

Racial Discrimination and the Conservative Outlook

By NATHANIEL WEYL

Let me make a few preliminary points. I note that I am to discuss¹ *racial discrimination*. The noun has become pejorative in recent usage, yet there is no such implication in its meaning. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines *discrimination* as “the perceiving, noting, or making a distinction or difference between things; a distinction (made with the mind or in action)”.

Without discrimination, we can neither analyze nor evaluate. To discriminate between truth and falsehood, right and wrong, the beautiful and the ugly is essential to science and to civilization. This is recognized in such archaic expressions as “a person of discriminating taste”. Unwise or unjust discrimination is pejorative just as is unsound judgment and deliberate immoral conduct. But to condemn discrimination *per se* is equivalent to condemning all judgment, evaluation, preference, acceptance and rejection.

My second general point is that I take it we are not considering the problems of the coexistence of members of different races in the abstract. For the problem to be significant, two conditions are necessary:

1. The dominant race must regard the subordinate one as alien or unassimilable;
2. The subordinate race must be numerous or powerful enough to constitute a problem.

Thus, discrimination against American Indians is not a major problem for white America because the Indians are quantitatively unimportant. Americans of Japanese and Chinese extraction constitute no problem, either in Hawaii or elsewhere, nor do they face much invidious discrimination. This is primarily because they have made an extraordinarily successful adaptation to American mores and institutions and because they have contributed far more than their share to the American creative élite.

The case of the Negro is otherwise. From the inauguration of President Washington in 1799 to the New Deal, there was an American consensus concerning the Negro. This is a point that Professor William Marina and I show in our book *American Statesmen on Slavery and the Negro*.

We argue that the conventional view of irrepressible conflict

¹ This paper was first given as a talk to the Regional Meeting of the Philadelphia Society in Atlanta, Georgia, on 21st November 1970.

between the slavocratic ideology of Calhoun and the egalitarian visions of the Abolitionists does violence to American history. We consider both these positions minority opinion, made dominant briefly by the dialectic of clashing fanaticisms.

The broad consensus opinion of both leaders and people was to oppose both the institution of slavery and the presence of the Negro. The conviction that the Negro was unassimilable and should not be granted citizenship was almost universal. The African slave trade was detested because it brought more Blacks into the United States. The free Negro was harshly persecuted to drive him out of the communities where he attempted to settle.

Such statesmen as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Henry Clay and Abraham Lincoln, to name only a few, urged that the Negro be both emancipated and immediately deported. "We have the wolf by the ears," Jefferson declared, "and we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go. Justice is in one scale and self-preservation in the other." He wrote in his *Autobiography*:²

Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free, nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government.

In an address to a colored delegation to the White House on 14th August 1862, Lincoln urged that they take the leadership in colonizing the American Negro population in Panama. "I think your race suffers very greatly, many of them, by living among us, while ours suffers from your presence," he said. While "the aspiration of men is to enjoy equality with the best", in the United States "not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours". He would not discuss this and could not change it even if he so desired. "But for your race among us," Lincoln added, "there could not be war, although many men engaged on both sides do not care for you one way or the other."

The Emancipation Proclamation made colonization, the allopatric solution to the race problem, chimeric. Spatial separation being ruled out, *post-bellum* America maintained subordination of the Negro and the strict regulation and minimization of interracial contacts through the Jim Crow system. This barred a whole matrix of relationships, deprived the Negro of basic constitutional rights, and punished sexual contacts which threatened the ethnic integrity of the ruling race by terror and lynching. Unlike slavery, this new *de facto* system of segregation and subordination was administered, not by the patrician South, but by the masses. Where slavery had involved responsibility on the part of the master and paternalistic concern for the welfare of the

² Thomas Jefferson to John Holmes, 22nd April 1820.

slave, the new system entailed no responsibility and total unconcern. The old way was predicated on *noblesse oblige*, the new way on animosity.

