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FOREWORD

BY SIR ARTHUR KEITH

Before my friend Professor John Walter Gregory begins his Conway Lecture, let me say a little about his adventurous life. His life is the key to his lecture. He is to speak to you about the difficulties and dangers which have arisen in our modern world as a result of the commingling of diverse races of mankind. He is, as you know, one of the most distinguished geologists of our time; but that does not explain why he is entitled to speak to-night as an authority on the rules which should be observed when white men settle in a black man’s land. As you trace the course of his life—one packed with unexpected turns and events—you soon begin to recognize his right to speak on the subject he has selected for his discourse.

He was born in London sixty-seven years ago. Although London is a menagerie of races, few of her children become anthropologists. Our lecturer’s place of birth does not explain his career. Nor does the fact that on leaving school he entered his father’s business, where he remained until he had reached his twenty-third year. Then something happened which landed him in that vast mausoleum of South Kensington—the Natural
History Museum. His love for sea-stars, sea-urchins, sea-cucumbers, and plant-like animals of the fore-shore came between him and business. They were not even modern sea-things which caught his fancy, but fossil forms dug from the chalk and formations underlying the chalk. And so he toiled in South Kensington, examining, describing, classifying, and publishing, thus becoming an authority on the geological history of his chosen groups of animal forms.

Specimens came to him from all parts of the world. That was not sufficient for him; he had to see the distant regions from which they came. When twenty-seven years of age he set out for North America to examine the geology of the Rocky Mountains and of the Great Basin. He became as much interested in the racial as in the geological problems of North America. What was the white American to do with his black brother? What was America to do with the immigrant flood which the diverse nations of Europe poured on her shores? The moment he began to brood seriously over these problems he became an anthropologist as well as a geologist.

Then in the following year (1892) he hastened to East Africa—to Kenya Colony—to the Great Rift Valley, and became pioneer, traveller, mountaineer, geologist, geographer, natural historian, and student of native races. He made basal discoveries, and brought home a harvest of observations and specimens. In that expedition to East Africa he blazed many new trails; he saw the country and its natives as they were before the white man made a home there. Soon after his return in 1893 he was rewarded by marriage,
choosing his partner from Essex—a county which has always had a peculiar attraction for him, and has now provided him with a home. Two years after marriage we find him crossing Spitzbergen as a member of Sir Martin Conway's Expedition. Tropical geologist one year; Arctic geologist a couple of years later.

In 1900 we come to the second unexpected turn in his career. He was then thirty-six years of age; he had been thirteen years in South Kensington; it looked as if he were to grow old in the service of the Museum and famous throughout the learned world for his knowledge of invertebrate forms—forms which flourished in our seas when the earth was several million of years younger than it now is. Melbourne University called him to fill her Chair of Geology, and thus he entered the second phase of his career, a short phase which lasted only four years. The great continental island presented him with new problems—problems of geology, palæontology, geography, and of anthropology. He had opportunities of studying primitive humanity living under primitive conditions, and took all the chances that came his way. He led an expedition to Lake Eyre. An account of that episode will be found in one of his many books—*The Dead Heart of Australia*.

In 1904, at the age of forty, he was again lifted from one side of the earth to the other. Glasgow called him to fill her Chair of Geology, and he answered the summons. So completely did he identify himself with his new surroundings that many, like myself, have supposed him to be a Scotsman! I hope our lecturer will accept this misunderstanding in the light of a compliment.
Anyhow, Scotland provided him with students and with problems. Her Highlands seem to be a paradise of geological puzzles; some of them still engage his attention. Glasgow gave him opportunities of studying the friction evoked by racial contact and the difficulties which attend the process of amalgamation of diverse nationalities.

