

747

THE ARMY INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE  
Washington, D C

Course 1936-1937

THE RACIAL FACTOR AS A DETERMINANT IN NATIONAL POLICIES  
by  
Doctor Lothrop Stoddard, Author

April 26, 1937

AIC 229 (5-14-37)23

THE RACIAL FACTOR AS A DETERMINANT IN NATIONAL POLICIES

It certainly is a great pleasure to foregather with you gentlemen and to give you substantially the talk that I have given off and on before the Naval War College at Newport since Admiral Sims' day. The general title they give this talk of mine down there is "The Racial Factor as a Determinant in National Policies". The racial factor is not only unconsciously but consciously determining world affairs and helping to mold national policies today perhaps more than ever before because people are becoming more race conscious as time goes on. For instance, you have the racialist concept of Nazi Germany on the one hand and the distinctly anti-racialist doctrines of Communist Russia on the other.

Now race, which is so often termed race prejudice, or race consciousness, is something that is no mere invention of theorists or propagandists. It represents a very deep-going instinct that is shared not only by men but by animals far down in the animal kingdom. Usually different varieties of animals do not interbreed normally. They will interbreed in captivity but not under normal conditions. Generally there is a strong consciousness of kind which prevents them from mating. We have outstanding examples, such as the gray rat and the black rat, which are deadly enemies and one drives out the other. Usually the gray rat drives out the black rat.

Man seems to have been very race conscious. Insofar as we know, in the early varieties of men, such as the Cro-Magnons and the Neanderthals, there was practically no intermixture between the two - no immediate specimens have been found. What happened was that one variety of men instinctively disliked the other kind and killed them off, probably ate them, before the institution of slavery, when it became more profitable to keep captives and get them to work instead of kill them and possibly eat them, then for the first time we have the beginning of a fairly widespread crossing of different varieties of men. Now modern science is tending to show not only the fact that different sub-varieties of the same species tend to keep distinct but has justified feelings which formerly were regarded as prejudices and given people a reason for dignifying emotions that previously were reprobated by humanitarians and religionists, etc. Therefore, today, as I say, that is one of the reasons why the racial factor is becoming

more and more a conscious determinant in the formation of national policies and national feelings. It played its part, for example, unaccountably in reinforcing our exclusionist immigration policies, keeping out the orientals. While the main factor undoubtedly was the economic factor, the fact that the oriental could underlive the white man, nevertheless these racial evidences are used by modern science to reinforce the exclusionist policies to a considerable degree.

We have a curious paradox in this world of ours today. Modern science, the development of communications, and other evidences are physically shrinking and unifying the planet as never before, and are bringing into effective contact peoples who formerly hardly knew of one another's existence. But this increasing shrinkage of the planet, this more and more effective throwing of peoples into effective juxtaposition with one another, at least economically, does not necessarily make for friendship and for amity. If you bring strangers together and they like one another and get along well together friendship develops, but if they do not like one another hostility develops, which previously was impossible. And so you have here increasing tensions between different kinds of men, and those points of friction sometimes have extraordinary repercussions. The world in a sense is becoming a sounding board where the clash of races and of national aspirations may have the most momentous results. Before I come to the concrete illustrations of this, I want to make one point clear and that is the distinction between race and nationality. While race prejudice, or race consciousness, is, as I say, an instinctive thing that goes back almost to the very origin of life itself, nationality is a distinctly human concept, and a rather sophisticated concept at that. It arises fairly late. In a nutshell I may say, the difference between race and nationality is this: that race is what people biologically really are (we cannot change it), nationality is what people politically think they are. You may have people of the most diverse racial stocks sometimes having a common sentiment of nationality, although that is rare because usually you have to have, in order to have people acquire the national instinct, the feeling of belonging to a nation in the deep sense. You cannot have too great distinctions in race. For example, while the Negro in this country is civically our fellow citizen and while he thinks of himself as an American, yet we know perfectly well that we do not regard the Negro, although technically our fellow citizen, as we regard a white American. There is a very deep-going distinction there, and beyond a certain point he is not admitted to be the same as ourselves. Of course, you get some rather interesting cross currents in

949

the effective shaping of national policies and ideals. For example, you have, what you might term, racialist doctrines, such as that in Nazi Germany today. Now, of course, modern Germany is not predominantly a Nordic country. While the ancient Germanian known to the Romans was undoubtedly almost purely Nordic in blood, that is, tall, fair haired people, in the course of time, as you know, the time of the fall of the Roman Empire, most of the Germanic tribes went into the Roman Empire and their place was taken by Alpine Slavs, that is, belonging to what is known as the Alpine race, the round or broad headed and fairly thick set, medium-dark complexioned people who came in from Central Asia and occupied the old Germany and pretty well to the line of the Elbe. Afterward, from Charlemagne's time on, we have what the Germans called the Drang nach Osten, the push toward the east, when they tried to reconquer and regermanize the land which their ancestors had abandoned. In the process, of course, the great numbers of the Slavic tribes, although conquered, were not exterminated, and so you get as you go east in Germany an ever larger proportion of Alpine broad heads, a darkening of the complexion, and a less and less percentage of Nordics. The same thing has taken place in southern Germany. Great numbers of Slavs poured into Bohemia and the adjacent Black Forest area. The troubles of Germany during the middle ages, especially the Thirty Years' War which killed off over something like three-fourths of the population, was a terrible blow to the Nordics and many of the lands were again occupied by the low-standard Slavs pouring in from the east.

