growing needs, Soviet geologists have been busy prospecting, and already both gold and platinum have been discovered in the Republic. New roads have been built from Stalinabad (the capital), and it is now linked up with the railway system of Central Asia. Air transportation also will be especially useful in these regions, on account of the mountains which delay both rail and road traffic.

The same story can be told of the other Republics. Everywhere the peoples are on the move. The Kazakh S.S.R. (1,055,850 square miles), east of the Caspian, had, before the Second World War, over 100 newspapers printed in Kazakh, and literary progress and industrialization are proceeding side by side. There are huge collective farms; the petroleum deposits are being worked, and it is considered that Emba-Neft is a second Baku, whilst the mineral riches of coal, lead, copper, zinc, and nickel are of outstanding importance. Yet throughout these vast regions, where work is continuing at an ever-increasing speed, there is no racial or colour bar. The aim is a common one. It is to build up a real Union of multi-national communities, without regard for race or colour, in which each citizen is animated by the ideal of a collective society, where each works for the good of all. No one supposes that these changes have been accomplished without suffering

and without turmoil. To transform a primitive form of society into a rapidly advancing industrial community in twenty-five years is a task which must entail immense hardship. Mistakes have been made; epidemics have been caused by faulty sanitation; and violence in some quarters has naturally been aroused by the clash between the old world and the new, and between the past and the future. Had racial and colour prejudice been as active in the Soviet Union as elsewhere, then events might have been delayed—but not prevented. But with the disappearance of what Soviet writers call " the exploiting class," one important instrument for fostering such prejudices vanished. There was no longer any question of a dominant economic class keeping a subject people in submission for its own ends. The fact that the means of production are no longer privately owned, and that a form of mutual aid has been established in the social and economic spheres, means that peoples are drawn together instead of being artificially separated. As Marshal Stalin has said, it is by this means that feelings of mutual distrust have disappeared and feelings of mutual friendship have been developed, and thus exists a fraternal co-operation within the system of a single federative State.

CHAPTER XIV

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RACIAL AND COLOUR PREJUDICE

IN the preceding pages we have sketched in the barest outline the story of how the colour bar operates in a few selected regions of the world, and in consequence we have been able to see something of the results of racial and colour prejudice. But in these accounts we have not, except here and there, been able to go at all deeply into the *origin* and *nature* of colour prejudice. It is true that, in describing certain factors which operate in favour of the imposition of a colour bar, it was possible to see that some particular economic or social factor was largely responsible for the prejudice which was instrumental in the erection of such restrictive customs and legislation. For example, in Australia the desire to exclude Chinese immigrants does not seem to be derived from any direct policy of antipathy towards the Chinese on account of their yellow skin, but rather from the theory that the result of such immigration would lower the standard of living of white Australians, and thus retard the growth of that type of white civilization which it was the aim of the Australians to foster. Elsewhere, however, it was clear that other factors were felt, and some of them seemed somewhat obscure and difficult at first to understand. If we are to get a clear idea of the meaning of racial and colour prejudice we shall have to try to disentangle the complex web of interlacing threads, and pick out the main strands to which, as it were, the smaller and less important fibres are attached.

Before doing so, however, we must first of all decide on what we mean by *prejudice*. The word comes from the classical Latin word *præjudicium*, which, properly a legal term, means a *preceding* or earlier judgement or decision, just as we speak to-day of a *precedent*. There was nothing in the word which suggested anything unfavourable; but in post-classical times the sense of something damaging or disadvantageous had crept in, and in still later periods the word came to mean almost what we mean to-day when we speak of prejudice. Whatever may be the history in the change of meaning, it is perhaps possible that at one stage the term was used to mean a " previous "

judgement—that is to say, one arrived at before proper consideration of the facts. To-day the word has a slightly different meaning, although it is still closely connected with the idea of a judgement arrived at from reasons not solely derived from the available evidence. Thus prejudice is not really the judgement itself, but rather the influence of any feeling or emotion on our process of reasoning which affects, either adversely or otherwise, our wish to arrive at the truth about something, or as near to the truth as is possible.

As it is very important to make this quite clear, let us take one or two examples and see just what happens where prejudice is concerned. In the Southern States of America it is generally admitted, by everyone who knows the facts, that a pronounced difference as between the treatment of whites and blacks can be observed in legal decisions occurring in the courts. Indeed, one writer says that frequently the Southern blacks fail to obtain even elementary just treatment when they come into conflict with the law. Now this inequality of treatment is clearly due to other influences than the desire to know the truth on the part of Southern judges and juries. Knowing the facts regarding the views held in the South, it is fairly obvious to us that this influence is in all probability a *prejudice* against Negroes, which tends to make juries prejudge the issue where Negroes are concerned, and so weight their consideration of the facts and their decisions regarding them. Similarly, it is often said—although with what degree of truth I am not prepared to say—that male juries are generally apt to be prejudiced when an attractive or pretty woman finds herself in the dock. Whatever may be the facts as to their decisions, it is almost certain that an unconscious, or even conscious, tendency will be present whereby their feelings and emotions will, in many cases, be favourable to the defendant rather than detrimental. In other words, we say that they are *prejudiced* in her favour. This supposition reminds me of Dante Gabriel Rossetti and how he used to call women he admired "stunners." At one time he indulged in a mild flirtation with a waitress at the Belle Sauvage Tavern, and in his letters he refers to her as "the cordial stunner." The expression seems to have been a favourite one with him, as his friend, Birkbeck Hill recalls that when at Oxford he used it when discussing women murderers. It seems that one day conversation turned on to the death penalty being applied to such women, and Rossetti declared that a

beautiful young woman who was charged with murdering her lover ought not to be hanged, even if found guilty, as she was "such a stunner." When Hill remonstrated, and said that he would have her hanged, beautiful or ugly, there was a general outcry of the artistic circle present. Indeed, one of them cried out, "Oh, Hill, you would never hang a stunner!" Examples of prejudice on the part of clerks and magistrates in the police-courts can be seen any day in almost any town in Great Britain. As an eminent solicitor has said: "The presumption of innocence does not exist in the police-courts." [1]

From the above examples the reader will get an idea of what we mean by prejudice and how it conforms to the definition attempted above. It is clearly derived from such powerful factors as emotional impulses and desires, self-centred interests, and that web of likes and dislikes which affects every normal human being. Habit also plays a prominent part in fostering prejudice; but ignorance is one of the most powerful means by which it is maintained. This has always been noticed by the great writers of antiquity and of modern times. Cicero, for instance, says that popular opinion estimates few things according to their true value, but many things according to prejudice—a view which was echoed later by Voltaire, who declared that it was prejudice which governed popular opinion, evidently suggesting that ignorance was partly responsible for it. Yet it has to be admitted that it is clearly impossible for people to-day to keep abreast of modern knowledge and thus feel themselves competent to express an opinion about current problems which crop up in discussion. All we can hope to do is to try to make ourselves as well acquainted as possible with those questions which most concern us, and suspend judgement on others which we have not sufficiently investigated. Generally speaking, the scientist working at his own subject may be said to be very largely unprejudiced, although when he offers opinions on other subjects his prejudices are often immediately apparent. The professional politician, who has spent most of his working life in appealing to the prejudices of others, is usually incapable of discussing any problem on a rational basis; for facts to him are not foundations on which to build, but pegs on which he can hang the propagandist material he finds most useful. That is why he so strongly objects to scientific men taking any part

[1] See *English Justice*, by "Solicitor" (Penguin ed., 1941), p. 40, and *cf.* the treatment of prostitutes when arrested.

in politics: he does not want to deal with facts which neither support his party's interest nor buttress his own emotional prejudices. To him such treatment as a scientist gives to questions like malnutrition in the colonies, or the relation between rapes and lynchings, is only to be tolerated as long as the scientist gives the bare facts and does not venture to comment upon them; for such comment might do harm to the prospects of his political party, and might enlighten the public as to possible reasons for the grave abuses which are everywhere apparent and which are closely connected with the survival of vested interests and political intrigues.[1]

We must now inquire how prejudices develop and whence they are derived. For example, is prejudice regarding race or colour an " instinctive " antipathy on the part of white people, or is it somehow developed during infancy and childhood? Before we attempt to answer this question, let us get some basic facts before us to help us to put the matter in its proper light. Every child—white, black, or yellow—that is born into this world is born into a definite cultural group, and that group has its own way of life, morals, manners, and customs. Man is naturally a gregarious animal—that is, one which tends to live or congregate in groups—and thus there is formed a kind of group consciousness which disposes members of the group to regard their unit as, in a sense, a rather special one, and probably superior to other groups. In this way arises in the members of each group a sense of solidarity and unity whence springs, very naturally, a feeling of exclusiveness and a tendency to regard others as *outsiders*, with *outlandish* ways and often *outside the pale*. To be with one's own group adds to one's sense of security; to be outside is to become an alien or a stranger where customs are different, and maybe what one has been taught to regard as right and proper is considered as wrong and impious. Thus a certain fear is engendered; and as fear itself arouses automatic emotional responses, prejudices (which are, as we have seen, closely connected with emotions) are aroused and tend to become part of each individual's reaction to his own environment and that of others.

We can now pass on to a brief consideration of prejudice in children. Although children have many prejudices, they are

[1] See the amusing correspondence in *The Times* of London, in December 1944, aroused by the statement of Dr. A. V. Hill, F.R.S., regarding his withdrawal from Parliament.

quite clearly not born with the kind of prejudice that we are here discussing. The human child, unlike many other young animals, is dependent for a considerable time upon its parents, during which time it is naturally insecure, and thus tends to identify itself with its family as well as with the group to which that family belongs. Moreover, it is likely, during its formative years, to absorb many opinions from parents and teachers which, not being founded upon actual knowledge, must in a sense be considered as prejudices. A good deal of work has been done within recent years on the subject of prejudice among juveniles, and a useful summary of some of the findings has been published in Luella Cole's revised edition of her book, *Psychology of Adolescence*, which was issued in New York in 1944. The general results of these investigations are to a certain extent what one would naturally expect. Children tend to take over the attitudes of those in control of them at home and at school, and as this attitude is largely the general attitude of the group, the children, by accepting those sentiments, feel at one with the group and not hostile to or different from it. More especially is this the case when there is any strong emotional factor present which has influenced the original attitude in the parents and teachers. The tests which have been made show that, in the United States for example, prejudice against Negroes begins very early in life among white children, and the development is gradual and influenced by many diverse factors. One point which is of considerable interest is that it appears that the degree of acquaintanceship with members of foreign groups tends to influence the amount of tolerance accorded; and this was found to be true in one inquiry of every case *except* that of the Negro. Here we can see how the early acceptance of the traditional and conventional picture of the average Negro (which the Americans call the " Negro stereotype ") has prevented any modification of the attitude, even perhaps when daily confronted with living examples to the contrary.[1]

Now that we have seen how prejudices develop in early years, and how a kind of pattern of belief is established, we shall be in a position to use this knowledge as a factual background

[1] The scientific study of stereotypes has recently been speeded up on account of the present interest in the nature of national character, but an enormous amount of work remains to be done with especial reference to those deeper psychological levels which influence acceptance or avoidance.

to a more detailed study of prejudices which are directly concerned with colour and race. Before doing so, however, it will be necessary to say something about what is called " the unconscious," which is one of the bases of the whole system of psychological analysis associated with the name of Sigmund Freud, and without some knowledge of which little real understanding of any psychological, sociological, or even political problem can, at least in my opinion, be achieved. To begin with, it must be admitted that there has been a great deal of nonsense written about the unconscious, and many psychoanalysts are, I fear, guilty of diverting serious attention from a good deal of valuable material they have to offer by mixing it up with claims and theories which it is sometimes difficult to treat with anything but levity. There is no necessity, however, for our present purposes, to analyse in any detail the various theories of what have been termed " unconscious " processes, experiences, or states. A few simple examples will illustrate the points to which our attention must here be directed.