The leading intellectuals and American statesmen of the first century and a half of the Republic deplored the Negro's presence and deprecated his ability. Among others, Jefferson, Madison, Clay and Lincoln believed Negroes to be mentally and morally inferior to the Whites. The Abolitionists held similar views. Thus, Charles Sumner called them "moving masses of flesh, unendowed with anything of intelligence above the brutes"; Thaddeus Stevens thought those he knew "not qualified to vote"; Ralph Waldo Emerson believed them degraded because of "sin"; William H. Seward found them "a foreign and feeble element . . . incapable of assimilation"; Theodore Roosevelt voiced the judgment that "as a race and in the main they are altogether inferior to the whites". Taft thought them destined "to be a race of farmers first, and all the time". Woodrow Wilson believed they were childlike and better off under slavery. The labor historian, John R. Commons, thought the Negro to be "indolent and fickle" and Charles Francis Adams Jun., after visiting sub-Saharan Africa, urged that a free society must consist of "homogeneous equals" and that the Negro, therefore, should be denied citizenship. Descending to the gutter movements of proletariat discontent, the American Socialist Party, during the only period when it was a mass movement, urged a racially segregated socialist America and officially termed³ the Negroes "lynchable human degenerates".

After the brief optimistic era of Reconstruction, disillusion with the emancipated Negro's political and economic performance became widespread. The general negation of racial equality of rights that followed has been attributed by liberal historians to such factors as an evil conspiracy by Southern Bourbons, disgust at the Negro's readiness to sell his vote, and the benighted character of Southern poor Whites.

Without wholly repudiating any of these suggested causes, I should like to suggest that a more fundamental divisive force is the character of the modern nation.

Nation is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the ultimate literary and scholarly authority on English speech, as "an extensive aggregate of persons, so closely associated with each other by common descent, language or history, as to form a distinct race or people, usually organized as a separate political state and occupying a definite territory". The root of *nation* is

³ "Report of the Meeting of the National Quorum of the Socialist Party, November 1903," *The Chicago Socialist*, 28th November 1903.

nasci, meaning to be born, thus indicating the key rôle of lineage in nationality.

The Negroes lack common descent with European settlers. Their history has little in common with that of England. The institutions of the Negro and Caucasian races are dissimilar. Even Negro speech is about as different from English as, say, Catalan from Spanish. The basic ingredients of common nationality appear lacking.

Historically, have widely different races successfully coexisted on the basis of full and equal citizenship in a free society? The answer I believe is seldom, if ever. Multiracial societies normally rest on subordination. An extreme case is India where the word for caste, *varna*, means color. Over the centuries the proliferation of occupational taboos has clouded the underlying situation but the foundation of the system, as Darlington observes, was the desire of the conquering Aryan element to bar miscegenation and regulate contact with the subjected darker peoples of India.

Religions and priesthoods have historically played a major rôle in keeping races and subraces apart. Priesthoods devise and enforce breeding barriers. Few people seriously believe any more that the Jews were prohibited from eating pork and shellfish because of rabbinical insights about public health. The point was simply that people who cannot eat together seldom sleep together. If the priesthoods prohibited a great deal of outmarriage, they also imposed taboos on excessive endogamy as the elaborate Catholic rules against incest during the Middle Ages testify.

Ethnic separation was often efficaciously imposed even in the absence of priesthoods. The gypsy separation from European society is an example. In Islam, which has no true priesthood, acceptance of slave girls in the harems broke down racial barriers among the upper classes. A powerful countervailing force was widespread castration of Negro slaves. In Berber society the solution arrived at was a white ruling class, a black slave class and an intermediate class produced by hybridization between the first two. Examples of variant solutions could be indefinitely multiplied. The general rule is that the conquering ethnic element either exterminates the conquered or subordinates it. In the second instance the subordinate element is prohibited from interracial breeding which might affect the racial purity of the dominant element; it is excluded from specified high status occupations, and other interracial contacts are minutely regulated.