Of course the Nordic-minded Nazis have no illusions on the subject. The idea many people have in this country that the Nazis claim Germany as a land of pure Nordics is absurd. What they have in mind is the reNordicising of Germany favoring the Nordic element in every way and the creation of a racially-minded people. They are already undertaking various eugenic measures. You know of their eugenics courts which attempt to weed out the unfit, the moronic, and the persons afflicted with certain diseases, by sterilizing and thus removing their strains from the population. So for the first time in history probably, you have a nation consciously guided by racialist and eugenic considerations, which is a very interesting experiment. Their idea is, as one of the chief Nazi thinkers expresses it, "Not what we Germans today racially are but what we shall become by the constant elevation and purifying, bettering of our stock generations hence." It is a long-range program. It goes over many generations.

On the other hand, you have Soviet Russia. Of course

the communist idea is that racial distinction does not amount to anything. Some actually deny that it amounts to anything, others admit that it may amount to something but they hold the environmentalist idea that the brain of the individual at birth is almost a blank sheet on which you can write practically at will and with a sufficiently intensive system of education and public pressure, etc., you, in a strong governmental policy, can mold people and develop them almost at will. Personally I do not believe that. I think the racial factor is the primary factor, that education is merely a bringing forth of that which potentially exists, that people racially do differ metaphysically, mentally, and psychically, and that those differences are very deep-going and cannot be eradicated by training and education, although they may be somewhat hidden and certain traits may be developed in their maximum but only to the maximum in quality at birth.

To show you how these clashes on a racial basis may ramify throughout the world, I can use no better illustration than the illustration I have used for years - the troubles in Kenya. Kenya, you know, is part of British East Africa. It is a highland area just back from the coast here (indicating). Due to elevation, it enjoys a cool climate and white men can not only live there and work, with proper precautions (of course in the tropics, as you know, although it may be cool, the actinic rays of the sun are more powerful than they are at sea level) but furthermore they can raise families of healthy children, which is not true, of course, in the tropical regions at sea level. In course of time a considerable population of Britishers, mostly of a very energetic, pioneer type, younger sons and that sort of thing, went in there and established themselves as ranchers, principally, (ranchers or plantation owners) and they have a considerable white settlement. Of course they use colored labor - the white man does not work in the fields.

In Kenya you have a variety of Negro races of somewhat different kinds but mostly on a pretty primitive level. As is usually the case, in the first stages they gave no trouble. Once they had been conquered and submitted, they accepted the white man as their master, they did not have any of these modern ideas of nationality, etc. There was very little friction. Along the coast there was a certain percentage of Mohammedan Arabs, or half Arabs, because from the stronghold at Zanzibar the Arab traders and slavers for centuries had been fronting this coast (indicating). But that was a minor factor. What had happened was that in the development of the plantations along the coastal districts

the early British government had allowed a large number of indentured laborers to come in from India, mostly low-caste Hindus, and these Indians, many of them, had chosen to remain. Unfortunately the terms of their indenture did not specify repatriation and so these people were there, they brought over their women, they bred with proverbial Hindu fecundity, and they became so numerous that even up in Kenya they outnumbered the relatively small numbers of whites. They were mostly market gardeners, and small traders (peddlers), and they enjoyed a very unenviable reputation. For instance, they were illicit purveyors of drink to the natives. Throughout the British colonies the sale of drink to the natives is usually forbidden because of its disastrous results upon the natives. The native is fond of it and he gets it through fermented beer, which gives him somewhat of a head but does not do him any great harm. However, when he gets hold of ardent spirits he is like the Hindu Mark Twain mentioned in his trip around the world, "No arinkee for drinkee, drinkee for drunkee". The native rapidly crinks himself into an early grave when he can get hold of sufficient ardent spirits.