Let us suppose that at one period of my life I was locked into a cupboard and became frightened. Here is an experience of which I was conscious at the time; but let us further suppose that since then I have forgotten it, and it has become inaccessible, inasmuch as I can no longer remember it. It is possible, by employing the requisite technique, again to make the memory of this experience accessible to me so that I now remember the situation which, before the technique had been applied, I had completely forgotten. Now it is highly probable, as even common sense itself would suggest, that there are reasons why the memories of certain experiences remain inaccessible; and some of these reasons are now known, and are of considerable importance. It almost seems as if what we think of as the conscious self is unwilling to let the traces of the early experience be remembered because, for some reason or other, the memory of it would be emotionally painful rather than pleasing. For example, even if I may not remember my early experience of being locked in the cupboard, the traces of this experience may have an effect upon my normal life to-day, although I may be totally unaware that any such effect has even the most remote connection with the incident of the cupboard. In other words, the assumption has been made that traces of past experiences which we cannot remember are still, as it were, existent in what is vaguely called " the unconscious," and can still exert an

influence over our lives without our becoming aware of them. Such influence varies both in its nature and in its results. In some cases—as, for example, the illustration above concerning the incident of the cupboard—one result may be that I find acute discomfort in travelling on the Underground Railway, or in being transported up and down a building in a small and cramped elevator. In other cases mental disorders, and even bodily ailments, may be caused, which are promptly relieved when the activating "unconscious" traces are recalled to memory.

Apart from incidents and events in our lives which remain inaccessible unless recalled to memory, there are also what can be roughly classified as emotions and desires which, in certain cases, and for reasons which are beginning to be understood, tend to be rejected by the person harbouring and experiencing them, and which are then forgotten, only reappearing in the conscious life of the individual in symbolic or distorted forms. Sometimes these emotions and desires appear in our dream life, and thus it is possible to interpret a good many of our dreams as symbolic pictures in which are expressed on many occasions our repressed wishes and secret desires. There are also cases in which persons are, for example, unable to touch objects for fear, as they say, that "they are dirty," and, when opening a door, are obliged to cover the knob of the door with an envelope before touching it. It is as if they were impelled towards such acts by an inner drive which they are unable to resist, in spite of the fact that, if they thought about it, it must be clear to them that the envelope may be as germ-ridden as the door-knob which has to be covered by it. It has been thought probable that the actions which such patients are compelled to make are in a sense substitutions for certain acts, derived from wishes or emotions which have been repressed and of which the traces are not permitted to enter the conscious mind. However that may be (and to enter into even an elementary discussion would lead us too far from our present purpose), it is clear that the reasons the patient gives for his actions are in a sense wrongly described, since, through analytic treatment, it is often possible to render accessible the emotions or desires which actually give rise to such impulsive actions.

Although the example given above is somewhat extreme, there is nothing mysterious or even unusual in the general process involved. The reasons we give for our actions are

often not the real reasons, as we sometimes know very well; but we put them forward because to acknowledge our real motives, even to ourselves, might hurt our self-esteem, or, if they were openly expressed, might tend to lower our reputation in the eyes of others. Thus a woman may be secretly envious of another and therefore may dislike her intensely, but the reasons she gives for her dislike are often of quite a different character; indeed dozens of such examples are to be met with every day. In many of these cases, especially where sexual desires and emotions are concerned, a person may, by consistently ignoring or repressing such experiences, exhibit modes of thought and behaviour in daily life which he may honestly interpret as due to rational processes of thought, whereas it is sometimes obvious that they are actually motivated by desires and yearnings which have been ignored and, as it were, thrust away and forgotten. There are, as might be expected, many simple desires and wishes that have to be ignored if a stable society is to be maintained; and, moreover, the moral teachings of religion tend to make people still further ignore and thrust away those natural wishes and desires which are part of the biological make-up of each one of us.

The process, however, does not end there. As we have seen above, this inaccessible material does not in many cases lie dormant, but reappears in the conscious life in forms which the individual himself fails to recognize. Sometimes the failure to repress the system of ideas or wishes which, if openly expressed, would render the person concerned unacceptable in his own cultural group, causes a conflict to ensue within the individual, and attempts have to be made to resolve the conflict in a manner satisfactory both to the person concerned and to the society in which he lives.

We cannot enter here into the many ways in which these conflicts are resolved, or describe what happens to the individual if no satisfactory adjustment is made. One method only claims our attention, and that is the process already mentioned by which refuge may be sought in substitution and the presentation of rational arguments for actions the performance of which are really due to quite different and probably not highly reputable reasons. This process is known as *rationalization*, or what the Americans sometimes call *thobbing;* and the reader will now be able to fit the psychological pattern into the numerous examples of the process as seen in the preceding sections of this book. He

will now realize that the dilemma which confronts white society in the United States and in South Africa, partakes of the nature of a psychological conflict which has failed to be resolved in spite of the thousand and one rationalizations which are put forward to explain and excuse racial and colour prejudice. For rationalization is the favourite means by which we try to explain away our prejudices to ourselves and to others. It is an excellent means of self-deception, although often it fails in its object, and other means have to be attempted whereby the underlying conflict may be resolved. We can now see how the problem of racial and colour prejudice can be attacked from the psychological angle, and how the basic findings of the psycho-analysts may possibly help us to unearth (or at least realize the existence of) some of the inaccessible material in our minds which may give rise to the more violent forms of prejudice as we have met them in the Southern States of America and in South Africa.

Before continuing the argument which arises from the above remarks, let us sum up the essential points at which we have arrived thus far. We have seen that prejudices—or in other words, opinions coloured by factors not wholly connected with our own wish to arrive at the truth—are often anchored to experiences, emotions, or desires which have either been forgotten, and thus are inaccessible unless revived, or have been repressed lest their emergence conflict with our own personal ideas of morality or religion or the established way of life and thought common to the cultural group within which we live. Various ways of meeting the difficulty have been described; but for our present purpose the most important of them is what has been called the process of *rationalization*, whereby reasons for our prejudiced opinions are advanced which are, as it were, dressed up in a form which no longer gives offence to ourselves or to others. We tend to make excuses: misdescribe the real source of our point of view, or substitute a pretended emotion for the one we actually experienced. In the simpler forms of rationalization we are fully aware what we are doing; in other cases, where the operative factors are inaccessible, we do not realize it, and honestly believe that the reasons we advance for our beliefs are what we doubtless call the true ones.

Now when a person is prejudiced in any direction, it is often noticed that when he is asked what grounds he has for believing this or that, he may be taken somewhat aback, or may become

annoyed or emotionally excited. The more annoyed or excited he is, the more likely it is that his belief is not founded upon evidence, but upon emotions and desires, open or repressed, which it will be painful to him to reveal. This fact should always be remembered when prejudices and beliefs are being discussed. It is rarely the things about which we have knowledge that arouse emotional excitement. People do not get emotionally aroused when they are discussing such questions as the composition of some substance, or the faults which are likely to arise in radio apparatus. But when it comes to discussing such questions as opening theatres on Sundays, or whether white women should walk out with black men, then the sparks begin to fly, and sometimes the most violent emotions are aroused. It has been found possible, by means of ingenious electrical gadgets, to study the intensity of certain emotions as they are brought to light through variations in the resistance of the body to the passing of an electric current. Reactions to certain words or expressions are indicated by the movements of a needle; and I well remember an occasion, when using the apparatus, when the needle oscillated so violently that it was clear that the subject had a strong emotional reaction to the word which had just been pronounced with a view to testing its effect. The word happened to be " bishops," and it was later discovered that the subject had violent prejudices against anything connected with ecclesiastical matters. Doubtless similar reactions would be obtained from a person with pronounced colour prejudice when such words as " black," " nigger," or " buck " were presented.

We can now turn for a moment from a consideration of the psychological aspect of colour prejudice to a brief glance at the historical side of the question. In the section on slavery (see pp. 34–39) it was noted that in early times it seems that in Europe there were no colour distinctions as we have them today. People apparently had not begun to think about it; and in the Roman Empire no colour barriers existed and few national distinctions of any sort were made. Apart from certain aspects of racial prejudice which were especially connected with the Jews, the rise of a specific colour antipathy seems to be a comparatively recent event, and therefore it may be plausible to assume that the emergence of the attitude can be correlated with some historical event or development which closely concerned the position of the coloured peoples.

It was in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries that the Spaniards and the Portuguese began to look outwards from Europe, and in the spirit of adventure and discovery brought the beginnings of knowledge of America and India to the Old World. The Dutch, French, and English were also beginning to enter into commercial rivalry, and the long wars of the eighteenth century were partly due to colonial quarrels and ambitions. Spanish successes in the earlier centuries had led English naval adventurers far afield, and it was as early as 1562 that John Hawkins was buying slaves in West Africa and shipping them to the West Indies. The English expansion which followed was determined principally by the desire for commercial advantages, although the spirit of pure adventure, coupled with other motives, had its share in the various enterprises.

It must be remembered that the attitude of many of these early merchant adventurers was untinged with any feeling of humanity in the sense in which the word is used to-day. It is true that here and there voices were raised against the slave traffic, but, generally speaking, the idea was current that Asiatics and Africans were pagans, who were enemies of Christ, and who could be killed or enslaved with impunity. Christians, it was thought, had no duties towards pagans, and the slave trade excited little sympathy in the breast of the first Pontiff of the Renaissance, the erudite Pope Nicholas V, who merely hoped that the Negroes would be converted. By 1620 the Dutch traders were bringing African slaves to Virginia, and later to the West Indies; and by 1650 the English West Indian merchants were demanding cheap labour, and found it in the persons of the imported Negroes.

