

K. A. Baird

RACE PREJUDICE

Prejudice has been called a great saver of time that would otherwise be spent in obtaining the facts and forming a reasoned opinion. It is quite evident that there is much prejudiced action, both official and non-official, concerning race. Examples include the *apartheid* movement in South Africa, which is tending to spread to the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland; problems of segregation and integration in the United States, where thirty states forbid inter-racial marriages in contravention of the Constitution of the United States; various signs of discrimination in some Canadian localities against Negroes, Orientals, Jews, Italians, and other "foreigners"; and some increasing signs of anti-White prejudices on the part of Asiatics and Africans in their own countries. On the other hand, there are some signs of pressures *against* any restriction of rights or privileges being based entirely upon colour of skin or place of origin, and having nothing to do with the intelligence, education, or mental ability of the individual.

Race prejudice is usually a deeply rooted tradition in families and institutions of the race claiming superiority. Others are considered inherently inferior, with fear that too close an association, particularly intermarriage, will of necessity cause deterioration in the "superior" race. The "inferior" race is therefore kept in a sub-average condition economically and socially by many subtle activities and attitudes as well as by legislation, and even by mob violence.

In the *Scientific American* of October, 1957, Morton Grodzins discusses a new pattern of segregation in the big cities of the United States. He suggests that the great increase of Negro population is being squeezed into the central part of the large city by various means, including social antagonism and various restrictive zoning, sub-division, and building regulations in suburbs. He says that Negroes do not necessarily "down grade" a neighbourhood or "push" Whites out, but that prejudice leads some Whites to leave and then real estate operators try to get higher revenue from Negro over-crowding by what they call "tipping" a building or neighbourhood.

Let us note in passing that members of the White race were the original aggressors in both situations where now there are major problems concerning integration or segregation of white and coloured races in South Africa and the United States. Perhaps the attitude of the Whites in both countries is largely based on one or more of the following: (1) the belief that descendants of slaves or conquered people are naturally inferior; (2) the fear of losing their present position; (3) ignorance of history; (4) a degree of subconscious racial conscience: to admit and grant equal status now is equivalent to admission of bad and unfair behaviour in the past toward the coloured people.

Is it really true that some races are inherently superior to others in any important characteristic? Is there evidence in history or in biology to support such thinking?

The oneness and equality of the human race is not a recent idea. Edith Hamilton, in *The Echo of Greece*, suggests that Zeno said in effect, "You must always remember that all men are your brothers, down to the vilest and most debased; all are sons of the same heavenly father. They are your family and your friends. Your fellow-citizens as well, because the whole world is the City of God and whatever happens to the least of God's children happens to the others."¹ The Apostle Paul in his famous sermon on Mars Hill in Athens stated that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." Quite recently Robert Green Ingersoll wrote: "Men are not superior by reason of the accidents of race or colour. They are superior who have the best heart—the best brain. The superior man. . . stands erect by bending above the fallen. He rises by lifting others."

Attempts to defend race prejudice on a theory of the inheritance of some particular type of blood are particularly fallacious. It is amusing but pathetic to learn that in some states of the U.S.A. the Red Cross segregates the blood of Negroes when collecting it to use in transfusions. Yet people who object to a transfusion of Negro blood have been willing to have a child brought up on the breast milk of a Negro wet-nurse, or on that from a cow or a goat, and raise no objections to an inoculation of antitoxin or other material from the serum of an animal! Of course the ancient and ignorant idea that blood is the carrier of hereditary characteristics is entirely wrong. Any differences between the bloods of individuals are entirely non-racial and cut across race. Except in the case of an abnormality in the placenta, no blood is exchanged between mother and child. Inheritance is by other means entirely, and therefore all the following expressions are entirely meaningless in fact, although they