The twenty-five years he spent in Glasgow were enlivened by excursions to distant continents. It is important we should note the attraction Africa had for him, because the message he brings with him to-night is based upon experiences gained on that continent. In 1905 he visited South Africa; three years later he made the acquaintance of Cyrenaica, that desert, isolated country in North Africa; in 1912 he led an expedition to Angola, thus completing his contact with all sides of the Dark Continent. In his visits to Africa, as to other regions of the earth, he has revealed himself to be not a narrow specialist, but as an observer and thinker who has permitted his eye to range over the land as a whole—its present problems (political and economic), its future possibilities, and its past possessions. When he speaks of racial problems of Africa he is speaking of what he himself has seen and experienced.

As a member of the Calcutta University Commission (1917–19) he visited India. The fact that he signed the minority report of that Commission—I dare say he drafted it too—need not surprise us; he is a man who formulates opinions for himself. He was struck by the appearance of the people of Calcutta—the prevalence among them of Mongolian traits. I mention the fact to reveal him as a persistent student of human races. Then
in 1922, at an age when most of us cease from strenuous exertion, came the most daring and hazardous of all his expeditions. He, in company with his son, coursed along the back-bone of Asia, exploring the geology of the "Alps of Chinese Tibet." Indeed, the only part of the earth which Professor Gregory seems to have omitted from his personal survey is South America.

He has an unrivalled knowledge of the races of mankind living in their native haunts in all parts of the world. Anything he has to say concerning the peoples of the earth must command our respectful attention. He has already summed up his anthropological experience in several publications—in contributions made long ago to Hutchison and Lydekker's *The Living Races of Mankind*; in contributions made to monthlies; in his *The Menace of Colour* (1925); and *Human Migrations and the Future* (1928). To-night we are to learn from his ripe experience what we must do if white men, yellow men, and black men are to live together and yet work out their separate destinies without coming to bloodshed.

One last word about our lecturer, and about his subject. He represents a type which becomes ever more uncommon among men of science: the man who takes the whole earth and its inhabitants as his province—a master of living knowledge. I have often marvelled how he has eluded the prying journalist so successfully. He has packed into his life more adventure than any writer of fiction would dare attribute to a hero of romance, and yet, outside his chosen circle and the wide and learned circle which drinks in his wisdom, he is just a professor among professors. How has he so
successfully eluded the popular eye? He has a secret—the secret of elusiveness, of unobtrusiveness, just the quality which is needed when we speak of races. You must not be misled by his diffidence and modesty.

Here in London we can discuss race problems with equanimity. What do we Londoners know of race feeling? We are ignorant as babies in this aspect of life. You have to live on a racial frontier before you realize the feelings and passions which race contact may engender. You have to live in an earthquake zone before you realize what panic means. To-night we shall hear race-problems discussed devoid of feeling. Our lecturer knows how race antipathies can burn; but, fortunately for him and for us, he is endowed with a gift which permits the quiet voice of reason to be heard above the din raised by hypocrisy, sentiment, and passion, which so often attend discussion on the politics of race. For the problems of race are in reality a conflict between reason and passion. Perfect ethics are easy in theory; they are terribly difficult in practice.
RACE AS A POLITICAL FACTOR

PART I.—THE INFLUENCE OF RACE

1. Growing Importance of Racial Problems.— The political issues of racial problems are of increasing complexity and importance, and are becoming world wide in range. In America—despite the noble efforts of the Conciliation Associations—Jerome Davis, of Yale, remarked in 1928 that “few Americans realize the importance or the extent of what is probably the greatest single issue confronting America, that of race relationships. No matter to what section of the United States we turn, we find a major racial problem stares us in the face. In the south the question of the Negro is easily one of our most perplexing conundrums”; in the East the industrial immigrants have introduced peculiar difficulties, and in the West the presence of the Japanese occasions serious friction and racial animosities.¹ In Africa the relation of Europeans to the native people, says General Smuts,² has become a “dominant issue of the

¹ Foreword to S. G. Emory, Immigration and Race Attitudes (1928), p. vii.
² J. C. Smuts, Africa and Some World Problems (1930), pp. 73, 30.
twentieth century," and by the contact of cultures in Africa we are, he adds, "facing the most perplexing racial situation which has ever been faced in the world." For Australia the White Australia Policy is now generally accepted in Europe as sound and just; but it is being followed by exclusion of South European immigrants, which may prevent Australia having a sufficient population for the profitable use of its costly developmental machinery.