As long as the slave trade lasted, feelings of racial and colour prejudice were simple and straightforward, and rationalizations were not needed. But as protests grew, so attempts began to be made to justify, through reason and the dictates of morality, what previously was simply the doctrine of naked force applied to the heathen. In 1762 the Quakers in England, and the Amis des Noirs in France, were raising their voices against slavery. In 1777 Parliament passed a resolution against the traffic, and seven years later Thomas Clarkson (1760–1846) published his famous essay on the question of whether it was right to enslave men against their will, one result of his labours being the formation of a public committee to abolish the slave trade. In 1808 it

was forbidden in the English Dominions, and this was followed by the abolition of slavery throughout the British Empire, in 1833. Elsewhere—above all in the United States of America—slavery continued; and from 1833 to 1865, when the constitutional amendment abolishing slavery in the United States was ratified, controversy was fast and furious, and in the writings of the period we can see how colour prejudice was being built up and introduced into the pattern of American life.

Two main factors claim our attention. To begin with, the slaves were the descendants of *conquered* peoples; and secondly, they were imported to do work which white men could not or would not do for themselves. Thus the stigma of inferiority had a dual basis, the disgrace of having been vanquished and imported like cattle being added to the class distinction of having to serve a white aristocracy of planters and overlords. Even these men, however, were not able to be completely immune to the new ideas of freedom which were becoming everywhere apparent as American democracy progressed. Thus, if slavery was to be continued, they had to justify their adherence to the system by rational arguments founded upon faith and knowledge. In the section on the colour bar in the United States of America we have seen some of the expedients to which they resorted. Science was invoked, and Nott and Gliddon, influenced by Gobineau, set forth their views on the inequality of the races of mankind. Even as they were writing their *Types of Mankind*, George Fitzhugh (1807–1881), that remarkable early American "Fascist," was attacking the whole conception of freedom in his *Sociology for the South* (Richmond, Va., 1855). To him, as to John Calhoun, slavery was right and necessary, and it did not much matter whether it was black or white. He scorned the theory that Ham was the ancestor of the Negroes, and considered that to confine justification of the slavery to the blacks was merely to weaken the authority of Scripture. But it was not everybody who went to the lengths of Mr. Fitzhugh. In South Africa, for example, the Dutch Reformed Church strongly upheld the idea of the Ham legend; and, as we have seen, it was not unknown in the United States.[1] Not only was the Negro to be a hewer of wood and

[1] For those who have access to old books, J. L. Hannemann's thesis on this matter, *Curiosum Scrutinium Nigredinis posteriorum Cham, i.e. Æthiopum, juxta Principia Philosophiæ corpuscularis* (Kilonii, 1677) is worth attention.

drawer of water in perpetuity, but it was believed that a mysterious Providence had brought the two peoples together in the Southern States for their mutual advantage. As the Rev. Dr. N. L. Rice, a St. Louis Presbyterian, said, God permitted slavery in this country because He wished to accomplish great and benevolent ends; the designs of an All-Wise Providence must be understood to be appreciated, for the African was sent to America to receive the light of the Gospel. Abolitionism, he maintained, led to infidelity, for slavery was authorized by Moses, and was never denounced by the Apostles. Indeed, as J. G. Birney put it in 1840, the American Churches were the " bulwarks of slavery," some of the evidence for which, be it added, Harriet Beecher Stowe found almost incredible. Slavery was the Lord's doing, and it was marvellous in men's eyes. It was in fact appointed by God, or, as John B. Thrasher said in 1861, it was " a divine institution." In these writers, and in such sermons as those by the Virginian Episcopal Bishop William Meade, we can see precisely the same kind of excuses for slavery that were used by the rich for their exploitation of the poor during the eighteenth century. In this country the conscience of the rich was assuaged by philanthropy: in the United States the gradually developing conscience of the planters had to be soothed by Biblical teaching or pseudo-science, whilst more rarely open defiance was proclaimed by such writers as George Fitzhugh or Iveson L. Brooks. Such appeasement of consciences or flinging of gauntlets, however, was not always successful. Although the South tried hard to rationalize its approval of slavery, the conflict failed to be resolved. And when slavery was abolished the old feelings still existed. They did not vanish along with the institution. They persisted, and, moreover, other feelings began to be made manifest, which, to be acceptable under the new order of things, had to be rationalized and explained away as we have described above.

Before considering these features it will be as well again to sum up the facts at which we have arrived. We have seen how racial and colour prejudice was almost, if not entirely, absent in the ancient world, and it was suggested that its emergence must probably have been due to some event or cultural development closely connected with coloured peoples. In following this clue we saw how the earlier age of discovery brought the enslavement of the conquered peoples, and how they took on

the badge of servitude, whilst the institution of slavery was supported by appeals to the Bible and to pseudo-scientific claims. With the disappearance of slavery the conflict and the dilemma became more acute. Where a man or woman was a slave or mere chattel to be bought and sold, little defence was needed as to how he or she was to be treated. But when slavery was abolished, and the call of freedom was in the air, then came the twin desires to preserve the institution under another name and to defend the new order by reasons which would be acceptable both to the defenders of the system and to their own cultural groups. Such a position could hardly be maintained if it were admitted, for example, that the Negroes were equal in any sense to white men, and that all that was wanted was a fuller opportunity for education for them to take their place in a society mutually advantageous to both parties. That would not do at all. For precisely the same reasons remained as were active before formal slavery was abolished, although in a decreasing degree. New lands had to be developed, mines to be worked, tropical products extracted from the teeming earth, and many jobs performed which white men either could not or would not attempt except under a compulsion which would be resisted. Thus the old ideas which were brought forward to support slavery—that is to say, rationalizations which misdescribed the real reasons—were again advanced, although they were brought up to date to fit the tendencies of the time. There was little need, in the old days, to maintain that the Negro slave was an inferior person, or rather that he occupied an inferior position in the social scale. It was obvious that, once slavery was abolished, the fiction of his inferiority had to be kept up if a semblance of the existing social pattern was to be maintained. Prejudice against him was essential if any popular support was to be obtained for keeping him in what was assumed to be, and openly called, " his place." Let us now turn, then, to the means by which it was hoped that this would be accomplished. Such a study will go far towards an almost complete understanding of racial and colour prejudice, especially when we become more fully aware of the psychological implications involved in these sentiments.

As has been said above, if a dominant white class wishes to maintain, without slavery, its influence over a coloured one subservient to it, it *must* adopt either a system which can almost be called the exercise of honest, naked force, or persuade both

itself, and if possible the white world generally, that the subservience of the one class is due to a manifest inferiority. Both these methods have been in use since the abolition of slavery, although the former is somewhat out of fashion to-day, since it smacks too much of Nazi and Fascist ways of thought and action. Before the war, however, such a way of approaching the subject was far from unknown. As an example, let us see what Professor C. C. Josey, who has been a professor of psychology in a number of American learned institutions, had to say in his book, *Race and National Solidarity*, published in New York and London in 1923. He discusses the problem of labour overseas and asks what is to be done if, at home, labour can no longer be exploited. The solution, he thinks, is to shift the burden somewhere else, and thus to draw the wealth of the exploited country to the United States. The peoples to be thus exploited must be rigorously controlled. Their birth-rate must be regulated, and white dominance must be assured through sheer weight of numbers and efficiency in utilizing the results of technological discovery. Our minds, he says, must be freed from many ethical and moral prejudices; but he admits that possibly grave difficulties will be experienced in getting people to regard this policy of deliberate exploitation as desirable. Certainly it would seem that rationalization is a more comfortable, although less honest, way of getting over the difficulty.

Before describing some of these rationalizations, let us look a little more closely at some of the more important psychological factors which go far to render firm support for the development of colour prejudice.

It will be remembered that in an earlier section of this book it was pointed out that the colour of Negroes, and others, made them always recognizable in white society, and thus the process of assimilation was much more difficult for them than for members of other minority groups. But what is at the moment more important is to remember the unfortunate significance attached to the word " black." We saw (p. 60) how the word in English often denoted something sinister, dirty, and evil. As William Blake says in his famous poem:—

> " My mother bore me in the southern wild,
> And I am black, but O! my soul is white;
> White as an angel is the English child,
> But I am black, as if bereav'd of light."

This idea, coupled with the notion put forward in school text-books that the Negro is a lazy savage, is sufficient to lay the foundations of a prejudice which will last a lifetime. For example, I pick out, almost at random, from my shelves a geographical account of the British Empire, the fourth edition of which was published in 1924, and I read that the representatives of the " Black Race " are in the main " childish, unintellectual, and superstitious." Even the members of the " Yellow Race," although of " considerable mental ability," have this sometimes " masked by a sluggish temperament and lack of enterprise." On the other hand, the " White Race " is distinguished by " mental and physical ability and activity "; and the writer of the book finds it a curious fact that the Maoris of New Zealand and the inhabitants of the Polynesian Islands " show some relation to this race." The prejudice in these lines need hardly be emphasized.[1]

As regards the effect of the word *black* and its various connotations, there seems little doubt that the Negro himself is often conscious of it. Indeed, one writer has called it the progenitor of a sub-conscious attitude of inferiority; and a current saying among Negroes in the United States, that " the blacker the berry the sweeter the juice," does little to offset it.[1] Nevertheless, it has to be admitted that prejudice against the yellow and brown peoples is often nearly, although not quite, as strong as against Negroes; so it must be concluded that the word *black* and its various connections plays merely a minor, although not unimportant, part in building up colour prejudice in the child. It should be remembered that it is the education of the child, both at home and in school, which is largely responsible for inculcating ideas which form, as it were, points around which later crystallize other notions leading to full-blown racial antipathies. An amusing commentary on this is furnished by Stephen Fovargue in his *A New Catalogue of Vulgar Errors*, which was published in England in 1767. He is dealing with the theory that Negroes are not a part of the

[1] For a short discussion of the treatment of race and colour in English schools, see *Race Relations and the Schools* (London, 1944), which was issued by the League of Coloured Peoples, with a foreword by Dr. G. P. Gooch.

[2] For those interested in the psychological implications of this matter, see among others, C. F. Gibson (*Psychoanalytic Review*, 1931, XVII, 413–425) and G. B. Bovell (*ib.*, 1943, XXX, 447–459), who points out that whiteness is a symbol of prestige.

human species, and he says: "Indeed, Master Tommy, if I had the Care of thy Education, I would teach thee a more reasonable Way of Thinking"; and he goes on to inquire whether he will next be asked to believe that a white horse is better than a black one! [1]

It has been found possible within recent years to devise means by which interracial attitudes may be roughly measured, and thus the psychological factors which go to the making of colour prejudice may be more clearly understood. One method is the so-called "Social-Distance" tests, which have been developed by E. S. Bogardus and his followers. This is a convenient means by which, through a simple questionnaire, it is possible to estimate the *degree* of partiality or otherwise towards racial or national groups, and thus to estimate the prevalence of changing attitudes among different sets of individuals at different times. Relying upon a rather simpler method, R. T. LaPiere estimated the amount of psychological prejudice in France and England, and came to the provisional conclusion that, in France, anti-Negro prejudice was greatest among the upper-class levels of society, and comparatively rare in the lower class; whilst in England, on the other hand, it was highest in the middle and lower classes. Although the methods adopted by LaPiere do not appear to me to be wholly satisfactory, there seems to be good evidence to show that both national and social differences in the amount and disposition of colour prejudice are to be found.