can carry very dangerous meanings in the superstitious social senses: blue-blood, royal blood, pure-blood, full-blood, half-blood, good blood, blood tie, blood relationship, consanguinity, German blood, English blood, Jewish blood, and Negro blood. As a matter of history, the term "blue-blood" is said to have risen in Spain where certain old and proud Castilian families inherited a very fair complexion, so that their veins showed more prominently than in the rest of the population and appeared rather strikingly blue. The difference between an aristocrat and a commoner was thus easily recognized, or so it was thought, as a visible difference in blood. In their ignorance they did not realize that the blueness of the blood was actually an indication that it was relatively lacking in oxygen, charged with CO₂ and other *exhaust* products and, as a matter of fact, that the bluer the blood the dirtier it is! All theories about inheritance by means of blood were developed by groups trying to keep themselves what they called "superior"—chiefly during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the idea of genes and the true principles of heredity were entirely unknown. In 1927 Georgia enacted an elaborate statute forbidding the marriage of a White person to anyone but a White person. It defines a White person as including "only persons of the White or Caucasian race who have no ascertainable trace of either Negro, African, West Indian, Asiatic Indian, Mongolian, Japanese, or Chinese blood in their veins." One wonders just what test could be used in the laboratory to identify these various bloods!

A study of history reveals some interesting facts about race, one being that there is no such thing as a *pure* race. For example, G. M. Trevelyan says that in the history of Britain "wave after wave of seagoing adventurous races, or of races pushed behind by other adventurers, was flung upon Britain's southern and eastern shore."² Each group overran with more or less success the eastern and southern parts of the Island until they reached the mountain ranges of Wales, northwest England, and Scotland. Although the various strains became much intermingled, some special dominant characteristics have remained in Cornwall, Wales, the Highlands of Scotland—areas sometimes called the Celtic fringe of the Island. The pre-Celts, whom Matthew Arnold called "dark Iberians," were not all dark haired. Some were of the Mediterranean type and others of the Alpine type, and some of their characteristics have been inherited by every modern Englishman. The Celts, who tended to be tall, and fair or red headed, came to Britain and Ireland only a few hundred years before Julius Caesar, probably in two waves: first the Gaels, who are still found in Ireland and Scotland; secondly the Cymri and Brithons, still found in Wales.

To this mixture of peoples were added Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Jutes, and a number of Mediterranean-type peoples. Then came the Normans (Scandinavians who had been in France long enough to develop certain characteristics). They seemed to have retained the Viking energy in colonization and war, but had developed various components of Latin culture. Since the Norman invasion, most of the additional strains have come in peace, either for purposes of trading or as refugees. After this recital, what can we say is a pure Englishman or Briton in the ethnic sense? The same type of mingling of peoples through the ages has been true of practically all human beings everywhere. The process has been retarded or accelerated by such influences as geography, trade, and war.

Ashley Montagu states that "not one of the great divisions of man is unmixed, nor is any one of its ethnic groups pure; all are, indeed, much mixed and of exceedingly complex descent."³ Not only is this a fact of history and pre-history, but it was known and accepted by the peoples of the ancient world; and indeed up to the latter part of the eighteenth century there did not exist any notion in man's mind corresponding to the modern conception of race. According to Lord Bryce, "the survey of facts has shown us that down till the days of the French Revolution there had been very little in any country, or at any time, of self-conscious race feeling. . . . however much men of different races may have striven with one another, it was seldom any sense of racial opposition that caused their strife. They fought for land. They plundered one another. . . . But strong as patriotism and national feeling might be, they did not think of themselves in terms of ethnology, and in making war for every other sort of reason never made it for the sake of imposing their own type of civilization. . . . In none of such cases did the thought of racial distinction come to the front."⁴ It is perhaps not generally realized today that certain persecutions of Jews in the Middle Ages were for other reasons than race—chiefly religious, cultural, and economic resentments.

A study of history therefore reveals that *Homo Sapiens* probably represents a more complex inheritance of characteristics from all the types of various sub-species than is the case with any other species. The reason for this complex inheritance lies in his greater desire and ability to travel, both singly and in groups, over the face of the earth.