Each of these questions is a phase of the world-wide problem of inter-racial relations which is spreading with the improvement of international communication, with the continued need for migration due to unequal distribution of population, with the more intense feeling of nationalism, with the growth of education and political ambition, and with the more sensitive public conscience that inspires the affirmative answer to the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

2. The Influence of Race.—Upon the efficacy of race there are three divergent schools of thought. According to one school, race is of fundamental importance, and the whole future of civilization depends upon race purity. Among the prophets of that school are Disraeli and Count de Gobineau.

Disraeli illustrated the importance of racial purity by reference to his own race.1 "The Hebrew is an unmixed race......The Mosaic

1 Disraeli, Coningsby, III, x.
Arabs are the most ancient, if not the only, unmixed blood that dwell in cities. An unmixed race of a first-rate organization are the aristocracy of Nature." One article in his doctrine was: Blessed are the pure in race, for they shall inherit the earth, while all mongrels shall be exterminated. "The fact is," he declared, "you cannot destroy a pure race of Caucasian organization. It is a physiological fact; a simple law of nature, which has baffled Egyptian and Assyrian Kings, Roman Emperors, and Christian Inquisitors. No penal laws, no physical tortures, can effect that a superior race should be absorbed in an inferior, or be destroyed by it. The mixed persecuting races disappear; the pure persecuted race remains."

The supreme importance of maintaining the purity of the white stock was upheld by Count Arthur de Gobineau¹—the founder of the Nordic school. He adopted three races of man—the black, yellow, and white. He accepted them, though with obvious reluctance, as divisions of one species. To this conclusion he found himself forced by the inter-fertility of the three races, and by the, to him, more weighty consideration—"the interpretation sanctioned by the Church."²

He described the white as the "great and

² Hotz, Translation of the first volume, p. 367.
noble race,” and his work is one long lamentation over its deterioration by dilution with the blood of the coloured people. He admits that racial intermarriages may improve the inferior type and may have some good results. “Artistic genius,” he says (op. cit., I, p. 358), “equally foreign to each of the three main types, has arisen only in consequence of the marriage of whites with the blacks.” But he declares that the resulting debasement of the whites is an evil for which the benefits count as nothing. Cross-breeding between the three main races he regards as the main cause of human degeneration. “Les peuples ne dégénèrent que par suite et en proportion des mélange qu’ils subissent, et dans la mesure de qualité de ces mélange” (ibid., I, p. 360).

The white races, which in his last volume he calls “the white species,” he declared, “was unmixed in the age of the Gods; it was moderately intermixed in the heroic age; in the age of nobles...... the race went swiftly downward...... owing to mixed marriages” (ibid., IV, 1855, p. 352).

The practical policy based on the doctrine of this school is that of preserving the ablest races unmixed in order that they may be maintained at the highest level of efficiency, and may continue their conquest of the forces of Nature, and their development of high standards in art and ethics. The influence of the successful races will then filter through to the less advanced peoples. According to this
view, the advance of humanity depends on the intellectual aristocracy among nations, as that of a nation is dependent on its highly specialized experts.

The second school regards race as a source of danger and discord, and, believing world-peace to be essential to further progress, hopes for the deracialization of mankind by widespread intermingling. Of this view the most brilliant advocate is Mr. H. G. Wells.

The third school denies that race has any existence apart from prejudice. "Race," says Professor Ross,¹ of the University of Wisconsin, "is the cheap explanation tyros offer for any collective trait that they are too stupid or too lazy to trace to its origin in the physical environment, the social environment, or historical conditions." "Our so-called race problems," says Professor Royce, "are merely problems caused by our antipathies."² Bruno Lasker attributes the upgrowth of race prejudice to education—in which Sunday schools have played a mischievous part—and to the extent to which the "insinuating tactics of selfish propaganda have succeeded in affecting social teaching."³

¹ E. A. Ross, Social Psychology (1909), p. 3. The traits, however, to which he refers are not physical, but social—such as: "Negro volubility, gypsy nomadism, Malay vindictiveness, Singhalese treachery, Magyar passion for music, Slavic mysticism, Teutonic venturesomeness, American restlessness."