Tribal genocide and expulsion of European and Asian minorities from some of the newly hatched African states suggest the fragility of tendencies toward supra-tribal, let alone supra-racial, nationhood. An area in which the multiracial nation seems viable is Latin America. Here, however, the social structure is

√ tacitly based, to a significant degree, on subordination of the Indian and Negro races, and on a complex gradation of ethnic status.

I have alluded to some of these historic aspects of the problem in the belief that conservatives should be concerned with man and society as they are, rather than with natural rights concepts of what they should be. The conservative should dream, but his dreams should be predicated on reality.

√ In such places as Surinam attempts to create multi-racial states have led to a party system in which the parties are ethnic and often centrifugal to such an extent that they seek to destroy the national framework. The racial bond is often regarded by its members as primary; the national bond as secondary. The total refusal of Palestinian Arabs to accept the state of Israel, even though self-interest dictates that they do so, is a tragic case in point.

In the United States the record now stretches over two centuries, almost exactly bisected by a civil war that many thought would reduce racial strife to inconsequential dimensions. The fact of the matter is that, after an historically unprecedented effort by the white majority to raise the Negro to his level, one spanning a generation and costing tens of billions of dollars, the conflict seems more irreconcilable than at any time in our history. √ The more the Negro is offered, not merely equality but preferential treatment, the more virulent seems his discontent. To the amazement of the liberals, articulate Negro spokesmen have become increasingly violent and committed to the destruction of a society which has offered their race more material well-being and educational and advancement opportunity than it could get anywhere else on earth. The more the Negro is advanced by hothouse treatment and governmental favoritism, the more he rejects the community of American nationhood in favor of that of racist *negritude*.

Are there any sound biological reasons for the perseverance of race as one of man's most fundamental building blocks, as a community which successfully claims the allegiance of its members even where self-interest and indoctrination point in an opposite direction? I believe there are.

Left wing academic propagandists such as Gunnar Myrdal have popularized the belief that mutual avoidance by different races is "prejudice"; that this "prejudice" has no basis in reality and is merely evidence of the psychopathology of those afflicted by it.

In the animal kingdom the integrity of species and races is maintained by breeding barriers. Whether the races be allopatric

or sympatric, these breeding barriers are both physical and psychic. Thus, a lion can be cajoled into mating with a tiger, if no lioness is around, but he will do so listlessly. *Ligers* and *tions*, as these particular hybrids are called, require for their creation either an absence of conspecific mates or an artificially created laboratory environment. The biological reason for this is the necessity for preserving stability in species, as a successful adaptation to econiche and habitat, and in race, as subspecies or emergent species. The forces for variation must be free to operate in evolution, but so must the forces for integrity of species: else evolutionary variation would be mere chaotic change.

In man, a variety of obvious breeding barriers between races exist, such as differences in the size of genitalia and in body odor. Thus, prostitutes in Japan used to be medically classified into those who could have intercourse with Caucasian males safely and those who could not. Another example is the racial survival of the Pygmies, which has been attributed by anthropologists to the fact that their body scent is acutely repugnant to the noses of all their neighbors.

✓ The most potent psychic interracial breeding barrier is that the man or woman with a healthy psyche tends to have strong self-love and self-esteem. Desiring to produce progeny in his own image, he generally chooses a mate resembling him physically, emotionally and mentally. (The adage that ageing married couples grow to look alike is a misconception of this tendency. The partners probably chose each other because of a resemblance which becomes increasingly apparent with age, since senescence obliterates secondary sexual characteristics.)

If this analogy with the rest of the animal kingdom has merit, then the desire of races and subraces to form enclaves or communities of their own is entirely natural. Its reproductive implications are obviously related to that self-love which is a precondition of the strong ego and of mental health. The preference for a community of people of similar physical appearance, background, traditions, mores, emotional reactions, habits of thought and convictions, is also understandable. Liberals may consider the fact that many Italo-Americans live in "little Italies", many Jews in "golden ghettos" and many Chinese in Chinatowns as evidence that ours is a depraved racist society. Sociologists, whose arrogance is matched only by their fundamental ignorance, should remember that the cities of most ancient civilizations were similarly stratified into the voluntarily separate districts of their component ethnic, national and religious subgroups.