By this time the reader will have begun to realize the immense complexity of the psychological nature of colour prejudice, and will understand how generalizations must be avoided if a clear picture is to be obtained. But the question about differences in national outlook is a very important one, and any attempt to answer it will lead us into still deeper and more troubled waters, since I propose tentatively to advance a few ideas which are sure to arouse the most violent opposition in certain quarters.

For this purpose it will be convenient to take three countries and summarize what we know about colour prejudice in each

[1] Mr. Fovargue does not seem to have been a good example to his pupils, even if he ever had any. He was a Fellow of a Cambridge College, and at one time attacked his college servant, and was accused of manslaughter. He fled to Paris, but finally returned to Cambridge wearing long dirty ruffles, his hair tied up with pack thread, and dressed in a sailor's jacket and trousers.

of them. In this way it may be possible to discover what are the factors which, for example, make the prejudice, and the resulting colour-bar, major problems in the United States and South Africa, whilst in Brazil the problem as a national question hardly exists.

In the account of the colour bar in the United States we have described some of its operations, and here and there the reader may have noted a few hints as to the reason for its enforcement and the psychological situation which follows it. We saw that the prejudice exists most commonly in the South, where it is only gradually giving way under social and economic pressure. This is what would have been expected when we remember not only the slave tradition and the chaotic period of Reconstruction after the American civil war, but also the inability to forget the former dominant role played by the whites, and its relation to the concept of master and servant. This, however, would not explain the intensity of the anti-Negro feeling, and, above all, the emotional passions aroused when the subject is being discussed. In order to explain these manifestations it is necessary to probe beneath the surface, to disregard the facile rationalizations, and to render accessible some of those emotions and desires which lie at the root of anti-Negro prejudice as it exists in the United States to-day.

Now when passions run high, and resort is made to violence instead of to reason, then it is to be suspected that highly charged emotions and desires—either open or inaccessible—are involved. There is something almost primitive about the attitude of white to black in the Southern States of America. It is as if the prejudice were an obsessional drive which gave the sufferer no peace. This is hardly a matter for wonder if my interpretation of one reason for colour prejudice in the South be correct. For in my view (which is not unsupported by the available evidence) the South *is* obsessed. Two factors dominate the racial feeling. They are sex and fear; and the sexual element is still further complicated by an admixture of jealousy—a further potent source of hatred. Although these features rarely come to the surface or are openly faced, indications of them can be seen everywhere if they are looked for with an observant and intelligent eye. Moreover, one result of these obsessions is that they lead to precisely the kind of psychological conflict within the personality which we briefly described earlier in this chapter, and which we touched upon when dealing with

the dilemma between faith and practice operating in American society. One of the most remarkable phenomena by which the student of American affairs is constantly confronted is this capacity on the part of the United States citizens to hold two diametrically opposite opinions at the same time, not only in social affairs, but also in political and economic matters. The 1944 election promises illustrated this tendency in economic affairs, and numerous examples could be culled from political circles during the last decade. The same tendency is to be observed throughout the different levels of American society, although it is emphasized rather more in some than in others.[1]

Although the element of fear is not so pronounced in the South as it is in South Africa, owing to the great difference in the number of black people, nevertheless it has a very real existence. The Southerner is a romantic, and his fantasies often take the form of a haunting dread lest one day the position in the South might be reversed and the Negro occupy the place he now holds. But his obsessional fears are small compared with his obsessions over sex. Indeed, some Southerners, when speaking honestly, admit that the basis of the whole Negro problem in the South is sexual; [2] and this opinion is echoed by Negro writers like James Weldon Johnson, who has summed up the matter well when he says that it is the factor of sex which is deeply rooted in the core of the heart of the race problem in America. So deeply rooted is it, he thinks, that it is not always recognized. But as long as this factor persists, so will the situation remain acute. Even if taken alone, Johnson maintains that it is quite sufficient to furnish all the rationalizations of the " complexes of white racial superiority." [3]

These are weighty words, and it is doubtful if Johnson himself knew how near he was getting to one of the least recognized causes of colour prejudice in the United States. However strong the desire to gloss over this aspect of the matter may be, it is essential that a clear realization of all known relevant facts is necessary if we wish to appreciate the intensity of emotional hatred against the Negro that we find in the United States. No understanding of colour prejudice in America is possible if the so-called " Negro problem " is taken out of its setting and

[1] H. W. Odum in his *Race and Rumours of Race* (Chapel Hill, 1943, pp. 42–43), has given some good examples of this.

[2] See *Race Relations and the Race Problem* (Durham, N.C.), 1939, p. 158.

[3] See J. W. Johnson, *op. cit.* (Penguin ed.), p. 81.

examined as an isolated phenomenon. For the Negro problem in the United States is in one sense not a *Negro* problem at all: it is a *white* problem, and the core of that problem is the frustration and consequent psychological conflict which is apparent in some measure throughout the whole of American life. Although Puritan influence has been over-emphasized, and the asceticism of Puritan life exaggerated, nevertheless the influence of Puritan thought has been far greater than is usually supposed. In England it affected our enjoyment of food;[1] in America it was sex.

The obsession of the Americans with sex has now become a commonplace. The story is told of a young American engineer in uniform who, during the war, stopped to look at a rather dilapidated locomotive in a railway station somewhere in England. " Say," he called to the driver, " do you know what we would do with that thing back in the United States, where I come from? " The driver looked at him for a moment and then replied rather gruffly: " Yes, I do: drink it or make love to it." The moral is obvious, but misleading. The Americans are one of the most vital peoples in the world, and their energy is remarkable. Yet much of this energy is frittered away through the conflict within themselves. They cannot learn to live with one another. The so-called " ideals " of Puritanism have poisoned the springs of life itself. The average American is torn with conflicting emotions, although he may be almost unaware of it. Through their worship of private enterprise and initiative they can do little to stem the flood of suggestive advertisements, pin-ups, photographs, and films that deluge the American market. Yet in their upbringing, and in the inculcation of " American ideals," all such material is condemned as immoral. Thus they are always assailed by feelings of frustration and guilt, which in turn lead to acts of aggression and symbolic ways of behaviour which can be interpreted only if the underlying conflict be understood. Much American humour and advertising illustrations can be properly interpreted only if these and similar factors allied to them are understood in the light of the conflict within the American mind. I hope to deal in detail with these manifestations in a later book.

[1] We are still told to-day, on bill-posters, to drink a certain kind of beer because it is " good " for us. We can therefore enjoy it without experiencing a feeling of guilt. It was an eminent American professor who first asked me to explain this extraordinary advertisement.

The desire to escape from this intangible web of standardized ideals to which every American is supposed to aspire is especially strong in the South. Half Puritan and half hedonist, he finds that the conflict within him is more powerful than it is in the North, for down there in the South there is something which makes his position much more difficult than farther North. That something is the presence of the Negro. According to the old beliefs—which still linger even if the rationalizations by which they were supported have changed—the Negro is a savage, hardly a member of the human species, and without those rights which belong to free men. As a slave he (and more particularly *she*) was a piece of property, a chattel to be treated as such. Miscegenation was not uncommon, and the supposed " natural antipathy " conspicuous by its absence. Love could be enjoyed with the black woman without that feeling of guilt and sense of sin, for with savages one could naturally do what one liked. With the still further denigration of the Negro woman came an unnatural emphasis on the purity of the white woman—cold as the gleaming ice, as she was said to be. Thus, when slavery disappeared, the conflict in the Southern mind became intensified. Emphasis on the purity of the white woman and her inaccessibility made the fear of assaults upon her a continual dread. A rape complex developed, and, although few white people would admit it, there was the feeling that possibly the white woman might not always, everywhere and all the time, object to advances from a black suitor.

Now although it is impossible here to discuss this matter in detail, a word or two must be said regarding it. There are, I think, two main factors underlying the attraction for persons of opposite colour when seen from the white point of view. One is simple and can easily be understood; the other is much more subtle, although all competent authorities on the subject agree as to its truth. Let us consider, in the first place, the point of view of the man, remembering one of the fundamental differences between the sexes in regard to the nature of sexual stimuli. Man sees; woman feels. Man is aroused to a great extent by sight; and, this being so, it is unlikely that he would remain passive when confronted with the beauty of the coloured woman. Many coloured women, especially those where there exists an admixture of white blood, as in Haiti, are not only beautiful from any æsthetic standard, but also at times present, in a somewhat exaggerated form, those secondary sexual

characteristics which are especially attractive to masculine eyes. Thus, from the male point of view, the coloured woman is in herself desirable; and history alone amply bears out the contention from every part of the world. But can it be said that the coloured man is attractive to the white woman? Certainly history and psychology would answer in the affirmative, and the reason is closely linked up with some of the more subtle factors mentioned above.

One of the more curious aspects of the civilized sexual life is the desire on the part of many of both sexes to unite with partners of *inferior* or lower social grade than themselves. We cannot enter into any full discussion of these phenomena, which are perfectly familiar to any reader of the novels of D. H. Lawrence, and arise partly from the desire to obtain freedom from those restraints which are imposed by civilized society and which are supposed to indicate moral virtue.

As Shakespeare said, " Black men are pearls in beauteous ladies' eyes "; [1] and a digression might be made at this point to mention the belief that women are often attracted by the lowest types of men—a well-known subject of stories all over the world. To choose but two examples, we have only to recall the tale of the bewitched Prince in the *Arabian Nights*, where the Princess was enamoured of a leprous and paralytic Negro; and the story in the *Heptameron*, where a widow who was being courted by the Lord of Riant, refused him in order to find consolation in the arms of a stablegroom who was as ugly, dirty, and sordid as Riant was handsome, upright, and pleasant. However we may interpret these and allied facts, it must be admitted that the attraction of the black man for the white woman exists, and thus must be taken into account when considering the position in the Southern States of America. One simple reason for this is, as might be expected, the desire on the part of many women to indulge their primitive passion for being dominated by brute strength by a man before whom they need not control their feelings, or preserve that outward indifference which for so many years, in Victorian England, was supposed to distinguish the " lady " from the " female." From the point of view of the woman there are also other attractions in coloured men into which we need not enter.[2] Here it is sufficient to point out that these facts all help us to analyse further the basic factors

[1] *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act V, Scene 2.
[2] *Cf.* D. F. Karaka, *op. cit.*, pp. 204–5.

underlying colour prejudice. For it is clear that here we can discern elements out of which conflict is made—and, moreover, elements which are firmly embedded in both culture, tradition, and even our biological inheritance.