² Josiah Royce, Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems (1908), p. 47.

PART II.—THE THREE HUMAN RACES

3. *The Term "Race."*—In the statement of these rival views there is considerable confusion as to the precise meaning of the term "race." It has two different meanings and origins. Its use in sport and for a rush of water is based on a Teutonic word. Its use for groups of animals and plants is based on the Spanish word *raza*, which has been derived from the Arabic *ras*, a head—a derivation which Professor Entwistle tells me that he discredits.

The range of the term "race" for a group of organisms varies indefinitely. The group may be small, as a stud of horses; or it may include a large number of individuals when used for a subdivision of species. Similarly, when applied to mankind a race may be a single family or dynasty, such as "the Bourbon race"; or it may be a clan or a tribe; or part of a nation, as when C. B. Davenport assigns the blue-eyed and dark Scots to different races; or a nation; or it may be more than a nation, as when Professor McBride divides the ordinary Europeans into three races; or it may be one of the primary divisions of man. It may, indeed, be used, as in Tennyson's "loss is common to the race," for all mankind.

4. *The Three Races of Mankind.*—The meaning that is steadily gaining ground is for one of the primary divisions of mankind,
of which according to general usage there are three—Caucasian, Mongolian, and Negro.

Professor Elliot Smith divides mankind into five races; the Mongolian, Negro, Caucasian (with four sub-divisions—viz., the blonde European, the dark southern European, the Semitic, and the Hamitic), the round-headed Alpine European, and the Australian.

Sir Arthur Keith, in his Presidential Address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association in 1919 on “The Differentiation of Mankind into Racial Types,” adopted as “the great racial stocks of modern times the white, black, and yellow,” and as “the three chief types of humanity the Negro, the Mongol, and the Caucasian or European.” In his latest work he adopts four primary groups, as he separates the Brown people from the Dark Europeans.

The Caucasians include most of the people of Europe, North Africa, and south-western Asia. They include the fair-skinned, blue-eyed Teuton, the dark-hued Italian and Spaniard, the Semites of south-western Asia, and the Hamites of the same area and of North Africa. As the typical Caucasian from the Caucasus is fair, it was at first customary to characterize the Caucasian as the White Race and include in it only the fairer Europeans and their descendants. The Jews and some of their allies were admitted, but not the darker com-

plexioned people of North Africa and southwestern Asia.

Colour is variable and unreliable as a racial characteristic. The Caucasian complexion darkens with exposure to the sun, and blondness persists only in extra-tropical regions. The Negro varies from black to brown or chocolate. That colour in all the races is dependent only on climate is refuted by the evidence of the American Mongolians, for the same skin colour persists throughout America from the Argentine through the tropics to Canada. As remarked of them by Flower and Lydekker,¹ “the colour of the skin, notwithstanding the enormous differences of climate under which many members of the group exist, varies but little.”

The colour of the skin is due to variable pigments. Disease of the supra-renal glands causes the deposition of a pigment which renders the skin of a white Caucasian dark brown. Leprosy whitens the skin of a Negro. The albino varieties of dark-coloured animals are white, and many fair-skinned animals become black by melanism. The variation in one species may be seen in the range from the black to the white rabbit. The complexion of primitive man was doubtless dark; and probably a change in food and climate led to a change in the supra-renal secretions that stopped the deposition of pigment. This

bio-chemical reaction caused the pale skin of the European. The change in colour happened after the Caucasian stem had branched off from those of the Negro and Mongolian.

A reversal of this secretional process may have led to the re-development of pigment in the dark or even black-skinned Dravidians of southern India; it is, however, possible that their dark hue may be due to the absorption of Negro blood, as is suggested by the broadness of the nose.