One thing is sure, no one race can claim that historically its *behaviour* has been such to entitle it to claims of superiority. In recent times the treatment of Ethiopians by Italians, of Jews by Germans, of millions within their own boundaries by Russian Communists, most certainly justifies the quotation, "man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." Earlier and ancient history follows much the same pattern,

and practically all races have been guilty at one time or another of great cruelty and uncivilized behaviour. In some cases the barbarian conquerors adopted the superior civilization of the remnant of the people they had almost annihilated. In China this occurred a number of times throughout the centuries. For example, the Mongols who conquered the Chinese and whose leader Kublai Khan founded modern Peking in 1279 later became absorbed by the Chinese. Many centuries before this, the people of Mahenjo-daro and Harappa, who had lived peacefully on the banks of the Indus for over a thousand years, were butchered by Aryan invaders about 1500 B.C., but many traditions and much of their civilization were adopted by the Aryans. The behaviour of the Spaniards in Mexico and South America, and the slave trade between Africa and southern North America, do not represent behaviour upon which the White race should base claims of superiority unless it be superiority in the ability to wantonly destroy human values.

It is interesting to contrast the Roman treatment of the early Britons with the treatment by the Britons' polyglot descendants of the Negro and other subject races. Julius Caesar found the Britons with an iron-age culture, and some Romans did not have a very high opinion of their possibilities. Cicero wrote to Atticus saying: "Do not obtain your slaves from Britain, because they are stupid and so utterly incapable of being taught that they are not fit to form part of the household of Athens." Fortunately others felt differently and allowed the Britons to develop and absorb the culture of the Mediterranean world with which they had come into real contact for the first time. In Caesar's day some African Negroes, who had long been in contact with other peoples, were in a much more advanced state of development than the Britons, who would have seemed to them a primitive people. But the Britons and their descendants have developed a civilization which has been sometimes called the Greece of the modern world, whereas the African Negro kingdoms became relatively isolated from other peoples and tended to stagnate for many centuries.

There are many other possible examples of cultural relativity. History and geography have much more influence upon culture and superiority than any fancied differences or superiority in "brains." Professor Otto Klineberg, after due consideration of the evidence, says: "We may state with some degree of assurance that in all probability the range of inherited capacities in two different ethnic groups is just about identical."⁵ As Montagu has pointed out, "the brain does not secrete cultural or intellectual power in the same way that the liver secretes bile. One is not born with the ability to think brilliantly."⁶ In other words, the advances of culture

have depended much more upon opportunity than upon some innate superiority of an ethnic group. For example, Australoid man is considered to be a sub-division of the Caucasoid or White division of mankind, and his primitive state is probably due to isolation, not to lack of capacity. Indeed, a few of these aborigines have developed quite brilliantly in recent decades.

To stress comparative equality in capacity is not to suggest any lack of differences, but these differences are cultural and developmental, not biological or fundamental. Erich Fromm summarizes this viewpoint very well:

The implicit assumption underlying much reactionary thinking is that equality presupposes absence of difference between persons or social groups. Since obviously such differences exist with regard to practically everything that matters in life, their conclusion is that there can be no equality. When the liberals conversely are moved to deny the fact of great differences in mental and physical gifts and favourable or unfavourable accidental personality conditions, they only help their adversaries to appear right in the eyes of the common man. The concept of equality as it has developed in Judaeo-Christian and in modern progressive tradition means that all men are equal in such basic human capacities as those making for the enjoyment of freedom and happiness. It means, furthermore, that as a political consequence of this basic equality no man shall be made the means to the ends of another group. Each man is a universe for himself and is only his own purpose. His goal is the realization of his being, including those very peculiarities which are characteristic of him and which make him different from others. Thus, equality is the basis for the full development of difference, and it results in the development of individuality.⁷

When we look as scientists into the subject of the "races" of mankind, we make some very interesting discoveries. According to Lancelot Hogben, "geneticists *believe* that anthropologists have decided what a race is. Ethnologists *assume* that *their* classifications embody principles which genetic science has proved correct. Politicians *believe* that their prejudices have the sanction of genetic laws and the findings of physical anthropology to sustain them."⁸ Lord Bryce has pointed out that since differentiation began in prehistoric times, the origin and attributes of the races of mankind are obscure and subject to fanciful hypotheses which can be neither verified nor refuted.

To explain the word "race" in any adequate scientific manner is very difficult, and use of the word begs the whole question. One can say that the three main divisions of mankind are the Negroid or black, the Caucasoid or White (including a large sub-division known as Archaic White, or Australoid), and the Mongoloid. Yet not one of these represents a long line of unmixed descent from a pure origin, but merely the predominance of certain genes or inheritable characteristics compared to

the average in either of the other divisions. In each there are many ethnic groups, all quite able to exchange genes across whatever boundaries (usually geographical) may separate them from other ethnic groups either in their same division or in one of the other great divisions of mankind. Such exchanges undoubtedly took place during thousands of prehistoric centuries. Any idea that some fixed and unchangeable type of germ plasma has been transmitted with unfailing regularity from generation to generation, perpetuating a particular type of personality and culture in pure form, is simply not true.