Many liberals — and most socialists, fascists and communists — are attracted by John Locke's notion of the mind as *tabula rasa*, an empty slate on which the hand of authority

can write whatever it pleases. Mankind is held to be a homogeneous substance. The unique importance of the human individual is considered a fallacy inherited from the ages of religious faith. The manifold differentiations of mankind into races and linguistic affiliation, the gradations of status, descent, aptitude, interest and talent are deemed relics of a parochial outlook. To the conservative, however, human individuality and the diversity and complex articulation of the social order give life much of its savor.

Someone once said that those who refuse to learn from history must re-experience it. That is true. It is also true that one cannot copy the solutions of history, for the past is not the present, nor is the present the future. In the present area of accelerating change in all parameters and aspects of human existence, slavish imitation of past solutions is particularly inappropriate.

The problem of Negro-White co-nationality would have been difficult under any circumstances because of race difference and because of the bitter heritage of slavery. The additional factor which makes the problem virtually insoluble is the persistence of massive differences in the observed intelligence of the two races.

I know it is fashionable in some circles today to downgrade both intelligence and intelligence test scores. The latter are a reasonably accurate measure of one's ability to grasp and solve the problems posed by science, the professions, administration and all the command and semi-command echelons of a complex society. To say that the tests measure ability to function in a bourgeois world is rather absurd. They are tests which Aristotle, Burke and Lenin would all have passed with flying colors. They are, in short, about as good predictors as we have of the capacity to do the mental work essential to every civilization which relies on rational thought — whether it be monarchist, free enterprise, socialist, fascist, communist or what have you.

Some sociologists have made the point that "ghetto-dwellers" would probably do much better than White middle-class students on a test adapted to survival in their environment. This is true, but pointless. In the Soviet and Nazi concentration camps the common criminals survived, where some of the outstanding minds and noblest spirits of the time perished. Do we live in a world so devoid of moral values that we equate the ability of the unknown thief who stole the bread Anne Frank needed to survive (and thus proved himself "more intelligent" by a practical "I.Q. test for ghetto-dwellers") with the author of the *Diary*?

Unfortunately, despite a spectacular improvement in his material standards, leisure, educational opportunities and chances for advancement over the past forty years, the Negro has not

narrowed the intelligence gap separating him from the White population since the First World War period. In fact, Arthur Jensen, William Shockley and, more recently, Professor Travis Osborne of the University of Georgia, have presented evidence that it is widening.

The most comprehensive and recent study available is the mental-test scores of all males who enlisted or were inducted into the American armed services in 1968. Of the two million men who appeared for induction, 31.9 per cent of the Negroes and 6.5 per cent of the Whites failed the mental tests. They fell into a group so low that they were deemed hopeless military material. Of the survivors, 58.9 per cent of the Negroes, but only 18.0 per cent of the Whites, fell into Group IV, which is mentally inferior. Thus, about three-fourths of the Negroes, as against about a fifth of the Whites, were in the subnormal to retarded categories. Over 42 per cent of the Whites passing the mental test, but only about 7 per cent of the Negroes passing the test, were in Groups I and II, very superior and superior. There were proportionately about twenty times as many Whites as Negroes in the Group I category — and this is by no means a genius measure; it is even lower than the qualification for Mensa membership.

Compare these results, or those for the past decade if you prefer, with the First World War comparative Negro and White scores and it becomes fairly clear that the Negroes have lost ground in relation to the Whites in respect of psychometric intelligence. I do not wish to discuss here whether this difference is genetic or environmental in origin. The practical point of importance is that, since a generation of Herculean public and private effort to raise the Negro's status has done nothing to lessen the gap, we can assume that it is going to remain with us and continue to be central to the problem of race relations in the United States.