Incidentally, there is a very bad feeling between the Hindus and the African natives. The African natives, if given a free hand, would promptly probably kill off all the Hindus, but with the rise of the nationalistic movement in India, especially after the war (you know Mr. Gandhi had been down here in Natal, South Africa, where there is also a Hindu problem, and the nationalists championed the rights of these people) there was a strong drive in India, as a reward for its war services, to have East Africa turned over to India as a dependency, where the wholesale immigration of Indians could go and establish themselves an outlet for that population. That was strenuously resisted, not merely by people in England but also by the intensely self-conscious white colonials of South Africa. They absolutely vetoed the establishment on the dark continent of an immense and rapidly multiplying reservoir of Hindus who would immediately intensify this local situation in Natal, which they had fairly gotten under control. At least the Indian nationalists insisted that, having been granted the status of British subjects, although under the very loose commonwealth of nations system, the British central government could not compel the dominions to admit Hindu immigrants into their territories. East Africa was not a dominion, not a self-governing dominion but a crown colony under the imperial government, and the government could do practically what it wanted to, so these people put the presentation of further immigration is not permitted at least the resident Indians should be given the full grant of rights of

British subjects, including the vote. Well, the result would be that if you had had the vote extended to these people they would have outvoted the whites, they would have set up a Hindu local government and the whites simply, absolutely said "Look here, we won't stand for this for a minute." They formed themselves into an armed association similar to the Boer commandoes and said (I have talked to their leaders, they were frank) "We will die rather than submit to this thing, and we do not intend to die. We intend to start a rebellion. We will start another Battle of Lexington if they try to put us white men under the heel of these wretched Hindus. We have the dominions with us." And the dominions made it perfectly plain that they would never allow anything like that. There was something that threatened to split the British Empire. That was the situation a few years ago, it has been smoothed over since.

In the meantime, you have the African natives arousing to self-consciousness through the introduction of modern gadget and modern ideas, and not merely looking less favorably upon the white man but also having very great race consciousness against these brown-skinned Hindus they detested. In that ferment you have certain Negro agitators coming in who had already begun to make trouble here under the assertion of Negro rights, not merely from South Africa but from West Africa and also some Negro radicals from the United States. There you have this area of friction way up here in the high lands of Central Africa having repercussions which threatened serious complications for the white members of the British Empire because not merely South Africa but Australia, New Zealand, and, to a considerable extent, Canada, were behind these white men down here. You have the whole of this vast seething mass of India stirring, you have the repercussions of the black men in South Africa and West Africa, and even our Negro population of the United States, so you can see how these racial factors do ramify and how they have most extraordinary repercussions in seemingly impossible, distant places.

I could talk all day if I were to go into detail, to sketch the various interpenetrations of this racial factor that is imminent, its national policies, so I will just pass you briefly over situations which are presumably quite familiar to you and concentrate upon those with which possibly your attention has been least directed. In the first place, the whole situation in the Far East is very familiar to you. Of course, as you know, the peoples of the Far East are by no means racially the same. They may look the same to us but they do not look the same to one another. In China you have

957

considerable racial differences between the south and the north. As you go south you get an increasing amount of Malay blood. Of course the Japanese are largely basically Malay. They undoubtedly represent the Malay northward push, although they are mixed up with Mongoloids, Koreans, proto-Chinese, and even the mysterious Ainus, who undoubtedly are some offshoot of the primitive Nordic people. The Ainus must have a certain amount of Nordic blood in them because very frequently they have gray or green eyes, extremely abundant hair, and other characteristics which denote a certain amount of Nordic, or at least proto-Nordic, blood. As you know, these Far Eastern peoples are developing a self-consciousness, and the differences in temperament which spring from their different racial origins undoubtedly play the part. You know of all the repercussions of the attempted outward push from these overcrowded lands, the factor of Chinese and Japanese immigration which threatened at one time or another the thinly settled lands like Australia and the west coast of America, the United States, and Canada, and which has necessitated very drastic exclusion legislation, legislation which I regard as absolutely vital and salutary but which is good only so long as there is effective force behind it, because were it not for our Army and Navy and the determination of our population to maintain those policies those exclusion laws would be just so many scraps of paper, would not prevent for a moment the wholesale influx of vast numbers of people from overcrowded China and Japan and possibly other regions of the Far East. That I shall pass over, because it is familiar ground to you.

Incidentally, the situation in India is, to a certain extent, motivated by race. Of course, you know that vast mass of humanity, numbering today something like three hundred fifty millions, is by no means racially uniform. There are vast differences in race. The people in Southern India belong mostly to the ancient Dravidian stock, the dark stock, in fact, there is a good deal of proto-Negroid blood. There is a Negroid belt of territory which extends not only in Africa but entirely along Southern Asia. You find Negroids, not necessarily migrants from Africa (of course there is a good deal of Negro blood brought in through slavery) but a more ancient Negroid strain in Southern Arabia, Southern Persia, a great deal in the Negroid tribes of the jungles and mountains of India, and of course you get the Negritos in the Philippines and Negroid elements in Southern China as well, etc. There is a Negroid strain throughout there. You get that dark or Negroid element pretty much in Southern India, but as you go north you have the very mixed descendants of the Aryan conquerors of India, who undoubtedly were Nordics. They were