Dr. G. M. Morant, a distinguished British anthropologist, has declared that "the idea that a race is a group of people separated from all others on account of the distinctive ancestry of its members, is implied whenever a racial label is used, but in fact we have no knowledge of the existence of such populations today or in any past time. Gradations between any regional groups distinguished, and an absence of clear-cut divisions, are the universal rule."⁹ Montagu criticizes the older anthropological idea of "race" as being artificial, not corresponding with the facts, and leading to confusion and the perpetuation of error. Because it is so weighed down with false meaning, he thinks it should be dropped rather than given a new meaning.

The expression "ethnic group" does not depend upon any single inheritable characteristic, but upon the maintenance of physical and cultural differences because of such isolating mechanisms as geographic and social barriers. To call a large ethnic group a "race" does nothing to make it an unchangeable type which will continue to transmit fixed and identical qualities from generation to generation. To try to classify mankind by colour of skin or hair is about as sensible as to classify horses according to their colour. No one ever suggests that mental and temperamental differences of horses are involved according to their colour, as white, brown or black. Similarly with dogs, a particular breed may tend to have the same coloured hair, but temperament and hair colour are inherited independently of each other, and neither one influences the other.

Members of the White race often assume that their whiteness is a token of superiority. This assumption can be very seriously questioned. Indeed, the desire of many Whites to acquire brownness through tanning seems to indicate some doubt in *their* minds. There is some evidence that the human race originated in sunnier parts of the earth, requiring pigment as protection against ultraviolet radiation. Our more immediate ancestors wandered farther north (among the glaciers, as it were). Since we lacked the stimulus to produce pigment over many generations, our supposed

superiority becomes simply a deficiency adaptation on our part. If we called ourselves the "Bleached" race, the label might be more descriptive. Whether the Aryans of India and the Australoids remained black or remained proficient in producing sufficient pigment to protect against the sunny climes in which they now live is an unanswered question. Gloger's rule indicates that in mammals and birds melanin pigmentation increases in warm and humid climates but becomes less in cooler and more arid countries. The rule seems to apply to men and women.

Not only is the Negro not inferior on account of the colour of his skin, but in some respects he is more advanced biologically than the White. According to the relativist doctrine, culture and taste are entirely ways of thinking that develop in certain communities, and even Negroes who have been educated in Western culture, as in North America, sometimes consider that straight hair and white skin are preferable to kinky hair and black skin; but in the biological sense these two characteristics, along with general lack of body hair, are not marks of inferiority, but indications of a later development than the corresponding physical structures in Whites. In other words, they are indications that the evolution of the Negro is more advanced than that of the White. Consider, for example, that the gorilla and chimpanzee tend to have lank hair, thin lips, and a profusion of hair on the body. In these respects, therefore, the White man stands nearer to the apes than does the Negro. Of course, in actual fact these characteristics have nothing to do with superiority or inferiority. Biologists do not know with certainty why Whites have more nearly retained somewhat primitive characteristics of these types, but there are probably good functional reasons for the development in both groups. In the same way, probably the tendency to a broad nose has value for the breathing of air at relatively high temperatures, and the comparatively long, narrow nose of Northern races may be a development for breathing relatively cold air. Which type has the more aesthetic value depends entirely upon the point of view.

The average size of the brain has sometimes been cited as an indication of the superiority of the White races. Actually such an argument is something of a boomerang. Here are the average cranial capacities of a number of types: Negro—1400 cc; White races—1450 cc; Japanese—1485 cc; Polynesians—1500 cc; Eskimoes—1535 cc; Kaffirs—1540 cc; Neanderthal man—1625 cc. If one claims that the Negro is inherently our mental inferior because on the average his brain has a volume of 50 cc. less, then we must be logical and declare the Japanese and Kaffirs and in particular Neanderthal man to be very much our superiors in mental capacity. As our legal friends sometimes say, *res ipsa loquitur*.