I should like to turn now to the question of policy, of what should be done. If the option were open, few White Americans would today wish to open our gates to the 20 million Negroes now in the country. But this has happened. Obviously, colonization and imposed subordination by law must be ruled out. The Negroes are American citizens. There is no room in our system for sub-categories of citizens with inferior rights.

One approach is that represented by the ultra-liberal ideology on race. It presupposes that race differences are superficial and that no innate mental differences of consequence exist. To combat "prejudice", governmental action is urged to compel interracial association regardless of the wishes of either ethnic group. White and Black children are forced to mix in the same schools and

live in the same neighbourhoods. On the theory that any superior position enjoyed by the Whites is due to prejudice and unfair advantage, governmental action of a compensatory sort is taken to bring the Negro up to the White level. This means denying scholarships, appointments, jobs and promotions to the best qualified applicants if they happen to be White. To the extent that race quotas rather than ability determine promotion, American science, technology, medicine, the professions, government and business leadership must suffer.

In education the stress is on hardship, not on ability. The best educational resources of the nation are squandered on mentally below-average children of both races whose potential is so low that they can contribute little or nothing to our society. The intelligent students, forced into the strait-jacket of this slow-motion educational system, find that the schools shackle their minds. Many acquire a profound antipathy to formal education; many become dropouts; still others develop revolutionary resentments. The gifted have become the orphans of American public education. The nation is engaged in squandering and stultifying its most promising human resources. If this were a deliberate effort to yield intellectual leadership to the communist world no more suicidal course could be suggested.

Let me add that on such fundamental matters Nixon represents no improvement over Johnson or Kennedy. The largesse of government jobs goes to Republicans. All that remains unchanged is wrong-headed policies which may destroy the nation.

Some conservatives today advocate developing a parallel system of private education through the voucher system. Yet, in defending it, such spokesmen for the conservative view as Bill Rusher vie with their liberal opponents in trying to show that it will mean more educational concentration on the disadvantaged. This is the tactic of expediency. Yet, unless the real problem is faced — that of the educational disinheritance of those superior minds which form the leaven and hope of every society — nothing is gained by such discussions.

A second profoundly adverse consequence of our educational policy is alienation. The more the policies of race favoritism and enforced interracial association are applied, the more apparent and militant is Negro rejection of American society. When masses of academically and mentally unqualified Blacks are pushed into the universities they are humiliated by failure and angered by rejection. This creates a racist, revolutionary element which demands the destruction of all academic standards and sometimes the destruction of the academy as well. When frustrated, it turns to mob violence, arson, terror and murder.

Negro alienation from American society has reached

unprecedented proportions. This alienation is correlated with an increased association and competition between the two races forced upon them by doctrinaire bureaucrats.

The suggested alternate policy is simple and consonant with the traditions and principles of American society.

Government should continue to act to ensure that no citizen is denied his civil rights or access to public schools, public office or any other governmental facility because of race.

In private areas, individuals should have the right to associate or refuse to associate with anybody they please without interference by governmental authority. This applies to marriage as well as to other forms of association. Individuals may deplore increasing trends toward Negro-White marriages either because this may diminish the production of children of high intelligence or for other reasons. Even those conservatives who deprecate the trend should feel obligated, however, to defend the right of the individuals to choose their own spouses.

Racial mixing in the schools, neighborhoods and residential complexes according to bureaucratically prescribed formulas is an abuse of governmental power. It is the business of the state to see that people are not deprived of their rights because of their race. It is not the business of the state to prescribe how they should be mixed in relation to their race.

Favoritism in governmental appointment, promotion, scholarship or entry into any educational institution on the basis of race is a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. It should be outlawed. Any compensatory advantages given Americans because of an unfavorable economic, social or educational environment should apply to all persons so handicapped, and not merely to those racially so handicapped.

Government should endeavor to enforce equality of rights and equality of opportunity. It should not try to legislate equality of rewards. In our society, rewards are supposed to be proportionate to contributions. Those who achieve more, should receive more.