Since we are about to approach the kernel of our problem, it may be as well to insist once again upon the fact that these impulses, urges, and desires to which attention has been directed are not consciously and openly nourished except in certain cases, but are part of the reservoir of material buried in the deeper strata of our being, and which emerge only in symbolic and distorted form. Thus, if it be suggested that colour prejudice is partly, at least, due to sexual jealousy, such a statement will usually be met by incredulity, derision, and probably disgust and resentment, since it is not understood that this jealousy is not consciously felt, but none the less is a powerful factor in establishing such feelings.

The jealousy above mentioned is of two main kinds. There is the generalized feeling that Negroes and so-called primitive people generally enjoy that unrestrained sexual life which is barred from the white man; and then there is the very powerful jealousy of the white Southern woman for the Negro or other coloured woman of her fantasy, who she thinks (quite rightly, as it happens), has robbed her of her due. Some evidence for the first of these two jealous trends can be seen both in American literature and on the screen. We have only to recall such films as *Sins of Bali* (where an advertisement now lying before me begins by saying "Let's go Native"); *Isle of Paradise*, *The Blonde Captive*, or even the *Maid in the Ozarks*, which was advertised as naughty, spicy, daring, bawdy, lusty, and unashamed, the posters revealing the most remarkable scene which was headed "250,000 applauding people are right." The desire of the white American woman for what she thinks is the lot of the "savage" female is well illustrated in such films as *White Savage: Temptress of the Tropics*, which tells the tale of Tahia, a "Daughter of Eve with a soul of Satan who ravaged the souls of men with the lash of primitive hate—the call of Pagan Love"; *Rama*, which unfolds the "emotional life of a cannibal girl," and many others.

Now jealousy is, as we saw when considering anti-Semitism, a potent instrument for fomenting hate; and just as jealousy plays its part in creating a prejudice against the Jews, so in the United States it plays its powerful (although almost wholly

unrecognized) part in creating colour prejudice.[1] Hence it is now possible to see more clearly the springs of hate which nourish colour prejudice in the United States. Very gradually the facts are becoming more widely known, but the frustration which is apparent shows little signs of diminution. It is not only the white man who suffers. The Negro, too, is sometimes cognizant of the situation, and many Negro parents are doing their utmost to discourage affairs between their children and white suitors.[2]

Although within Negro society the sexual conflict has never attained the intensity it has reached among the whites, yet there are indications that in the better-educated circles the American " way of life " is having its effect. Generally speaking, Negro newspapers do not reveal the sexual obsession common in the white Press. Such advertisements as those which class childbirth with cancer, as " woman's two most dreaded words," would be impossible, I think, in the coloured Press of the United States. Moreover, there have been protests by Negro correspondents on the kind of pin-up pictures that are printed week by week for use in the American Armed Forces. It is this natural and unashamed way of looking at life which the Negro displays, but which cannot be openly expressed by the white American in the South, that acts as a continual irritant. The white man's jealousy is aroused; his frustration torments him; he hates

[1] I am inclined to agree with Dr. W. Reich in regarding both anti-Semitism and colour prejudice as linked to the frustration due to unsatisfied sexuality, although these factors should not be regarded as very powerful outside the United States. See his *The Discovery of the Orgone* (New York, 1943, p. 215, and *cf.* F. Windram's *Night Over Africa*, London, 1937), p. 218.

[2] See A. Davis and J. Dollard, *Children of Bondage* (Washington, D.C., 1940), p. 52, and *cf.* C. V. Charles, " Optimism and Frustration in the American Negro " (*Psychoanal. Rev.*, 1942, XXIX, 270, which deals with *Native Son*, the work of the best-selling Negro novelist; A. L. Porterfield, " A Century of Frustration " (*Social Sci.*, 1942, XVII, 132-42), and the novels of Gilmore Millen, of which *Sweet Man* (New York, 1930) deals with the question of the black man and the white woman, and Gwethalyn Graham, whose story, *Earth and High Heaven* (Philadelphia, 1944), deals with the conflict between Erica Drake, a member of a strict Canadian Conservative family, and her young Jewish suitor, Marc Feiser. A study dealing specifically with frustration has recently been published entitled *Rebel without a Cause*, by R. M. Lindner (New York, 1944), and H. Orlansky in his *The Harlem Riot* (New York, 1943), has made a study of mass, frustration as a factor in group violence. *Cf.* also Edith Heal's novel *This Very Sun* (New York, 1944).

to be reminded of it, and thus he transfers his hate and aggression on to the Negroes—those "gentle, human, dark-skinned people"—as H. G. Wells so aptly calls them.

To sum up, then, it would seem that there is considerable evidence to suggest that colour prejudice in the United States, and especially in the South, is due to a number of causes, some arising out of the former slave conditions and the master–servant relationship, and some deeply rooted in the twin factors of fear and sex. Economic conditions also have their effect, and with the gradual growth of skill on the part of the Negroes, and the return of the fully trained Negro combatant and non-combatant troops, the position is likely to grow worse rather than better. Indeed, the recent racial riots in Detroit and elsewhere may be but the prelude to other upheavals on an even greater scale.

We must now turn our attention to Africa, where we shall soon realize that racial and colour prejudice can be approached from a different angle from that which we have described in the Southern States of America. In Africa generally, and in South Africa especially, colour prejudice, where it exists, springs from three main sources: (*a*) the feeling of dominance of the white minority, over a huge black majority, together with the desire to preserve that dominance and the fear of losing it; (*b*) the conflict between the Christian conception of equality and brotherhood and the glaring inequality to be observed everywhere; and (*c*) the economic problem arising from an increasing number of black workers competing with white labour under the existing social and industrial system. The attitude of the white minority has been clearly expressed on a number of occasions. As an example, take Archibald R. Colquhoun's opinion as expressed in his book, *The Africander Land* (London, 1906). Here he says, quite plainly, that in a country where white and black live together the white must be the predominant race. There can never be any question of equality, social or political. Nothing, indeed, could be more explicit than that.

If we ponder upon these words we cannot fail to come to the conclusion that, if they be carried into effect, then a psychological situation is created where hatred, oppression, and frustration can hardly fail to appear. Moreover, in South Africa we have the additional influence of the Ham legend fostered by the more extreme elements of the Dutch Reformed

Church; and elsewhere in Africa (for example, Kenya, the Rhodesias, etc.) the added irritant that the Bantu and the Masai, to take but two examples, are in possession of land which is coveted by white settlers for their own advantage. In this connection it is instructive to observe how many of the Government officials and District Commissioners, especially in places like Tanganyika and Uganda, show little of that fanatical hatred and contempt which are characteristic of some of the settlers elsewhere. The psychological background is lacking; intense prejudice cannot exist where the springs which feed it either have never had any existence, or fail to flow owing to lack of pressure.

In South Africa, fear of the Native is sometimes openly expressed. In 1943 the Minister of Native Affairs in the Union, Major Van der Byl, stated bluntly that if you have got 6,000,000 against 2,000,000, and you educate the 6,000,000 and give them the money, there must be more votes to swamp the 2,000,000. Similarly Mr. P. O. Sauer, in the House of Assembly, voiced the same fears; whilst Mr. S. M. Loubser demanded segregation even in the post-offices, otherwise, as he said, " the feeling in regard to colour will probably be deadened." [1]

This element of fear has been fully recognized by all those competent to judge. Thus Lord Olivier, whose long life in the public service amply qualified him to judge, was one of those who noted how rational arguments to support the colour bar were used to reinforce irrational prejudice " due to subconscious fears " [2]; and he went a step farther when he declared that colour prejudice was a " protective fear—a ' phobia ' . . . of the subconscious self," an opinion which has received the support of the veteran administrator, the late Lord Lugard, who has gone so far as to say that fear is the *root cause* of colour-bar discrimination.

Apart from the elements mentioned above, the question of sex does not play so large a part in Africa as in the United States, as might have been expected if my brief analysis of the situation be in any way correct. But it is still there, and at times assumes an ugly aspect. Attempts to prevent miscegenation have been strenuous both in the Union of South Africa and elsewhere, and this in face of the alleged " natural racial antipathies " which are supposed to exist. In Transvaal there

[1] See *Debates*, February 26, 1943, cols. 2400, 2429, 2424, etc.
[2] *The Spectator*, May 9, 1931, p. 727.

have been quite a considerable number of prosecutions in connection with relations between black men and white women, and the practice of employing coloured male servants to wait upon white women has sometimes led to results which might have been foreseen had a little imagination been exercised. Moreover, the power that the wives of settlers have over their black servants is sometimes abused in a manner which is occasionally made public, such as the notorious Selwyn flogging case in Kenya in 1934. The attitude of the white household towards the beaten man was exemplified by the refusal to allow the sufferer to be taken to hospital in the family's automobile, the excuse being, as the owner of the vehicle expressed it, that he could not have " baboons placed in my car." The local lady physician, Dr. Marguerite Arnell, who spoke for the defence when the matter was before the courts, declared that hide straps were in common use throughout Africa for the purpose of beating natives, although Lord Hailey has stated that the use of the hide whip had been abolished in British territories before the date of the Selwyn trial. It is possible, however, that he was here referring to " official " floggings, and not to " private " punishments on the settlers' farms.

We have now come to the point when the main factors underlying racial and colour prejudice, and their psychological implications, have, I hope, been made clear. It only remains for us to examine cases where the prejudice is either partially or entirely absent, or is so closely related to economic and social status that it is difficult to disentangle the one from the other.

In the section on the colour bar in Brazil the reader will have noticed how weak is the prejudice underlying it, and how slight and unpopular is any sign of racial antipathy of the more malignant type. Now even the most casual observer cannot fail to ask himself why this is so; and possibly, if he has ever been in Portuguese East Africa, he will remember the lack of colour prejudice in the daily life of Moçambique generally, and in Lourenço Marques in particular. What is there in the culture of Portugal which seems inimical to the rise and development of colour antipathy? How is it that the same features can be seen both in Brazil and in Portuguese East Africa?

