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THE RACES OF MANKIND

By RUTH BENEDICT and GENE WELTFISH

The authors of this famous pamphlet are distinguished anthropologists. The late Ruth Benedict was Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University and Dr. Gene Weltfish was also a member of the Department of Anthropology.

the world is shrinking

Every morning in the newspapers we read of the words spoken at the United Nations headquarters in New York by delegates of a hundred nations who have come together from every corner of the globe to create the economic, social, and political conditions that will prevent war and improve the lot of men the world over. Men from Peru and Afghanistan, from Israel and Sweden, from Syria and El Salvador, from South Africa and Iceland, from India and Australia and Liberia work together, debating the admission of a new member in the General Assembly, discussing human rights or full employment or the war against disease in the Economic and Social Council, or the welfare of people who do not yet govern themselves in the Trusteeship Council.

The United Nations has brought home to Americans the fact that the whole world has become one neighborhood. Men of all races work shoulder to shoulder, men of all religions, speaking all languages. For Americans this is not so new an experience as it is to people of most nations. In our country men of different color, hair texture, and head shape have lived together since the founding of our nation. They are citizens of the United States. Negroes and whites, Indians, Mexicans, Chinese, and people from the European nations are all taxable, subject to the draft, and to the other laws of the land. They are part of our great national community. History today is only bringing together on a world scale races which live together on a smaller scale here in America.
Americans know better than most how much hard feeling there can be when people of different races and nationalities have to live together and be part of one community. They know that there is often conflict. When what we all wanted more than anything else was to win the war against Hitler, most Americans were confident that, whatever our origins, we would be able to pull together to a final victory. Hitler believed we were wrong; he believed that hard feeling would break out and leave us defeated. He was quite sure that he could “divide and conquer.” And he believed that he could convince nonwhite races in Asia and Africa that this was a “white man’s war.” He believed especially that America was a no man’s land, where people of all origins were ready to fall to fighting among themselves. He believed that this was a front on which we were doomed to lose the battle.

science and the race front

In most problems facing us we have learned to turn to science. When we need new fuels, substitutes for rubber, lighter metals, or new plastics, we ask scientists to tell us what is possible and what is impossible. The chemists tell us how to make the plastics we need, and the physicists tell us how to harness atomic energy, and the engineers tell us how to build supersonic jet planes. When we are faced with shortages, scientists tell us what essential materials we have unwittingly been throwing on the dump heap.

We need the scientist just as much on the race front. Scientists have studied race. Historians have studied the history of all nations and peoples. Sociologists have studied the way in which peoples band together. Biologists have studied how man’s physical traits are passed down from one generation to the next. Anthropologists have studied man’s bodily measurements and his cultural achievements. Psychologists have studied intelligence among different races. All that the scientists have learned is important to us at this crucial moment of history. They tell us: “this is so,” “this is not so,” “this occurs under certain conditions,” or “this occurs under opposite conditions.” This booklet cannot tell you all that science has learned about the races of mankind, but it states facts that have been learned and verified. We need them today to help build a world where all men can live together as brothers.
**one human race**
The Bible story of Adam and Eve, father and mother of the whole human race, told centuries ago the same truth that science has shown today: that all the peoples of the earth are a single family and have a common origin. Science describes the intricate make-up of the human body: all its different organs cooperating in keeping us alive, its curious anatomy that couldn't possibly have "just happened" to be the same in all men if they did not have a common origin. Take the structure of the human foot,
for instance. When you list all the little bones and muscles and the joints of the toes, it is impossible to imagine that that would all have happened twice. Or take our teeth: so many front teeth, so many canines, so many molars. Who can imagine finding the same arrangements in two human species if they weren’t one family?

The fact of the unity of the human race is proved, therefore, in its anatomy. It is proved also by the close similarity in what all races are physically fitted for. No difference among human races has affected limbs and teeth and relative strength so that one race is biologically outfitted like a lion and another biologically outfitted like a lamb. All races of men can either plow or fight, and all the racial differences among them are in nonessentials such as texture of head hair, amount of body hair, shape of the nose or head, or color of the eyes and the skin. The white race is the hairiest, but a white man’s hair isn’t thick enough to keep him warm in cold climates. The Negro’s dark skin gives him some protection against strong sunlight in the tropics, and white men often have to take precautions against sunstroke. But the war has shown that white men can work and fight even in a tropical desert. Today white men in hot countries wear sun helmets and protect themselves with clothes and rub their skin with suntan oil. Very dark-skinned people in the north, too, can add cod-liver oil and orange juice to their diet, and, if they need to, take a vitamin pill or two. The shape of the head, too, is a racial trait; but whether it is round or long, it can house a good brain.