tall, light-complexioned people, and their lives, as you read them in the earliest writings of sacred Vedas, depict a Nordic consciousness. Among other things, they had what is stronger among the Nordics than any other race, a very strong race consciousness, and they abhorred these people and abhorred the idea of contact with them. They attempted to perpetuate their identity by establishing the caste system. Although it is a very complicated subject and I do not have time to go into it, what happened probably was that the bulk of the Aryan invaders stayed in the Punjab and then war bands, something like the Spanish Conquistadores here in Central and South America ranged far and wide and with greatest ease conquered these much inferior and feeble aborigines, established themselves as overlords of these people, and in all probability took a considerable number of native women as their concubines. After that thing had been going on for a generation or so they came to realize the consequences of it and tried to stop further wholesale interbreeding by the establishment of the caste system, but what probably took place was that these half castes were included in the upper caste and that introduced a sufficient amount of colored blood permanently to perpetuate the type although even today in India the high-caste Hindus are almost white. In fact, there are one or two sects which are, and have been for many centuries, extremely careful to inbreed among themselves, and many of those today have blue eyes and rosy cheeks and more or less brown, or even occasionally fair hair. But there are all sorts of races in here (indicating), and their temperament varies extremely, as you know, between the weak and unwarlike Bengalis and some of the peoples of Southern India who are also weak and unwarlike, and the very warlike peoples of Northern India, such as the Rajputs, the Sikhs, and the Northern Mohammedans, who represent still more recent immigrants, invaders from Central Asia, not Nordics this time but of Turkish origin. Then you have the strains of Mongoloid peoples in Nepal, Sikkim, and all these border regions, and those connote very distinct differences of temperament, very distinct differences of type, and those things, to a certain extent, coincide with the religious differences which go so deep here in the east.

India is not in any sense a country, it is a sub-continent inhabited by very widely differing and mutually antagonistic peoples and the idea entertained that India can, in the near future, become in any sense a nation is absurd. If the British left India, India would immediately become probably a most terrific center of internecine war, unless it was stopped by the intervention of some other power.

952

I want to come somewhat nearer home and discuss the situation in Latin America, because you have a situation developing there that I think will give us a great deal of concern, a great deal of trouble in the not distant future. Of course, when you speak of Latin America - it is a misnomer. The term "Latin" America connotes the portion of America inhabited by peoples of the so-called Latin stocks, that is, Spaniards and Portuguese, etc. Well, as a matter of fact, Latin America never has been predominantly Latin and never has been predominantly white. It has always been predominantly Indian, with a large Negro infusion in various places. Of course, the Conquistadores were very few in numbers, they did not as a rule bring large numbers of their women, they settled down as conquerors and took enormous numbers of the Indian women as their concubines, and they produced a vast number of half-breed children known as Mestizos.

In time they began to import large numbers of Negroes into the tropical islands of the Caribbean and the tropical parts of South America. There you have not merely the intermixture of white and black (Mulattoes) but you also have the intermixture of Indians and Negroes producing the combination known to the Spaniards as Zambos. So you have the most extraordinary combinations here. In some parts of tropical Latin America, along the tropical coasts, you have the most terrific mixture. As those of you who have been to Panama know, you see mongrelization there, including descendants of Chinese. It is a perfectly awful combination. You know what a poor lot Panamanians are for the most part. What happens in wide racial crossings is this. Although there are probably many thousand unit characteristics carried by the Genes, these unit characteristics are not a fortuitous concurrence of separate atoms, they are linked - and sometimes the links are very long. You see it physically, for example. Probably the best known illustration is the linked combination of red hair and the delicate skin which freckles easily, and the gray or green or blue eyes. You very seldom, almost never, see dark complexioned people who freckle tremendously and you do not usually see white people with a brunette skin and a flaming crown of red hair. It just does not happen more than - well, it is the exception that proves the rule. Modern biology has shown that these characteristic linkages are not merely physically but psychologically very numerous, and they come about as a result of ages of relative isolation in interbreeding which establish the outstancing norms in the racial types. In the world today you have a racial organism which contains many linkages and which tends to perpetuate itself. When you interbreed two very distinct human species, you immediately start to break