If the reader will turn back to the section on Brazil (see pp. 181–187), he will find on p. 181 a brief note on the early history of Brazil's colonization, and how the Portuguese, with their easy way of life, soon contracted alliances with the population, and

acquired an acceptance of those differences which kept less adaptable people than themselves exclusive and apart. Moreover, an important factor which has been frequently overlooked is the influence of the religion of the Roman Catholic Church over a Latin people as compared with the influence of Protestant Calvinistic teaching over predominantly Anglo-Saxon stock. In the Latin countries of Europe, where Roman Catholicism held sway, there was little of that stern and unyielding attitude regarding what was called " morality " which was so common among the adherents to the Protestant sects. The sins of the flesh were often regarded with a somewhat benevolent eye, and a more tolerant attitude was frequently noticeable. It is the Latin traditions and view of life generally which make the Brazilians what they are. Unlike the North American, who seems to live to work, they work to live. At the annual carnival in Rio de Janeiro it has been said that sometimes work stops for three whole days whilst the people dance, sing, feast, and make love without any of that sense of artificiality which is nearly always present in the United States. After the war of 1914–1918, a play was produced in the Brazilian capital which satirized the attitude towards love of a North American business man. In love with the heroine, he is depicted as running on and off the stage, rushing up to the lady and saying, effusively, " I love you," and then getting out his watch and saying, " But I must go to my business: I will return." Work to the North American is often an escape *from* life, and especially from woman; to the Brazilian it is a means through which life and love can be enjoyed. Thus we do not often find in Brazil, any more than in many parts of France or Spain, those neurotic complexes concerned with guilt which disfigure the cultures influenced by Protestant and Puritan ideas. Moreover, the legacy of Portugal was milder than that of Spain; it tended to go to fewer extremes, and encouraged toleration and an easy-going indifference to physical and mental peculiarities. The common attitude of the ordinary American tourist, when visiting the Latin countries of Europe, is often one in which can be detected the belief that what he thinks as " loose living " is being practised there; and it is often obvious that secretly he hopes that he may have the opportunity to " loosen up " himself if occasion offers. In a certain sense (although not in the way he thinks of it) this feeling is based upon fact. To a Parisian like the late Count S. C. de Soissons (who gave an account of what he saw

in the United States in 1896), many American women seemed to regard their men-folk simply as machines for making money. He says that he did not know whom he ought to pity, the men or the women. Even to-day things have changed but little.[1] One American woman, who used to make frequent trips to Europe, told me once, on a westbound vessel, that she was going home again to the country where the men were " just doormats, and like it! " Such arrangements as at Scotts Hotel for single girls in Washington, with its " beau-parlours," and curtains too narrow to be drawn completely, are, to the informed European, pathetic examples of the conflict within American society which arises, as we have seen, from the impact of two completely incompatible sets of ideas. Such phenomena as these are rare in Brazil, which is a country where the men are not dominated by the women—who, for their part, consequently suffer but slightly those special feelings of frustration and unsatisfied longing which are the fate of so many in the United States. Here there is no general feeling of " white " superiority and Nordic worth, because mixture has been going on for so long that the idea of race purity has lost its meaning—if indeed it ever had very much. Sexual jealousy of the coloured population is almost entirely absent, and there is no fear of a black majority swamping a white minority. Educated Brazilians believe in assimilation and mutual tolerance, practising both to a large extent, thus relieving the country of many of the problems associated with colour prejudice and the consequent inequalities and injustices of the colour bar. It cannot be due merely to chance that the most extreme forms of colour prejudice are found in the United States and in the Union of South Africa, both of which countries have been strongly influenced by Protestant rigidity as opposed to Catholic elasticity in practice. Moreover, in the United States, modern Catholic influence (in spite of Papal pronouncements) has done but little to render colour prejudice less, or to mitigate the more evil effects of the colour bar.[2] It has also supported Protestant agitation in favour of greater emphasis on restrictions in sexual freedom and the sacred character of Holy Marriage. Their united

[1] *Cf.* Jules Romains, *Salsette Discovers America* (London, 1942), p. 30.

[2] See, for example, the challenge to Catholics on the question of " white " attitude, by Sister M. Verona, in the *Journal of Religious Instruction*, April 1944, and *cf.* T. Hamilton's remarks in his *Men and Manners in America*, 2 vols., London, 1833, II, 210.

efforts do not appear to have been what can be described as a brilliant success. In 1937 the chance that marriage in the United States would end in divorce was estimated as just over 1 in 6.

It is in such facts as these that we can understand the lack of colour prejudice, not only in Brazil and other countries where Latin traditions have played their part, but also in European countries like France and Portugal itself. Moreover, the idea so often found in the United States, and also among certain classes in England, that the " Dago " is inferior, seems, when analysed, to be closely associated with the imaginary loose living in Latin countries. And how curious it is (to those who have not read the preceding pages!) that so many English, Americans, and South Africans seem bent, every summer, on exposing as much of their bodies as they dare to the rays of the sun, so that their skins may attain that hue of dark brown which they affect so much to despise. Let's go Native!

Before concluding this slight survey of the psychology of colour prejudice, there is one further point to be considered which is of great importance if we wish to understand how it is that colour antipathy, and the consequent colour bar, can have such a firm hold over so many people, and how difficult it seems to dislodge it once it has taken root and begun to flower.

Let us for a moment return to the process of rationalization. We have seen how, in order to explain an irrational prejudice to ourselves or to others, there is a tendency to misdescribe the real reasons (even if we know them), and thus to pretend that the basis for our opinion is something which is acceptable both to ourselves and the outside world, and which, when considered and tested, can be found to be true. Now, if we experiment with our friends and their prejudices, it will be a common experience to find that, when we question them closely on the reasons they put forward for their opinions, they will begin by asserting this or that, but, when doubt as to the truth of their assertions is expressed, they will begin to get " hot and bothered," and very often end by losing their tempers. The cause of this is quite simple. In many cases they know that the reasons they advance are not the real reasons, and are naturally not at all willing to have these divulged by cross-examination. Only a few days before writing these words I was discussing the matter with a young American of high intelligence. " You know," he said, " when I see one of your English girls

out with one of our Negroes, I see red." "Tell me exactly why you feel like that," I replied. "Why should you, who know neither the woman nor the man, have *any* emotional feelings on the matter? Try to analyse it." He was silent for a moment, and then said: "I can't say why; I just get hot and flare up and feel I want to kick the bastard." I waited a moment to see what was coming, as I saw that he was trying to analyse these feelings. Suddenly he sat up: "Lord," he said, "do you think it is because I am *jealous*?" and then, as if adding it as an afterthought, he continued: "You know, there's a saying in the United States that, once a woman goes with a Negro, she will never be content with the white man again." [1] Had my friend been less honest and straightforward he would probably have advanced the usual rationalization for his feelings. I should have heard much on the necessity of protecting white womanhood from the black menace, and similar stories. It is in ways like this that the modern employers of African labour excuse their actions, just as the early slave-owners excused themselves. In a book now before me, which was published in 1833, I am told that slavery, and the responsibility it entailed, gave the slave-owner's character "a sort of austere dignity favourable to virtue," and that the planter of the Southern States of America was "one of the most perfect models of the human race." Similarly, I am told by the Chairman of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines, at the Annual Meeting in 1938, that "mining employment, far from lowering the physical standard of the Native population, has quite the opposite effect." [2]

Now it may happen that in any particular case a rationalization put forward to explain a prejudice *may* be true; in other words, that the person harbouring the prejudice is able to advance reasons for it which, although they are not the reasons that in fact mainly activate him, nevertheless *might* be advanced for his point of view, and thus be argued from a solid foundation. An example of this can be seen very clearly if we consider the colour bar in the Union of South Africa. Here we have a white minority dominating, by force, a large black majority. Colour prejudice is apparent everywhere, and the reasons for

[1] I leave the interpretation of this untrue generalization to the reader.

[2] For the effect of work in the mines, see among others, L. M. Nesbitt, *op. cit.*, and *cf.* N. Farson, *Behind God's Back* (London, 1940), pp. 121–122.

it have already been discussed. Fear and sex may play their parts; but the principal factor is one which, although associated with fear, has its basis in actual fact, and can be argued from that basis. It is certainly true that, were social and political equality to be granted, vast educational schemes put into operation, and similar means adopted for bringing the Bantu fully within the framework of South African life, *then* a position would arise where the black majority would dominate the white minority. Whether such a situation is possible or impossible, right or wrong, is not the question. South Africans assume that it is both impossible to contemplate and is wrong in itself, and, if it happened, then their whole conception of culture and way of life would disintegrate. Whether this be so or not is beside the point. What is important to understand is that, realizing the South African point of view, whether based on prejudice or not, we can see that he is able to bring forward facts to support the colour bar, and to argue logically from those facts. A simple Boer farmer, who firmly believes in the Ham legend and the innate inferiority of the Bantu, is thus able to bring forward sound logical arguments for his support of the colour bar, even though the reasons he adduces are for him mere rationalizations of his own personal prejudices which are thus misdescribed.

It is precisely here that a fact emerges of great importance regarding colour prejudice and the colour bar. For if we are able to nourish purely irrational prejudices, and then, when challenged, are able to produce rationalizations which are in themselves logical and to the point, then it becomes exceedingly hard to show that in very many cases these prejudices are fundamentally irrational, and that to argue the truth or falsity of the rationalizations merely tends to confuse the issue. It is true that the kind of rationalization we have been considering is not always applicable, and is often open to serious objection, since it rests largely on the tacit assumption (i.e. the prejudice) that the black man is and must always be inferior to the white man. Thus, in argument, the colour *bar* can be separated entirely from colour *prejudice*, and the latter can be attacked whilst leaving the former alone. In this way confusion is avoided and the basic prejudice isolated, the rationalizations for it being then dealt with as they are presented.

It is in these and similar psychological considerations that I think we may begin to understand the strength of racial and

colour prejudices, and to realize how firmly they are planted in the minds of the white upholders of Western civilization, and how difficult it will be to uproot them in those parts of the world in which the educational, social, economic, and industrial systems are partly responsible for their appearance and growth. White people will not always be able to preserve their sense of self-importance by the pretence that the majority of human beings on this earth are inferior to them. Their self-respect and pride in the achievements of themselves and their cultural groups cannot forever be sustained by so foolish a dream. Such an attitude may be excusable among Poor Whites; it is inexcusable for most of us. What is certain is that we must try to understand these antipathies before we can deal with them. For deal with them we must. The writing is already on the wall. Nay, it is in block letters of black and white.