The races of mankind are what the Bible says they are — brothers. In their bodies is the record of their brotherhood.

**WHAT ARE RACE DIFFERENCES?**

The greatest adventure story in the history of the world is the spread of early man to all corners of the globe. With crude tools, without agriculture, without domesticated animals except the dog, he pressed on, from somewhere in Asia, to the tip of Africa, to the British Isles, across Bering Strait into America and down to Cape Horn. He occupied the islands of the Pacific and the continent of Australia. The world had a small population then,
and many of these pioneers were for centuries as separated from other peoples as if they lived on another planet. Slowly they developed physical differences.

Those who settled nearer the equator, whether in Europe, Asia, or in the Americas, developed a darker skin color than those who settled to the north of them. People’s hair is often the same over great areas: frizzly hair, lank hair, wavy hair. Europeans remained quite hairy, but in some parts of the world body hair almost disappeared. Blue eyes appeared in the north. In some places in Asia a fold of skin developed over the inner corner of the eye and produced what we call a slant eye.

All these distinctive traits made it easy to recognize people as belonging to different parts of the world. In each place the people got used to looking at one another. They said, “Our men are really men. Our women are beautiful. This is the way people should look.” Sometimes they liked the appearance of their close neighbors. But strangers seemed odd and queer. Strangers wore funny clothes and their manners were bad. Even more important, strangers did not look the way people should. Their noses were too flat or too pointed. Their skin was “a sickly white” or “a dirty black.” They were too fat or too short. Everywhere in the world men and women used the standard of their own people to judge others and thought that people who differed from this standard looked funny or ugly.

**all peoples much the same**

After the discovery of America by Columbus, Europeans began traveling to every quarter of the globe, and all the new peoples they met were complete strangers to them. For one thing, the Europeans couldn’t understand their languages. They looked and acted strange. Europeans thought they were different creatures and named a lot of different “races.” Gradually the Europeans described each one as having a skin color, kind of hair, kind of lips, height, and head shape that was peculiar to that “race.” Nowadays we know that this was a false impression.

**height**

Take height, for example. There are tall and short people almost everywhere in the world. Near the sources of the Nile, the Shilluk
Negroes are 6 feet 2 inches; their neighbors, the brown pygmies, are 4 feet 8 inches. In Italy, a six-footer and a five-footer could both be native Italians for generations back. Among the Arizona Indians, the Hopi Pueblos are 5 feet 4 inches; their Mohave neighbors are nearly 6 feet.

A report of the Selective Service System in 1941 showed that registrants examined for the U. S. Army varied in height from 4 feet 6 inches to 7 feet 4 inches. This represents the extremes of height anywhere in the world. The Army’s limits for acceptance, from 5 feet to 6 feet 6 inches, would include most men in the world.

**shape of head**
Take the shape of the head as another example. In West Africa there are more long heads; in the Congo, more round. Among the American Indians, as well as in the population of Europe, both the longest and the roundest heads are to be found, and in Asia Minor long heads and round heads appear among very close relatives.

Or let us take the brain itself. Because the brain is the thinking organ, some scientists have tried to find differences in the size and structure of the brain among different groups of people. In spite of these efforts, using the finest microscopes, the best scientists cannot tell from examining a brain to what group of people its owner belonged. The *average* size of the brain is different in
different groups, but it has been proved over and over again that the size of the brain has nothing to do with intelligence. Some of the most brilliant men in the world have had very small brains. On the other hand, the world’s largest brain belongs to an imbecile.

**blood the same**

For ages men have spoken of “blood relations” as if different peoples had different blood. Some people have shouted that if we got into our veins the blood of someone with a different head shape, eye color, hair texture, or skin color, we should get some of that person’s physical and mental characteristics.