down the linkages and once the process starts it continues. You cannot tell what is going to happen by the first cross. Subsequent crosses, especially the intermarriage or the interbreeding of these first crosses, produces a situation finally where you get an absolutely, or almost absolutely, indeterminate biologically. You just cannot tell what is going to come out. That naturally is a chaotic condition and you have a tremendous range of variability. If it was possible to take a hand in the thing and scientifically oversee this business, as Luther Burbank did with his plants, you might get some remarkable combinations and then perpetuate those and vastly improve the human species, but you cannot do that because you cannot destroy your waste products. When Luther Burbank wanted a new result he would breed consciously for that result. He might get it in one out of a thousand instances and he would save that one instance and destroy the 999 others, take them into a pile and burn them up, but you cannot do that with human beings. The evidence points to the fact that the undesirable results of wide mixture are much more numerous than the desirable, therefore, you get an accumulation of chaotic, unpredictable, uncertain humanity that gives you political instability, social instability, enormous incidents of neurotic or unbalanced individuals, and is on the whole a bad thing. The losses immensely outweigh the gains. You can see that by the unstable nature of the mongrel peoples of tropical America. I think they are probably the best instances of the results of that sort of thing. You know perfectly well that these people are politically un governable. What is happening, for example, in Porto Rico today as an instance of that thing? They have been for something like thirty or forty years under American rule, but we know perfectly well that if American oversight were withdrawn we would have the condition in Porto Rico that we have today in Santo Domingo, we would have conditions that exist elsewhere in Latin America. These peoples have got to be governed by the strong hand, whether the strong hand is benevolent or whether it is an unprogressive and squalid local tyranny.

What is the new development that is happening in Latin America? Until the revolution against Spain the white man was the uncontested top dog, but unfortunately the Spaniards kept all the plumes of office to themselves, (that is, the Spaniards of Spain) and they looked down with high disdain upon the native-born whites, known as Creoles. The word "Creole" originally had no racial significance. It comes from the Spanish word *criollo*, which means a little snoot. It referred to those born in the colonies as distinct from those born somewhere else. In former days they spoke

753

of Creole and Spanish-born whites among the Spaniards, and also Creole and African Negroes.

During the breakdown of Spanish central government due to Napoleon's occupation of Spain in the early years of the 19th century, you have the Spanish authority weakened and the Creole whites taking advantage of the situation to lead insurrections against Spain. What the Creole whites had in mind was that they were to take the places of the Spanish-born Spaniards when they were kicked out, and to run the country. But the struggle was very long and desperate, a terrific struggle, and great numbers of the native whites and all the Peninsular Spaniards, the loyalists, were killed or expelled. As the remaining Creole whites were too few to win independence themselves, they had to call upon the halfbreeds and the native Indians and Negroes to fill their armies. These elements demanded their reward, and so in a very short time you have the attempt to break down Creole ascendancy. The leaders of the revolt were very much disillusioned. Bolivar, the leader of the whole thing, went into exile. In his last years he made this prophetic remark: "South America is ungovernable. We who have made the revolution have plowed the sea." That was largely true throughout a large part of the 19th century. You have conditions approximating anarchy in all these regions (indicating). You have a differentiation, of course, due to the development of rapid communication, you have certain areas of South America open to large-scale European immigration. That was true in Argentina, in Uruguay, in the southern provinces of Brazil especially, and, to a lesser extent, in Chile and those countries where there have been very few people of any kind in colonial times, because the Spaniards during colonial times were interested in gold, silver, and certain valuable tropical products. They were not interested in the relatively cool, temperate lands. Through wholesale European immigration, you have those parts of South America become really white man's countries, and even in the tropics and upland regions you have certain relatively small areas dominantly white settlements, such as the high land of Colombia, and Central America. But elsewhere you have an increasingly mixed mongrel strain in those parts where the native Indian did not survive in great numbers. One of those places, of course, was Mexico. Diaz, although partly Indian himself, headed the so-called Cientifico regime, which was largely a government of whites or near-whites, an aristocratic government favorable to foreign capital and relying upon the white world. With the downfall of Diaz you have a really racial civil war - the uprising of the darker halfbreeds, the mestizos (there are practically no Negroes in Mexico) arousing the Indian masses. In

Mexico today the old whites have been submerged. They have either been killed off, are in exile, or they are politically impotent. You have a government today, not of the native Indian but of the halfbreed. The Mestizo element in Latin America, or wherever you find it, is essentially unstable. The darker Mestizos hate the light Mestizos and they rely on the Indian, so what you have unquestionably is the increasing resurgence of Indianism. It is a revolt not merely against the political domination of the white man or even the economic domination of the white man, but against the whole of the white man's ways, his ideals, and everything connected in the resurgence of the primitive Indian ideals, which are those of the tribe and clan, and you have a resurgence of Indianism all down this Andean region, where large numbers of Indians have survived, where they today form the basis of the population. Of course, Costa Rica is a little white, or semi-white, island, likewise in Colombia, because this part of the country (indicating) is largely settled by whites and it is fairly much a white man's country. The hinterland is occupied by wild Indians, known as Indios Bravos. They haven't arisen to the point where they have any political ideas at all - they just live in the woods and keep to themselves. In Venezuela there was no Indianist movement because there are practically no full-blooded Indians, except the Indios Bravos in the hinterland. Probably not more than ten per cent of the blood of Venezuela is white, and the number of pure whites is very, very small. There you have mongrel conditions which approximate the conditions in northern Brazil. When the Portuguese came over already they were not pure whites. There you see a very sad result of intermixture. The Portuguese of the early middle ages were pretty fine stock but in the later middle ages they did two things: they not only conquered and expelled the Moors in southern Portugal but they also made great discoveries and founded their colonies all down the west coast of Africa. Finally, of course, they reached India and established an empire in India and the Spice Islands of the South Seas. What you get here are enormous tracts of land in southern Portugal, the Algarve and other provinces, which were practically empty of population (Moors expelled wholesale) and these lands were given as fiefs to nobles or the church. It was just at this time that the Portuguese navigators were discovering the west coast of Africa, and the obvious thing was the bringing in of great numbers of slaves to profitably work these lands. So there was a very large Negro population of slaves in southern Portugal, and in time there was a great deal of interbreeding of Negro women and white men. Therefore, you have the whole population of southern Portugal permanently darkened and with Negroid