Even if one so-called race were slightly superior to others, for how many generations and centuries would this be true? Inbreeding in a large group does not necessarily cause deterioration. Under some circumstances it may hasten evolutionary changes, but there is always some danger of over-emphasis of concealed deleterious recessive genes. This danger is reduced or eliminated by out-breeding. There is definite value in hybridization, whether in plants, animals, or man. Actually for many millennia all human beings have been hybrids, in that their immediate parents differed in many more than one gene. In other words, the human race became so mixed in prehistoric times that a "pure race" has become impossible. Hybridization is today proceeding more rapidly than at any previous period because migration and intermingling of peoples is so much easier.

It seems to be something of a tragedy, however, that while this process sometimes results in new types that are recognizably superior in some respects to the parent stocks, and are at least novel, prejudices often tend to render these novelties worthless and their possessors miserable. Particularly, wherever the White race has been in a position of authority it has tended to give very little opportunity to the individual of mixed breed. When such individuals have overcome their handicap, their accomplishments have often been so disconcerting to their alleged superiors that the facts have been distorted or suppressed. Let us consider a few examples of race mixtures. On Pitcairn Island the hybrid English-Tahitian descendants of nine English sailors, eight Tahitian men, and about twelve Tahitian women are unusually long-lived and taller than the average Tahitian or Englishman. They are vigorous, robust, healthy, and mentally alert, and they have shown originality and adaptability in their somewhat limited environment. Maori-White unions in New Zealand have resulted in an excellent type of hybrid. In Northern Australia, children of Whites and so-called Aborigines are physically excellent and possess intelligence, stamina, and resource, although handicapped by social prejudice. In Hawaii, Polynesians have intermarried with Japanese, Filipinos, Koreans, Puerto Ricans and others, producing hundreds of varieties. The mixed Hawaiian is in some respects superior to his progenitors. In Canada and the United States there is no evidence that Indian-White, Negro-White, and Chinese-White hybrids are in any way inferior to the average White.

To sum up the biological evidence, let us quote from an American biologist. Over thirty years ago William Castle wrote as follows: "So far as a biologist can see, human race problems are not biological problems any more than rabbit crosses are social problems. The rabbit breeder does not cross his selected races of rabbits unless he desires to *improve* upon

what he has. The sociologist who is satisfied with human society as now constituted may reasonably decry race crossing. But let him do so on social grounds only. He will wait in vain, if he waits to see mixed races vanish from any biological unfitness."¹⁰ On the other hand, F. H. Hankins suggested: "In the ever-changing texture of racial qualities and the infinite combinations still to be made there may in the future arise race blends quite as excellent as those which produced the age of Pericles, the wonderful thirteenth century, the Renaissance, or the present era in European civilization."¹¹

There is, therefore, no particular reason for feelings of superiority on the part of any so-called "race," because of its history in the long run or because of biology. The sources of race pride and prejudice are in traditions and in fears (economic, social, and political fears), and these traditions and fears are based on a vast ignorance of the essential similarity and oneness of interest in all types of *homo sapiens*. Please note that the *sapiens* has been added by *homo* himself.

The superiorities and inferiorities of what are called "races" exist only in the minds of men, not in fact. But the behaviour based on such ideas is not easy to eradicate. It is one thing to diagnose and another to treat successfully. To use a figure of speech, the best treatment for the disease of race prejudice is two-pronged, like the best treatment for a bacterial infection—increase the patient's resistance, and use drugs that are strong enough to destroy some of the germs but not so strong as to destroy the patient's tissues. The resistance of sane people to race prejudice will increase with education. Legislation that is enforced can destroy some of the behaviour which perpetuates the disease, but the place and time and type of legislation must be wisely chosen or it may destroy other important values in society.

The educational process concerning race prejudice can be carried out by conversation and writing, and by example. Two examples of the latter may suffice. In a new Montreal suburb two friendly White families opposed the plan of several others to force out a Negro sleeping-car porter, who had bought a house there. The plan was abandoned. In St. Louis, when two Negro families moved into a block occupied by Whites, some people thought the district would "deteriorate," and they put up "for sale" signs. One man, however, put up this sign: "This house is not for sale. We like our fine neighbours. Your race, religion, and politics are not our concern. All who take pride in their homes are welcome on this street." Some six "for sale" signs were removed. Reporters later investigated and decided that "deterioration" had not arrived.