Modern science has revealed this to be pure superstition. All human blood is the same, whether it is the blood of an Eskimo or a Frenchman, of the “purest” German “Aryan” or an African pygmy — except for one medically important difference. This medical difference was discovered when doctors first began to use blood transfusion in order to save life. In early attempts at transfusion it was discovered that “agglutination” or clumping together of the red cells sometimes occurred and caused death. Gradually investigators learned that there are four types of blood, called O, A, B, and AB, and that although blood typed O can be mixed successfully with the other three, none of these can be mixed with one another without clumping.

These four types of blood are inherited by each child from its forebears. But whites, Negroes, Mongols, and all races of man have all these blood types. The color of their skin does not tell at all which blood type they have. You and an Australian bushman may have the same blood type. Because you inherit your bodily traits from your many different ancestors, you may have a different blood type from your mother or your father or your brothers and sisters. You may have eyes like your mother’s, teeth and hair like your father’s, feet like your grandfather’s, and a blood type like your great-grandmother’s.

Today throughout the country doctors are giving blood “plasma” infusions without regard to race or blood type. Plasma is what is left after the red and white cells or corpuscles are removed from the blood contributed to the Blood Bank. Plasma from several different persons is mixed together and is used to restore any injured man whether he is white or black or yellow.
Finally, let us take skin color, the most noticeable of the differences between peoples. Few traits have been used as widely to classify people. We all talk about black, white, and yellow races of man.

In the world today the darkest people are in West Africa, the lightest people in northwest Europe, while in southeast Asia are men with yellowish-tan skins. Most people in the world, however, are not of these extremes but are in-betweens. These in-betweens probably have the skin shades that were once most common, the white, yellow, and dark brown or black being extreme varieties.

Recently scientists found that skin color is determined by two special chemicals. One of these, carotene, gives a yellow tinge; the other, melanin, contributes the brown. These colors, along with the pinkish tinge that comes when the blood vessels show through, give various shades to the human skin. Every person, however light or dark his skin may appear, has some of each of these materials in his skin. The one exception is the albino, who lacks coloring substances — and albinos appear among dark- and light-skinned peoples alike. People of browner complexions simply have more melanin in their skin, people of yellowish color more carotene. It is not an all-or-nothing difference; it is a difference in proportion. Your skin color is due to the amount of these chemicals present in the skin.

**HOW ARE RACES CLASSIFIED?**

The three primary races of the world have their strongest developments in areas A, B, and C on the map on page 9. In these parts of the world most of the inhabitants not only have the same skin color but the same hair texture and noses. A is the area of the Caucasian Race, B of the Mongoloid Race, C of the Negroid Race.

The Caucasian Race inhabits Europe and a great part of the Near East and India. It is subdivided in broad bands that run east and west: Nordics (fair-skinned, blue-eyed, tall, and long-headed) are most common in the north; Alpines (in-between skin color, often stocky, broad-headed) in the middle; Mediterraneans (slenderer, often darker than Alpines, long-headed) in
Most people in the world have in-between-color skin.

The distribution of racial subtypes is just about the same in Germany and in France; both are mostly Alpine and both have Nordics in their northern districts. Racially, France and Germany are made up of the same stocks in just about equal proportions.

American Indians are Mongoloid, though they differ physically both among themselves and from the Mongols of China.

The natives of Australia are sometimes called a fourth primary race. They are as hairy as Europeans, and yet they live in an area where other peoples have very little body hair.

Aryans, Jews, Italians are not races. Aryans are people who speak Indo-European, “Aryan” languages. Hitler used the term in many ways — sometimes for blond Europeans, including the Scandinavian; sometimes for Germans, whether blond or brunet; sometimes for all who agreed with him politically, including the Japanese. As Hitler used it, the term “Aryan” had no meaning, racial, linguistic, or otherwise.
there is no jewish race

Jews are people who acknowledge the Jewish religion. They are of all races, even Negro and Mongolian. European Jews are of many different biological types; physically they resemble the populations among whom they live. The so-called “Jewish type” is a Mediterranean type, and no more “Jewish” than the South Italian. The ways of life that Jewish people have developed in different parts of the world have nothing to do with physical make-up, any more than do those of Mohammedans or Catholics.