INDEX

ABERCROMBIE, H. R., 135
Abkhazian, A.S.S.R., 203
Aborigines' Rights Protection Society, 158
Adams, George, 170
Africa, colour bar in, *Ch. VIII*
—— Belgian, colour bar in, *Ch. VIII*, 3, pp. 161 ff.
—— British Colonies and Protectorates, colour bar in, *Ch. VIII*, 2, pp. 150 ff.
—— French, colour bar in, *Ch. VIII*, 3, pp. 161 ff.
—— Portuguese East, colour bar in, 63, 166, 235
—— South, Union of, Bantu in, 129 ff. and *passim*; colour bar in, *Ch. VIII*, 1, pp. 125 ff.; "coloured" people in, 129 ff.; Government of, 128; Indians in, 22, 143 ff.; Jews in, 22, 146, native labour in, 139 ff.; population of, 129; trade unions in, 140 ff.
—— West, colour bar in, 151; cocoa production in, 158
African Students' Association, 124
Afro-Americans, 26
Aggrey, Dr. J. E. K., 148
Ahasuerus, King, 43
Alexander, M., 141
Alston, Melvin, 83
"American dream, the," 104
American Federation of Labor, 76, 78
American ideals, 228
Amery, L. S., 145
Amis des Noirs, 219
Amsterdam News, 91
Anderson, Marian, 81
Anti-Semitism, *Ch. IV*; colour prejudice and, 27; and dislike of Jews, 40 ff.
Arabian Nights, 230
Archer, William, 31
Armed Forces, of U.S., Negroes in, 80 ff.
Armenoids, 41
Arnell, Dr. M., 235
Aryan languages, 11; race, 11, 186
Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching, 108
Athenaeum, The, 41, 66
Atlanta Statement, 107
Australia, aborigines of, 191, 192; Chinese labour in, 188, 189, 209; colour bar in, *Ch. XII*; half-castes in, 192, 193; "piebald," 198; white, 38, 62, 191, 194, 198
Azerbaidzan, S.S.R., 200

BACHMAN, John, 66
Bahia, 183
Balfour, Arthur, 190
Bankhead, Senator, 81
Bantu, in South Africa, 23, 129, 133 ff., 240 and *passim*.
Barbados, 169, 173
Barlow, Joel, 66
Basutoland, 128, 153, 154
Batista y Zaldívar, F., 174
Beatty, G. H., 141
Bechuanaland, 128, 153, 154
Bigland, E., 161
Bilbo, T. G., 112
Birmingham, Alabama, 77
Birney, J. G., 221
Black, the colour, 38, 60, 61, 223
Blake, William, 223
Blood, Negro, in transfusion, 91
Bogardus, E. S., 225
Bolin, Jane, 90
Bovell, G. B., 224
Brahmin caste, 19, 179
Brazil, colour problem in, 63, 112, *Ch. XI*; population of, 183; as compared with U.S.A., 236
British Empire, coloured people in the, 4
Broadbent, Capt. E., 114
Brookes, E. H., 146
Brooks, Iveson L., 221
Brotherhood of Sleeping-Car Porters, 76, 77
Brown, Capt. J., 168
Brown race, 21, 25
Browne, Sir Thomas, 31
Buck, Pearl, 5
Buckingham, J. S., 67
Buckland River riot, 189
Buddhists, in India, 20
Buell, R. L., 140
Burton, Sir Robert, 51
Bustamente, A., 170
Butler, U., 170
Byron, Lord, 53

CABRAL, Pedro, 181
Cadbury, firm of, 166
Cagots, 28
Calhoun, John, 220
Calpin, G. H., 142
Cambridge, coloured students at, 22
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 128
Canaan, curse of, 51, 68. (*See also* Ham.)
Canada, 6, 198
"Cape Coloured" people, 23, 129 ff.
Cardiff, 58, 116, 120
Carolina, North, 87
Carrión, J., 175
Carroll, Charles, 67
Cartwright, A. S., 67
Caste, 19, 179
Cecil, Lord Robert, 190
Celler, E., 99
Census, Negroes and the U.S., 16, 74, 95
Chamberlain, Joseph, 189
Charlemagne, 28
Charles, C. V., 232
Chiang Kai-Shek, Mme., 5, 98
Chidell, F., 191
Children, colour prejudice among, 114, 212, 213
China, civilization of, 24
Chinese, 24; in Australia, 188, 189, 209; in New Zealand, 193, 197; in U.S.A., 97 ff.
Chinese Exclusion Acts, 97 ff.
Christian Council Emergency Committee, 147
Christianity, and slavery, 35 ff., 219, 221
Churchill, Winston, 113
Cicero, 211
Cinema, Negroes in the, 91; American, 231
Cipriani, A., 170
Civil rights, of Negroes in the U.S., 87 and *passim*.
Civil Rights Acts, 71, 88
Clarke, Adam, 67
Clarkson, Thomas, 219
Clayton, Bishop G. H., 127
Clowes, W. L., 64
Cocoa, production of in West Africa, 158; in Principe and San Thomé, 165, 166
Cole, Luella, 213
Colonial system, French, 161 ff.; Dutch, 178
Colour (The) Bar and Race, 134
"Coloured peoples," meaning of the term, 12 ff., 22, 25 and *passim*.

Colour Bar, the, and colour prejudice, *Ch. V.* (*See also* under geographical headings.)
Colquhoun, A. R., 233
Commission on Interracial Co-operation, 94
Committee on Fair Employment Practice, 77, 92
Committee on Racial Discrimination, 79
Communists, colour prejudice among, 114
Confucius, 24
Congo, Belgian, scandals in the, 3, 164
Congress of Industrial Organizations, 72, 76, 78, 79
Constantine, L. N., case of, 117
Constitution, South African, 127; of the U.S.A., 74, 88; of the U.S.S.R., 202, 203
Cotton, W. A., 135, 140
Crawford, Frederick, 78
Creoles, 27
Crisis, The, 92
Cuba, 174
Curran, J., 81

Dabney, V., 70
"Dago," 38, 184, 238
"Dark Caucasians," J. W. Gregory on, 25
Davis, A., 161
Davis, Allison, 232
Declaration of Independence, 64
Desiderius, King, 29
Dickerson, Earl, 77
Dollard, J., 232
Drama, Negroes in the, 90
Dravidians, 19
Drew, Charles R., 91
Durban Convention, 128
Durham Statement, 106, 107
Dutch, in South Africa, 123, 127, 131; in East Indies, 178

Eboué, A. F., 163, 164
Eck, H. J. van, 148
"Edinburgh Castle," case of the S.S., 116
Edschmid, K., 184
Education, of Negroes in the U.S., 82, 105; in South Africa, 133, 134
Egyptians, the ancient, 21, 22, 25
Emancipation Proclamation, 77
English Justice, 211
Envy, jealousy and, 53
Epicanthic fold, 7
Espionage, subversive activity and, 47
Ethridge, Mark, 77
Executive Order, Pres. Roosevelt's, 77

Farson, N., 239
Fascism, 46
Fear, and colour prejudice, 122, 226, 240
Federal Council of Churches of Christ, 94
Filipinos, in U.S., 73, 100, 101
Films, American, 231; Negroes and, 91
Fishberg, M., 42
Fitzhugh, George, 220
Fletcher, M. E., 120
Flogging, 235
Florida, 87, 137
Fort Hare, 133
Fovargue, S., 224, 225
Freeman, E. A., 65
Freyre, G., 161, 183
Friends, Society of, 94; and slavery, 219
Frustration, 46, 69, 228, 232

Gandhi, M. K., 177
Georgia, Negro education in, 83, 105
Georgian S.S.R., 200
Ghettoes, 44
Ghurkas, of Nepal, 21
Gibson, C. F., 224
Gide, André, 163, 178
Gliddon, G. R., 66, 220
Gobineau, J. A. de, 66, 220
Gold Coast, 158
Gooch, G. P., 224
Gorki, 205
Graham, Gwethalyn, 232
Graham, Stephen, 31
"Grandfather Clauses," 87
Grattan, C. H., 124
"Greasers," 38, 184
Great Britain, colour bar in, *Ch. VII.*
Green, William, 77
Grégoire, Bishop Henri, 65
Gregory, J. W., 25
Grey, George, 195
Guadalupe Hidalgo, Treaty of, 94
Guildford, J. P., 114
Guilt, sense of, 228, 229

Hailey, Lord, 160, 235
Hair, in Asia, 7; in Brown Race, 21; dekinking Negroes, 72; in Negroes, 7; in N. Europe, 7; in Maoris, 194
Haiti, 175
Ham, the legend of, 51, 62, 67, 68, 69, 220, 233, 240
Hamilton, T., 237
Hannemann, J. L., 220
Harlem, 71, 89
Hawaii, group mixture in, 9, 101 ff., 172
Hawkins, John, 219
Heal, Edith, 232
Health, of Negroes in the U.S., 85 ff.
Hemmerde, E. G., 118

Heptameron, 230
Herbert, X., 192
Hertzog, General, 128, 135
Hill, A. V., 212
Hill, Birkbeck, 210
Hindus, 19 ff.; in the U.S., 99
Hitler, Africans called "half-apes" by, 2, 65; on law and order, 2; and anti-Semitism, 53; and colour bar in U.S., 79; General Smuts compared to, 145
Hooton, E. A., 5
Horses, white better than black, 225
Horwitz, E. L., 114
Hot Springs, Conference at, 176
Hottentots, 122, 129
House, Colonel E. M., 190
Housing, of Negroes, in Jamaica, 171; in South Africa, 136 and *passim*; in the U.S.A., 86
Hudson, R. S., 113, 117
Hughes, W. M., 191
Humanitarianism, 34
Hurston, Zora N., 92
Huxley, E., 161

I go West, 115, 230
Illiteracy, in the U.S., 82 ff.
India, peoples of, 19; colour bar in, *Ch. X.*
Indians, in Kenya, 155; in New Zealand, 194; in South Africa, 22, 143 ff.
—— North American, characteristics of, 17; in the U.S.A., 73
Industrial Conciliation Act, 131
Inferiority, sense of, 224
Institute of Race Relations (S. Africa), 149
Institute of Race Relations (U.S.A.), 93
Intercolonial Conference (1896), 189
Islam, and slavery, 36

Jains, in India, 20
Jamaica, 170 ff.
Jamaicans, in England, 118
Jansen, E. G., 148
Japanese, 26; in Australia, 188, 190 ff.; in Brazil, 185; in Hawaii, 101 ff.; in U.S.A., 99 ff.
Jazz, 92
Jealousy, and racial and colour prejudice, 52, 231 ff., 239
Jefferson, T., 65
Jews, assimilation of, 43; in British Empire, 43; in Canada, 43; in commerce, 45; and fraud, 45; frustration among, 46 ff.; in Great Britain, 43; in New York City, 42; in

Poland, 43; power of 45; in relation to anti-Semitism, 40 ff.; in Russia, 200, 204; in South Africa, 22, 146
" Jim Crow " laws, 74, 112
Johnson, C. S., 83
Johnson, J. W., 69, 227
Joint Council to Promote Understanding between White and Coloured People in Great Britain, 116
Jones, A. Creech, 150
Josey, C. C., 223
Joshi, P. S., 22, 145
Journal and Guide, 91

KARAKA, D. F., 115, 116, 230
Kasakhs, 201, 207, 208
Kazan, 206
Kemp, J. T. van der, 124
Kenya, 155 ff., 192, 234, 235
King, Miss Amelia E., case of, 117
Kingston, Jamaica, slums of, 171
Kirghis, 201
Krause, F. E. T., 141
Kshatriya, 19
Ku Klux Klan, 32