Leadership on a larger scale is being exemplified in Kenya where a

White settler, Michael Blundell, is working hard to develop racial cooperation and gradual African participation in government. Associating freely with Africans in both social and business matters, he looks forward to a Kenya where each race has its rights and privileges but no race dominates.

The question of where and when to have legislation and enforce it is a difficult one. In the last few years the time has apparently arrived in the United States when the minority, who have been breaking both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution and the law in denying the fundamental rights of citizenship to Negroes, must be forced to observe at least the letter of the law and constitution. There can be little doubt that the former permissive attitude of government toward not only denial of the right to vote but even the mutilations and mob murders by a few sadistic Whites was not contributing much toward a solution of the problem of race prejudices. When people discover that their fears of integration in the schools are quite unjustified, it is probable that the majority of Whites who have been moderately opposed will no longer consider it is a problem.

Great care should be exercised in preparing legislation designed to protect minority groups against discrimination. It seems reasonable to suggest that various so-called races, religious groups, and political groups should have equality of opportunity and equal rights concerning what might be called *public relationships*. These would include not only the right to vote and take part in the government of the country but also equal rights to use public transportation and public and transient accommodation. For many centuries it has been recognized that although he operates a private business, the inn-keeper has certain responsibilities toward the public. At the same time legislation must not be such as would take away from the individual the right to choose with whom he wishes to associate in his private life. Premier Leslie Frost called the Ontario Fair Accommodation Practices Act of 1954 the proudest piece of legislation of his career. It was later found that it could not be applied to housing. Indeed, such an application would be of doubtful justice. While discrimination should not be allowed on the basis of colour, the landlord should have some right to choose who shall live in and on his property. If a law were to declare that he could not make such a choice, it would be quite unfair to him. Many landlords undoubtedly discriminate as to the *social* type of family whom they allow to occupy their housing. Education would seem to be the only relief in this case, gradually enabling both landlords and other tenants to realize that it is not the colour of the skin but the type of family or individual which is really obnoxious and undesirable

in a neighbourhood. This applies, of course, in the matter of one's social contacts as well.

An article in *Life* (February 17, 1958) entitled "The 'Unsilent Generation' Breaks Silence," consists of free comments by Princeton seniors, given anonymously, on their lives and futures. While essentially materialistic and selfish, some good points were made by a number of these students. In discussing certain types with whom he does not wish to associate, one commented: "But this is not a matter of disliking them or feeling superior to them. We are simply different. Intimate social contact would be pointless and probably boring on both sides." The idea contained in the last two sentences of this quotation is worthy of emphasis. The association of people of greatly differing interests and social customs can be very boring, uninteresting and unpleasant, or uncomfortable, to both; and the right to avoid such a situation must be maintained in any legislation such as a bill of rights. A similar rule must somehow be applied in immigration laws. When Barbados Premier Adames said of Canada, "Your immigration laws are worse than the McCarron Act in the U.S.," he was probably tripping over *his own* race pride, because the chief reason for banning immigration is to avoid introduction of people with entirely different economic standards, and the problems that would thereby be created. It is not an expression of race prejudice, but a recognition of an economic situation. Exclusion from immigration is applied to nationalities rather than to races.

One of the principal fears in the minds of those who talk and work against any clear integration of races is that of intermarriage. Looked at objectively, it will be seen that this fear results from a vicious circle in thinking. Many people have a strong race prejudice through fear of marriage between the races but, as we have seen, there is absolutely no biological reason against intermarriage—in fact, much may be urged in its favour. The reasons against it are entirely social and cultural, and the principal social and cultural objection is the fact that so many people have race prejudices that lead them to behave badly and unkindly toward mixed couples and particularly toward their children. The writer has been sometimes asked by otherwise intelligent people in a tone which implied that it was a crowning argument against integration of the races: "Would you want your daughter to be married to a Negro?" The answer has been: "No, but not because he was a Negro, but because of the difficulties that people like you would put in the way of their happiness and that of their children. However, in spite of such behaviour I would prefer to see my daughter married to an intelligent and cultured Negro than to some of the 'White trash' I have met." Here again education is needed.