These suggestions presuppose a return to those traditional values of an open and free society which were once such a vital element in the American dream. Contemporary governmental policies, involving racial quotas and official ethnic discrimination, are more reminiscent of Czarist Russia, Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union than of the free world.

As Theodore Roosevelt, an unjustly neglected spokesman of American conservatism, put the matter in 1901:⁴

⁴ Hermann Hagedorn (editor), *The Memorial Edition of the Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, New York, 1923-26, Vol. XXIII, p. 192.

I have not been able to think out any solution to the terrible problem offered by the presence of the Negro on this continent, but of one thing I am sure, and that is that, inasmuch as he is here and can neither be killed nor driven away, the only wise and honorable and Christian thing to do is treat each black man and each white man strictly on his merits as a man, giving him no more and no less than he shows himself worthy to have.

Estyn Evans Appeal Fund

After 40 years as head of the Department of Geography at Queen's University, Belfast, Professor E. Estyn Evans relinquished the Chair in 1968 to take up a personal Chair in Irish Studies. In 1965 he was appointed Director of the University's newly founded Institute of Irish Studies. At the end of the 1969-70 academic year he retired from his Chair.

To mark this long and distinguished service and also the affection in which he was held by his colleagues, students and friends, it is proposed to establish an *Evans Fund* to finance an *Estyn Evans Lecture* to be given periodically in Queen's University on a subject perpetuating his interests, and an *Estyn Evans Prize* to be awarded annually in the Department of Geography, Queen's University. The target is a capital sum of at least £2,500 (\$6,250).

Donations should be sent to

Mr N. C. Mitchell or Mr V. C. R. Ford,

Department of Geography

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, BELFAST, N. IRELAND

Carbon-14 and the Prehistory of Europe: A Review of the Revised Data

By DONALD A. SWAN

For many years the writings and views of the late V. Gordon Childe have dominated thinking in Britain and America on the prehistory of Europe. Dr Childe, who was the first Lord Abercromby, Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology and later Professor of European Archaeology at the University of London, was the author of *The Dawn of European Civilisation* (1951), *The Danube in Prehistory* (1929), *The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origins* (1926), *The Prehistory of European Society* (1958), *Prehistoric Migrations in Europe* (1950), *Prehistoric Communities of the British Isles* (1940), *New Light on the Most Ancient East* (1935), *et al.* In his view most of the major cultural advances in ancient Europe came about as the result of influences from the early civilizations of Egypt and Mesopotamia. Agriculture, metallurgy, writing, even styles of art and burial customs were supposedly developed in the Near East and then slowly diffused to "barbarian" Europe.

On the other hand, the great German archaeologist, Gustav Kossinna, adopted a "long chronology" in reconstructing the prehistory of Europe, which reversed the direction of the diffusion of many cultural traits. Dr Kossinna, who was Professor of German Archaeology at the University of Berlin, was the author of *Ursprung und Verbreitung der Germanen* (1928), *Die deutsche Vorgeschichte* (1934), *Der germanische Goldreichtum in der Bronzezeit* (1913), *Die Indogermanen* (1921), *Germanische Kultur in I. Jahrtausend nach Christus* (1932), *Altgermanische Kulturhöhe* (1934), *et al.* He was also the founder and for many years the editor of both the archaeological journal *Mannus: Zeitschrift für Vorgeschichte* and the archaeological series *Mannus Bibliothek*. The latter, which by 1945 had grown to 73 volumes, is an encyclopedic collection of works on the prehistory and early cultures of Europe. In addition to Dr Kossinna, some of the leading archaeologists and prehistorians in Europe contributed works to this project, including Dr Georg Wilke, Dr Walther Schulz, Dr Ernst Wahle, Dr Hans Hahne, and Dr Julius Andree from Germany, Dr Nils Åberg, Dr Oscar Almgren, and Dr Eric von Oxenstierna from Sweden, Dr Jozef Kostrewski from Poland, and Dr Constantin Diculescu from Rumania.