traits in southern Portugal today. Among the upper classes you get a relatively pure white stock.

About this time the Portuguese began to settle in Brazil. These people, with very little race consciousness to start with and certainly many of them with a "touch of Au Tar Brush", settled this country (indicating) and began to breed with the native Indians, who were for the most part Nomads. There were no large blocks of population, such as in the high land of Peru or the great Aztec Empire of Mexico. The Portuguese who went inland were an adventurous cowboy population. They interbred with the Indians and formed a more or less Mestizo people. Then the people along the coast who founded plantations immediately began to import enormous numbers of Negroes from the West African colonies, and so today you get, all along the coast in Southern Brazil, until you get pretty well down around Sao Paulo, a black, or very strongly negroid, population, while in the interior you get a pretty thoroughly Mestizo population.

We all know the instability of the Brazilian type. Also, there is a distinct cleavage between north and south Brazil because during the nineteenth century there was a tremendous influx from Europe. There were several hundred thousand Germans who kept white, who have a strong color line and refuse to intermarry with Negroes and Mulattoes, there was an immigration of Italians, mostly from northern Italy, who are very different from the mongrel Italians from the south and who also have a strong racial consciousness, so you have in southern Brazil a predominantly white population with (it isn't as strict as ours) a color line, whereas in northern Brazil you have practically no color line. It is true that white blood does have a distinct social prestige and it usually seems to correlate with economic efficiency and success. There have been a number of very interesting biological and sociological studies made, and it seems to be pretty clear that although there is more freedom for the individual regardless of race in Brazil than anywhere else in the world, still the Negro is at the bottom of the pile and the white, or near-white, is on top.

The periodic civil wars in Brazil between the south and the north are very largely motivated by difference in temperament and by distinct racial considerations. It may in time very well be that Brazil will break up into two parts. The mongrel north and the white or near-white south with its different ideals and different temperaments, etc., will break away from one another and establish separate national

identities The Andean region, with the exception of Colombia through Peru and Bohemia until you get to Chile, is predominantly a red man's land, and in those countries Ecuador, Bolivia, and Peru, you have the resurgence of Indianism as a conscious thing - revolt against the white man, revolt against his civilization, his ideals, etc All this movement is very largely affected by communistic radicalism, but you must remember that the Indian is a primitive communist He does not understand private property, he has very little personal initiative Land given our Indians went usually for riotous living and between drink and Rolls Royces our oil-rich Indians were as poor as they were at the start, and it was to revive the more or less communal ownership of the tribal land that the Howara-Wheeler Bill was passed Undoubtedly it corresponds to the mentality of the Indian, at least the full-blooded Indian, who does not respond to our civilization In the same way, you have a reinforcement of the primitive communism of these Indian people The ancient Inca Empire of Peru was thoroughly communistic The people submissively and happily lived their lives The same was true of the various missions established especially by the Jesuits. They were very successful as long as they had complete control over the Indians (a government of paternal despotism) but as soon as that authority was removed, the Indians at once relapsed into their native characteristics. And so you have this Indianist movement that is going to cause a great deal of trouble because you are going to have the halfbreeds striving for power, striving to break the ascendancy of the white, or near-white, aristocracy, then you are going to have them fall out among themselves, you are going to have the darker Mestizos more and more stir the Indian mass itself, and you are going to have the Indian revolt against everything white increase very rapidly There is a serious aspect to that You may say "Well, let them stew in their own juice, what of it?" It makes just this difference If you have the Indian mentality prevail there, you are not going to have any more strong government, you are going to have very weak government, and that is going to be an area of extreme weakness and low pressure, which is going to be a great temptation for other people across the Pacific, especially for the Japanese The Japanese, as you know, are very much alive to this thing They are not doing much about it except in an economic way They have tried to advance some colonies here and they have been fairly successful, especially in Brazil There are also a considerable number of Japanese settled in Peru and Ecuador They naturally are not doing anything about this now because they have other fish to fry in the Far East, but they have this very much in mind They are building up their economic power in Latin America and I suppose will await eventualities Certainly so long as this