There is no good reason against a free integration of the races of mankind except the imaginations and prejudices in the minds of some people. With modern communications, the process of such integration is proceeding with an increasing acceleration.

We must therefore reach the conclusion that, as a matter of simple justice, our laws should give the same degree of freedom for self development and for participation in public affairs and activities to every human being in the community regardless of creed, race, or colour of skin. As Rev. Martin Luther King of Montgomery, Alabama, has said: "The important thing about a man is not the colour of his skin or the texture of his hair, but the texture and quality of his soul."¹² Pointing out that the Negro is no longer content to think of himself in inferior terms, Dr. King writes:

The struggle for freedom on the part of oppressed people, in general, and the American Negro, in particular, is not suddenly going to disappear. It is sociologically true that privileged classes rarely ever give up their privileges without strong resistance. It is also sociologically true that once oppressed people rise up against their oppression there is no stopping point short of full freedom. So realism impels us to admit that the struggle will continue until freedom is a reality for all of the oppressed peoples of the world.

Since the struggle will continue, the basic question which confronts the oppressed peoples of the world is this: How will the struggle against the forces of injustice be waged.¹³

He then suggests that violence never solves social problems and that, if used by the American Negro at the present time, it will result in bequeathing to future generations "an endless reign of meaningless chaos." He thinks that non-violent resistance will eventually win—that it will not only win justice for the Negro but will win over those who at present oppose it. He says to the people of his own city: "We are out to defeat injustice and not White persons who may happen to be unjust." This Dr. King seems to be a very great man. If the victims of race prejudice have a few more leaders of his type and with his wisdom, and if others in the non-oppressed groups will speak up in the interests of truth and justice, possibly it will not be long before the problem of race prejudice will be solved. To quote Dr. King again: "It may well be that the greatest tragedy of this period of social transition is not the glaring noisiness of the so-called bad people, but the appalling silence of the so-called good people. It may be that our generation will have to repent not only for the diabolical actions and vitriolic words of the children of darkness, but also for the crippling fears and tragic apathy of the children of light."¹⁴

In spite of all that we see to the contrary, we have some grounds for hoping that world conditions may eventually approach those described by Tennyson, half questioningly, half prophetically:

When the schemes and all the systems, Kingdoms and Republics fall,
 Something kindlier, higher, holier—all for each and each for all?
 All the full-brain, half-brain races, led by Justice, Love, and Truth;
 All the millions one at length with all the visions of my youth?

All diseases quench'd by Science, no man halt, or deaf, or blind;
 Stronger ever born of weaker, lustier body, larger mind?
 Earth at last a warless world, a single race, a single tongue—
 I have seen her far away—for is not Earth as yet so young?—

Every tiger madness muzzled, every serpent passion kill'd,
 Every grim ravine a garden, every blazing desert till'd,
 Robed in universal harvest up to either pole she smiles,
 Universal ocean softly washing all her warless isles.

NOTES

1. Edith Hamilton, *The Echo of Greece*, p. 162.
2. G. M. Trevelyan, *The Mingling of the Races* (1934), p. 18.
3. Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (1945), p. 5.
4. James Bryce, *Race Sentiment as a Factor in History* (1915), pp. 25-26.
5. Otto Klineberg, "Mental Testing of Racial and National Groups," in *Scientific Aspects of the Race Problem* (1941), p. 284.
6. Ashley Montagu, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
7. Erich Fromm, "Sex and Character," *Psychiatry*, VI (1943), p. 23.
8. Lancelot Hogben, "The Concept of Race," in *Genetic Principles in Medicine and Social Science* (1932), pp. 122-44.
9. G. M. Morant, "The Future of Physical Anthropology," *Man*, XLIV (1944), p. 17.
10. William E. Castle, "Biological and Social Consequences of Race Crossing," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, IX (1926), p. 156.
11. Frank H. Hankins, *The Racial Basis of Civilization* (1931), p. 351.
12. Martin Luther King, "Out of the Long Night of Segregation," *The Presbyterian Record*, February (1958), p. 10.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*