LABOUR PARTY, British, memorandum of 1943, 159
Labour, native, in South Africa, 139 ff.
Land Apportionment Act, 153, 160
Language, race and, 11
LaPiere, R. T., 225
Law, inequality before the, 210
Lawrence, D. H., 230
Lawyers, Negro, in the U.S., 90
League of Coloured Peoples, 224
League of Nations Covenant, racial equality clause in, 190 ff.
Leecraft, A. S., 67
Leopold II, King, 164
Libraries, segregation in American, 84
Lincoln, Abraham, 65, 70, 77
Lindner, R. M., 232
Little, Dr. K. L., 116, 121
Liverpool, 58, 119, 120
Londres, Albert, 163
Loubser, S. M., 234
Louisiana, meaning of " Negro " in, 16; and poll-tax, 87; schools in, 105
Lourenço Marques, 166, 235
Low, A. R., 111
Lugard, Lord, 122
Lyman, Richard R., 52
Lynching, in the U.S., 108, 109

MACCRONE, I. D., 131
McWilliams, Carey, 100
Maher, C., 156
Makino, Baron, 190
Mancebia, 183
Manley, N., 170
Mansfield judgment, 114
Maoris, 193, 194 ff., 224
March, on Washington, 76, 77
Marshall, General George, 81
Massachusetts, 65
Masuka, J., 102
Mathu, E. W., 156
Mbadiwe, Kingsley Ozumba, 124
Meade, Bishop, William, 221
Medicine, Negroes in, in the U.S., 90
Mediterranean race, 21
Melanin, 13
Meneffee, S., 85, 86
Mexicans, 38, 94 ff., 184
Miami, Fla., 137
Michel, F., 28
Michigan, 71
Millen, G., 232
Milner, Lord, 5, 128
Missionaries, in Africa, 124, 134, 147
Mongoloid peoples, characteristics of, 7; in India, 19
Moodie, J. W. D., 123, 127
Moore, Sir L. F., 167
Mormons, 50 ff.; and Negroes, 51, 52
Morton, Samuel, 66
Moslems, in India, 20; in the U.S.S.R., 202
Moyne, Lord, 127
Mulatto, meaning of, 16
Mulattoes, in the U.S., 74
Mulzac, Hugh, 81
Music, Negro, 92
Mustapha Kemal, 202, 204
Myrdal, Dr. Gunnar, vi, 64, 69, 86, 104

NATAL, Indians in, 129, 143 ff.
Nation, meaning of, 9
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 105, 108.
National Conference on Social Work, 89
National Maritime Union, 82
National Youth Administration, 79
Native Development Fund, 133
Native Labour Regulation Act (1911), 139
Natives Land Act (1913), 135
Natives (Urban Areas) Act (1923), 136
Nazi Primer, the, 2
Nazis, views on race of, 1, 182
" Negress," avoidance of word, 27
" Negro," meaning of the word, 15 ff., 183
Negro Caravan, 59
Negro Digest, 59
Negro Labor News, 92
Negroes, in Brazil, 183 ff.; characteristics of African, 7; dislike of, 57 and *passim*; odour of, 30 ff.; skin colour of, 14
Nepal, 21
Nesbitt, L. M., 140, 239
Newclare, 137
New Jersey, 71
New Orleans, 89
New York City, Jews in, 42; Negroes in, 71 ff., and *passim*
New Zealand, aliens in, 194; Chinese immigration and, 193, 197; Maoris, 193, 194 ff.; racial prejudice in, 193
Ngata, Sir A. T., 196
Nicholas V., Pope, 219
Nielsen, P., 32
Niger, River, 26
Nordic race, 12
Norfolk, Va., 32, 83
North, the, of the U.S., anti-slavery sentiment in, 75
North Georgia Review (The), 109
Nott, Josiah, 66, 220
Nyasaland, 154

ODOUR, of Cagots, 28; of Europeans, 29; of Jews, 29, 31; of Negroes, 30 ff.; of Saracens, 29
Odours, " racial," 29 ff.
Odum, H. W., 227
Olivier, Lord, 234
Opportunity, 92
Orlando, 136
Orlansky, H., 232
Ottley, Roi, 59, 101
Oxford, coloured students at, 22, 115

PARKER, John J., 83
Parsis, in India, 21
Pascagoula, 85
Patterson, Henry S., 66
Paul, St., and slavery, 35
Payne, Clement, 170
" Pegging " Act, 144
Pennsylvania, 71, 84
People's National Party, 170
Perham, M., 161
Periman, N. D., 72
Phelps-Stokes Fund, 149
Philadelphia, 65
Philip, John, 124
Phooley, Jyotirao, 179
" Piebald " Australia, 198
Pierson, D., 184
Pipes, James, 92
Political Action Committee, 76

Politicians, prejudices of, 211
Poll-Tax, in South Africa, 133; in U.S.A., 87
Polygamy, 50
Poor Whites, 241; in South Africa, 142 ff.; 186; in U.S.A., 186
Porterfield, A. L., 232
Porteus, S. D., 192
Portuguese, the, in Brazil 181
Poverty, in Jamaica, 171; of Negroes in U.S.A., 85; in Puerto Rico, 103; in West Indies, 169, 175
Prejudice, meaning of the word, 209; and the colour bar, *Ch. V.*; psychology of racial and colour, *Ch. XIV.*
Prejudices, racial and colour not synonymous, 27
Press, the Negro, in the U.S., 91, 92
Professions, Negroes in the, in the U.S., 90
Protocols of the Elders of Zion, 54, 56
Pseudopodia, 109
Psychology, the, of racial and colour prejudice, *Ch. XIV.*
Puerto Rico, 101 ff.
Puritans, influence of the, 174, 228

QUAKERS, slavery and, 219

Raça e assimilaçao, 186
Race, meaning of, 8 ff.
Race Relations and the Race Problem, 227
Randolph, A. Philip, 76, 77
Rationalization, 216 ff., 238
Reconstruction, period of, 74, 88
Redding, J. S., 59
Reich, W., 232
Religion, Negroes', in the U.S., 93
Representation of Natives Act, 132
Repression, 215
Reserves, problem of the, 138
Rhodesia, Northern, copper belt in, 151, 153; trade unions in, 152
Rhodesia, Southern, 153, 154
Rice, N. L., 221
Richmond Statement, 107
Rienzi, A., 170
Riots, in Buckland River, 189; in Louisiana, 81; in Mexican communities in the U.S., 96, 233
Roberts, Frederick M., 100
Roberts, George A. McGuire, case of, 118
Robertson, H. G 161
Robinson, Walter, 82
Romains, Jules, 237
Roman Catholic Church, attitude of, 93, 236, 237
Roosevelt, F. D., 5, 77, 97
Roosevelt, Theodore, 98, 182
Rosario, J. C., 175
Rossetti, D. G., 210

SAFFIN, John, 65
San Antonio, 95
Sarawak, concubinage in, 178
Sastri, V. S. Srinivasa, 145
Sauer, P. O., 234
Saunders, H. St. George, 111
Schenck, R. S., 192
Schwartz, Louis, 72
Scotts Hotel, 237
Segregation of Cagots, 28; of Jews, 44; of Negroes in U.S., 71 and *passim*; in South Africa, 135 ff.
Selwyn flogging case, 235
Semitic languages, 11; peoples, 41
Serfdom, 34
Sewall, Samuel, 65
Sex, American obsession with, 69, 228 ff.; and fear, 226, 240; the Negro question and, 69 and *passim*.
Shakespeare, 60, 113, 230
Shipbuilding, employment of Negroes in, 79
Sicily, people of, 22
Sims, T. W., 26
Skin, pigmentation of, 12, 23; glands and, 29, 30
Slave-owners, characters of, 239
Slavery, *Ch. III.*, 218 ff.
Smith, Bessie, 92
Smith, Clarence, 92
Smith, Joseph, 50
Smith, Lillian E., 109
Smuts, General, 62, 132, 145, 147, 149
Snelling, Paula, 109
Soissons, S. C. de, 236
Sophiatown, 137
South, the, and the Negro, 67, 70 ff., 83, 90, 226; obsessed by sex, 226 ff.
South Today, 109
Southern Negro Youth Congress, 111
Southern Regional Council, 106
Stalin, Marshal, 208
Stanley, Colonel Oliver, 113
Stephen III, Pope, 29
Stereotypes, 213
Stollwerck, firm of, 166
Stowe, Harriet B., 221
Strange Fruit, 109, 110
Strydom, J. G., 168
Students, colour prejudice among, 114
Sudras, 19
Sun-bathing, 238
Sundaram, Dr. L., 144
Swaziland, 128, 153, 154

TAJIKS, 201, 206, 207
Tajikstan, 206
Talmadge, Eugene, 83, 112
Tanganyika, 154, 234
Tatar, A.S.S.R., 205, 206
Taxation, native, in South Africa, 138
Terrell, Mary C., 92
Tests, "social-distance," 225
"Thobbing," 216
Thrasher, John B., 221
Tinley, J. M., 131
Trade Unions, in Africa, 140 ff.; in U.S.A., 76; in West Indies, 169 ff.
Transvaal Chamber of Mines, 138, 140, 239
Trinidad, class divisions in, 173 ff.; colour bar in, 169 ff.; group mixture in, 9; oil industry in, 175; trade unions in, 170
Tshekedi, Khama, Chief, 167
Turkey, 204
Turkmen, 200
Tutankhamen, 25
Tyler, I. K., 110

UGANDA, 154, 234
Unconscious, the, 214 ff.
Undesirable Immigrants Exclusion Act (1919), 193
Union of South Africa, colour bar in, *Ch. VIII*, 1. (*See also* Africa, South.)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 63, 199; Constitution of, 202 ff.; nationalities in, 201; race and nationality in, *Ch. XIII.*
United States of America, meaning of "Negro" in the, 15 ff.; colour bar in, *Ch. VI*; psychology of colour prejudice in, 226 ff.
Universities, Negroes in American, 83
Untouchables, 20, 179
Urban League, 105
Usbeks, 201

VAISHYA, 19
Van der Byl, Major, 234
Vereeniging, Treaty of, 127
Vermont, 111
Verona, M., 237
Vianna, O., 185
Voltaire, 211
Voting, of Negroes in the U.S.A., 87; in South Africa, 131, 132, 143

WAGES ACT (1937), 13

Waitangi, Treaty of, 194
Walker, Madame C. J., 72
Wall *v.* Oyster Case, 84
Ward, Sir J., 196
Warner, W. L., 192
Washington, D.C., 86
Washington, Dr. Booker T., 26
Webb, Mr. and Mrs. Sydney, 206
Webster, Milton, 77
Wells, H. G., 112, 223
West Indies, colour bar in, *Ch. IX*; coloured people in the, 27; French, 174; poverty in the, 171, 175
Wilson, Woodrow, 190, 191
Windram, F., 232
"Wops," 184
"YELLOW PERIL," The, 24, 96
Young, Brigham, 52
Young Maori Party, 196
Young, P. B., 91