Italians are a nationality. Italians are of many different racial strains; the “typical” South Italian is a Mediterranean, more like the Spaniard or the Greek or the Levantine Jew than the blond North Italian. The Germans, the Russians, and all other nations of Europe are nations, not races. They are bound together, not by their head shape and their coloring, but by their national pride, their love of their farms, their local customs, their language, and the like.

racial mixture

As far back in time as the scientist can go he finds proof that animals and men moved about in the world. There were different kinds of animals, and many of them went great distances. But wherever they went, the different kinds could not breed together. A tiger cannot mate with an elephant. Even a fox and a wolf cannot mate with each other. But whenever groups of people have traveled from one place to another and met other people, some of them have married and had children.

At first men had to travel by foot. It took them a long time but they got almost all over the world that way. Long ago when people knew only how to make tools out of stone, the Cro-Magnons lived in Europe. Waves of migration came in from the east and the southeast. These new people settled down, bred with the Cro-Magnons, and their children were the ancestors of modern Europeans. Since then there have been many migrations from Asia and northern Africa.

Later men tamed the horse. They built carts and rode horseback. They built great boats, which were rowed by hundreds of men. They could go faster and travel farther than ever before. The Phoenicians went on trading expeditions through the Medi-
terranean. The Romans went to Spain and up along the coast to the British Isles. Then the Huns swept in from Asia through central Europe and destroyed the Roman Empire. The Tartars came in from the east. They threatened to conquer all of Europe but were defeated in one of the greatest cavalry engagements of all time. The Mohammedans captured all of North Africa; they took Spain and went on up into France across the Pyrenees. Thousands of Negro slaves have been brought into Europe at various times. Where are they now? Peoples have come and gone in Europe for centuries. Wherever they went, some of them settled down and left children. Small groups were absorbed into the total population. Always the different races moved about and intermarried.

We are used to thinking of Americans as mixed. All of us have ancestors who came from regions far apart. But we think that the English are English and the French are French. This is true for their nationality, just as we are all Americans. But it is not true for their race. The Germans have claimed to be a pure German race, but no European is a pure anything. A country has a population. It does not have a race. If you go far enough back in the populations of Europe you are apt to find all kinds of ancestors: Cro-Magnons, Slavs, Mongols, Africans, Celts, Saxons, and Teutons.

It is true, though, that people who live closer together intermarry more frequently. This is why there are places like Alsace-Lorraine, where Germans and French have intermarried so much that the children cannot tell whether they are German or French and so call themselves Alsatians. Czechoslovakia included old Bohemia which had a population of Nordics and semi-Asiatics and Slavs. After World War I the Germans and the Czechs along the border between the two countries intermarried so often that the Germans of this section got to look like Czechs and the Czechs began to speak German. But this did not make the two countries love each other.

People of every European nation have racial brothers in other countries, often ones with which they are at war. If at any one moment you could sort into one camp all the people in the world who were most Mediterranean, no mystic sense of brotherhood would unite them. Neither camp would have language or nation-
ality or mode of life to unite them. The old fights would break out again unless social conditions were changed — the old hatred between national groups, the old antagonisms between ruler and ruled and between the exploiter and the exploited.

The movements of peoples over the face of the earth inevitably produce race mixture and have produced it since before history began. No one has been able to show that this is necessarily bad. It has sometimes been a social advantage, sometimes a running sore threatening the health of the whole society. It can obviously be made a social evil, and, where it is so, sensible people will avoid contributing to it by grieving if their children make such alliances. We must live in the world as it is. But, as far as we know, there are no immutable laws of nature that make racial intermixture harmful.

**racial superiorities and inferiorities**

When they study racial differences, scientists investigate the way by which particular traits are passed on from parents to children. They measure head form and identify skin color on a color chart. They map out the distribution of different kinds of hair or noses in the world. Scientists recognize that these differences do not themselves show better or worse qualities in peoples, any more than bay horses are better than black ones. They know that to prove that a bay horse is superior to a black one you
have to do more than identify its skin color on a color chart; you have to test its abilities.

Science therefore treats human racial differences as facts to be studied and mapped. It treats racial superiorities as a separate field of investigation; it looks for evidence. When a Nazi said "I am a blue-eyed Aryan and you are non-Aryan," he meant "I am superior and you are inferior." The scientist says: "Of course. You are a fair-haired, long-headed, tall North European (the anthropological term is Nordics, not Aryans), and I am a dark-haired, round-headed, less tall South European. But on what evidence do you base your claim to be superior? That is quite different."