Colour, though no criterion of the primary races, is useful for the sub-divisions. Huxley divided the Caucasians into the White Caucasian or Xanthochroii of North-western Europe, and the Dark Caucasian or Melanochroii, which includes the brunette southern Europeans, the Berbers, Moors, Arabs, the ancient Egyptians and other Hamites, most of the people of India, the Australian aborigines, and some of the blackest of known tribes, such as the Somali and some Sudanese.

There is a deep prejudice against the term "Caucasian" as the name of one of the three primary races, since the typical Caucasians are fair and some authorities shy at including the ebony Somali and Sudanese in the same division of mankind as the Swedes and the Georgians.

The application of the term "Caucasian" to some dark types seems, however, no more inappropriate than the inclusion of the American Indians and the Malays in the Mongolian
Race, and no more incongruous than the inclusion of the Melanesian and the Bushman in the Negro Race. Sir Arthur Keith, in his latest pronouncement (*Ethnos*, 1931, p. 79), regrets Huxley’s disuse of the term “Caucasian.”

No doubt the term “Caucasian” is liable to misconception from the popular belief that it means the white man. Hence terms based on the hair should be used in addition to more popular names. The most definite physical distinction between the races is based on the hair; that of the Mongolian is round in cross-section, so that it hangs loose and lank, and, like a piece of string, does not coil in one direction. People with this lank hair are known as the Leiotrichi, or smooth-haired. The Negro hair is flattened in cross-section so that it coils up like a piece of ribbon and produces the woolly hair of the Negro, of which the extreme type is in the peppercorn-like pellets of hair of the Bushman. The Negro race is therefore known as the Ulotrichi, or woolly-haired. The Caucasian hair has an intermediate shape; it is oval in cross-section; it is wavy, and the race is known as the Cymotrichi or wavy-haired.

The distinction based on the hair was established by Pruner Bey¹ in 1864. It has to be

---

applied with some discretion, and only to normally developed hairs. Some of the less exposed hairs are irregular and variable in shape; but, according to Pruner Bey, extreme variations are "only met upon the same head when there is commixture of blood."

5. The Classificatory Value of Race: Mankind as One or More Species.—As to the classificatory value of the distinctions between the three races there has been extreme difference of opinion.

The sons of Adam are members of one body:
For they are made by one and the same nature,

wrote the Persian poet Sadi, and that view is adopted by the overwhelming majority of scientific opinion. Many anthropologists formerly held that the races of mankind should rank as distinct species, and three of them were named Homo caucasicus, Homo mongolicus, and Homo ethiopicus. The more extreme "polygenists" regard three species as inadequate, and Darwin quotes one claim for sixty-three. At first sight it appears absurd to place a Negro and a Norwegian in one species and the house sparrow and hedge sparrow in separate species. Many accepted species are based on less marked physical characteristics than those of the three types of human hair. Despite the physical differences, the fact that all people can inter-

sections, which show the variations, may be seen in Hans Friedenthal, Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte des Menschen (Jena, 1908).
breed and produce fertile offspring is taken as evidence that they all belong to one species. It has been often maintained that some human hybrids are sterile after a few generations; but it is generally agreed that, unlike the horse and donkey, whose progeny, the mule, is sterile, all human cross-breeds are as fertile as the pure stocks. Darwin,¹ after a characteristically judicious discussion of the question, concluded that man should all be included in one species; the primary divisions, he thought, might “with propriety” be called sub-species, but would probably “from long habit” continue to be called “races.”

The specific unity of man was reconsidered by high authorities at the First Universal Races Congress (London, 1911). F. von Luschan,² of Berlin, concluded that, despite all evidence to the contrary, we are forced to admit “the real unity of mankind,” and Ratzel³ that “there is only one species of man; the variations are numerous, but do not go deep.”

6. Nationality and Race.—Nationality, moreover, has no connection with race if the term be used for the primary divisions of man. It is fortunately unnecessary to attempt this evening to chase the elusive definition of the term “nation.” Israel Zangwill discussed and rejected the numerous definitions in his Conway

¹ Darwin, Descent of Man (2nd edit. 1874), p. 175.
³ Ibid., p. 31.