generous in our treatment of the colored people. However, under present conditions, were theoretically the Negro is the equal of the white man at law, nobody knows where he is at and you always have a large number of Negroes aspiring to social equality and to intermarriage, and that puts the white man on the defensive. He is determined at all costs to preserve his racial purity, and, therefore, cannot take any chances. White men have to be much more rigid in their treatment of all Negroes than they would under different circumstances. If the weight of evidence of modern biology is right, then it seems to me that the weight of evidence tends more and more to show that the intermixture of widely differing breeds, especially the white man and the Negro, is a bad thing in the vast majority of cases and that the loss of the peculiar identity of the white man will be a terrific biological loss. It seems to me you are going to build up a stronger and stronger social consciousness and taboo, not merely based upon instinctive prejudice but upon considered reasons, that is going to strengthen effectively the separation of the races. I think that is as far as we can go today. I believe if the majority of the white men in this country were convinced that at all costs anything is better than the loss of the racial identity (and there are enough Negroes in this country, practically one-tenth of the population, to make us all mulattoes statistically) I think they would acquiesce in very drastic programs, either for the segregation of the Negroes into one section of the country or for their wholesale deportation, say to Africa. But, as I say, instead of a breaking down of the color line and an increasing mixture of whites and Negroes, the present tendency is just the opposite. There is less mixture than there was and with the growth of this reasonably logical consciousness it seems to me that there is a hope that somehow or other we will meet this terrific problem in some such way that the white race shall remain essentially unimpaired. Of course, a certain number of very light Negroes do slip across the line but that does not make a great deal of difference so long as it is merely exceptional and it is not recognized and legalized. The latest researches of Davenport and others, especially in the West Indies, apparently show that although the Negro type is extremely persistent, (of course the Negro type is prepotent over the white, because the white is more recent, and therefore biologically more stable, it is a more delicate form of life whereas the Negro is an older, more primitive and more generalized type, and throughout nature the more primitive and the more generalized type exists over the more recent and more specialized) it has been pretty well shown that the fourth successive cross between a white and the successive Negro mixed breed will produce a type where the

Negro blood is permanently bred out, where there is no reversion. You have there, of course, in the first cross, Mulatto, second Quadroon, third Octoroon, and fourth "Mustafec", as they call it in the West Indies. These four recrosses must be in every case between this increasingly white product and a pure white man. If you have another mongrel slip in anywhere along the line you do not get that result, you do get reversion. Assuming that clandestinely a certain number of Octoroons or Mustafecs do slip across the line, there is so little Negro blood in those people that with the vast mass of white people we have in this country it does not make much difference, but if you were to legalize that and say that any man who becomes an Octoroon is legally a white man, and if you have an acquiescence of the white people that they will intermarry with those people, then you would have an influx of Negro blood that would be very great and would undoubtedly work a permanent change in the white strain. In colonial times, at the time of the Revolution, one-fourth of the population of the colonies was colored. In some of the southern colonies a large majority of the population was colored. In the Carolinas and Georgia, especially in the Carolinas and South Carolina in particular, a large majority of the people were slaves. However, through the working of the color line, with the growth of the whites faster than that of the negroes, you have a ratio today of not one to three but perhaps of only one to ten - ten times as many whites as negroes whereas in colonial times there were only three times as many whites. You see what would have happened if you had had intermixture then? You would have had everybody statistically a Quadroon, dark Mulatto, whereas today, the worst that could happen, if you had intermixture, would be to have everybody a light Octoroon. As time goes on and the Negro population does not increase (apparently it is not increasing) the chances are that the Negro will become statistically a smaller and smaller element in the population. Therefore, the longer time passes and the longer you can maintain the color line, the less serious this problem becomes. It will always be serious but it will be less serious, and it can be dealt with when the proper time comes, if and when. That is, I think, about as much as we can say.

Colonel Jordan: In speaking of Latin America, you pictured a more or less unstable condition there. Do you think that our good neighbor policy is going to blow up? Do you think we are going to have to go back in?

A: It seems to me that the good neighbor policy, if it envisages Latin America as a whole, is not permanently going to work. Of course, there are different ways of going in. I mean you can go in underhand in many cases, you can

have indirect pressure, but there are certain limits below which these countries cannot be allowed to fall, not merely for our own interest but because you would have an increasing pressure from the rest of the civilized world to protect life and property and investment there. The only alternative to a breakdown of that extreme doctrine of the good neighbor, regardless of who the people are down there, is that in some way or other we can develop what may be termed a Pan American policy with the effective strong powers of Latin America, that is with the white nations Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile, which are the strong elements in Latin America, and possibly with the people in Colombia and Costa Rica. But you have to recognize sooner or later the differentiation down there, and it seems to me the only hopeful way of doing that, unless we are to revert practically to unilateral action of the United States in these disturbed areas, is to try for some form of Pan American cooperation with the really Latin American powers as distinguished from the mongrel and unstable nations such as I have described.

Q A speaker from this platform last year stated he thought the attempt of the Japanese to penetrate Manchukuo, possibly colonize there, would eventually fail because of the hatred of the two races concerned. Would you care to comment on that?

A The Japanese and their colonization policy in Manchukuo are under two terrific handicaps. In the first place, climate. The Japanese are a very delicately adjusted insular people, they do not like cold, they do not stand cold, they do not thrive very well under it. Unless they choose their immigrants, especially their peasant settlers, very carefully from the northern part of Japan, particularly from Hokkaido and the northern part of the main island, they will have trouble. If they try to put people from the temperate south in there, those people are going to have a lot of trouble sticking. In the second place, there is the economic factor. The Chinaman, and even the Korean, can underlive the Japanese if he is given a fair chance. Of course it may well be that what will happen is that the Japanese will frankly give their settlers (I understand they are planning to plant half a million families there in the next ten years) certain special advantages. That will mean that they will have to subsidize those people to a certain extent because, given fair and aboveboard competition, a Chinaman can outlive the Jap every time - the Jap cannot stand the competition. They are going to have a very stiff problem if they attempt permanently to settle a large Japanese population there. There will have to be some artificial discrimination in their favor before they

can stick

Q You commented on the expected trouble in India and Porto Rico if authority of power is withdrawn. Would you care to make a comment along similar lines in the Philippines?

A I think we made a frightful mess of the Philippines, showed our national ineptitude for empire there more than anywhere else. In the Philippines we should have followed the example of the Dutch, who have done a splendid job with a similar people. I was talking to a Dutch official many years ago and he said "The key of our policy is this we try to keep their bellies full and their heads empty." They never have tried to make those Malays imitation Dutchmen. They have given them mighty little education along Dutch lines, they haven't encouraged it at all. They have tried to make them good Malays, not imitation Dutchmen. We went in with all our fine ideas of brotherhood and environmentalism, etc., and tried to turn these Filipinos into imitation Americans. We have raised their standard of living far higher than that of any other people in the Far East, put them in a very impossible economic situation, and incorporated all sorts of ideas about self government, etc. The only result is that they hate us like hell, so it is just a mess. Personally, the way these Filipinos feel toward us, I do not see that we have any special duty toward them, and I would like to cut the whole thing lock, stock, and barrel, turn the Philippines adrift. What I fear is that we have increasingly been placed in the worst possible position, the position of responsibility without authority, responsibility toward the rest of the world without authority for what happens in the Philippines. A small group of clever Mestizos, European or Chinese, are running the show, these Mestizos undoubtedly will fall out among themselves, as they always do, there will be increasing instability and trouble there and so long as we have any responsibility for the Philippines toward the rest of the world we are liable to be put on the spot. If there is intervention in the Philippines and things have broken down there and foreign life and property are insecure, we are going to have all our sentimentalists rise up and say "Are we going to allow our poor brown brother to be treated this way? We have got to rush to his defense, etc.," and then the trouble will begin. We have let ourselves in for a lot of trouble there. I wish to Heaven that Dewey had weighed anchor for the open sea as soon as he had smashed the Spanish fleet. If we had gone into the job right, frankly, in an imperialistic way, said "This is going to be our Far Eastern base and we are going to make it a

759

strong base", fortified the island, had not had any nonsense about things, had deliberately, as the Dutch did, tried to keep their bellies full and their heads empty, and started scientifically and efficiently to exploit the vast natural resources of that country for the benefit of America and Americans, that would have been one thing. But the way we have gone about it we have just made a frightful mess and I cannot see that there is anything to be gained by staying in the Philippines. We have never gotten anything out of them, they have always been an expense and trouble, and from which, as I said, we have had no thanks and no gratitude, and which are now in a very unstable situation in every way.

Q This morning's paper states that Brazil, and I think Peru, have definitely closed the gates to Japanese immigration except in a very small trickle. Japan is jammed, what is she going to do in the longrun if Manchukuo falls down?

A Japan has got to do one of two things. Mere trickles of immigration won't do any good. Either Japan has got to find some area where she can pour millions of her people in a relatively short space of time, or she has got to industrialize herself still more and that means that she must at all costs dominate China because she has got to be sure of one major market where she can not only sell her goods but where she can be assured of constant command of its natural resources and where she can see that the capital that she invests there will be protected and will redound primarily to her interest. She has got to, in some way or other, dominate China, and personally I for one do not think we have any business thwarting Japan in China. If we let Japan have a free hand in China she will never attack us, at least not for a long long time to come. If we do try to thwart her, she will fight us, and why we should go into China, where our interests are so negligible, and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for other people, notably for the British, I cannot see.

Colonel Jordan: Dr. Stoddard, I want to thank you very much for a perfectly wonderful talk.

Dr. Stoddard: Colonel, it has been a pleasure to meet you and this splendid audience.