Race prejudice turns on this point of inferiority and superiority. The man with race prejudice says of a man of another race, "No matter who he is, I don't have to compare myself with him. I'm superior anyway. I was born that way."

It is the study of racial superiorities and inferiorities, therefore, which is most important in race relations. This investigation, to have any meaning at all, must get evidence for and against the man who says, "I was born that way. My race is proof that I am the better man." It must be an investigation of what is better and what is worse in traits passed down by inheritance. Such traits are, by definition, racial. The first thing we want to know scientifically is what traits a man is born with and what things happen to him after he is born. If he is lucky after he is born, he will have good food, care, and education; these are not things of which he can boast: "I was born that way."

A man learns the language he speaks. If he'd been born of Nordic parents and brought up from infancy in China, he'd speak Chinese like a native and have as much difficulty learning Swedish when he was grown as if he'd been born of Chinese parents. He wasn't "born" to speak Cockney English or to speak with a Brooklyn accent; he speaks the way people around him speak. It's not a racial trait; he didn't inherit it.

**customs not racial**

Differences in customs among peoples of the world are not a matter of race either. One race is not "born" to marry in church after a boy-and-girl courtship, and another race to marry "blind"
with a bride the groom has never seen carried veiled to his father’s house. One race is not “born” equipped to build skyscrapers and put plumbing in their houses and another to run up flimsy shelters and carry their water from the river. All these things are “learned behavior,” and even in the white race there are many millions who don’t have our forms of courtship and marriage and who live in shacks. When a man boasts of his racial superiority and says that he was “born that way,” perhaps what he’s really saying is that he had a lot of luck after he was born. A man of another race might have been his equal if he’d had the same luck in his life. Science insists that race does not account for all human achievements.

**what about intelligence?**

The most careful investigations of intelligence have been made in America among Negroes and whites. The scientist realizes that every time he measures intelligence in any man, black or white, his results show the intelligence that man was born with *plus* what happened to him since he was born. The scientist has a lot of proof of this. For instance, in the First World War, intelligence tests were given to the American Expeditionary Forces; they showed that Negroes made a lower score on intelligence tests than whites. But the tests also showed that Northerners, *black and white*, had higher scores than Southerners, *black and white*. Everyone knows that Southerners are inborn equals of Northerners, but in 1917 many southern states’ per capita expenditures for schools were only fractions of those in northern states, and housing and diet and income were far below average too. Since the vast majority of Negroes lived in the South, their score on the intelligence test was a score they got not only as Negroes, but as Americans who had grown up under poor conditions in the South. Scientists therefore compared the scores of Southern whites and Northern Negroes.

**Median Scores on A.E.F. Intelligence Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Whites:</th>
<th>Northern Negroes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>45.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>47.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.55</td>
<td>49.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Negroes with better luck after they were born got higher scores than whites with less luck. The white race did badly where economic conditions were bad and schooling was not provided, and Negroes living under better conditions surpassed them. The differences did not arise because people were from the North or the South, or because they were white or black, but because of differences in income, education, cultural advantages, and other opportunities.

Scientists then studied gifted children. They found that children with top scores turn up among Negroes, Mexicans, and Orientals. Then they went to European countries to study the intelligence of children in homelands from which our immigrants come. Children from some of these countries got poor scores in America, but in their homeland children got good scores. Evidently the poor scores here were due to being uprooted, speaking a foreign language, and living in tenements; the children were not unintelligent by heredity.

class not inborn
The second superiority which a man claims when he says, “I was born a member of a superior race,” is that his race has better character. The Nazis boasted of their racial soul. But when they wanted to make a whole new generation into Nazis they didn’t trust to “racial soul”; they made certain kinds of teaching compulsory in the schools, they broke up homes where the parents were anti-Nazi, they required boys to join certain Nazi youth organizations. By these means they got the kind of national character they wanted. But it was a planned and deliberately trained character, not an inborn “racial soul.” In just the same way the Japanese bred a generation of ruthless fighters. Fifty years ago Europeans who lived in Japan used to describe them as “butterflies flitting from flower to flower,” incapable of the “the stern drives” of Western civilization. Since 1900 the “butterflies” have fought six times overseas, and they became desperate and ruthless fighters. In a generation the butterflies turned into game cocks. But their race had not changed. The same blood still flowed in their veins. But in spirit they were more like the Germans than they were like their racial brothers, the Chinese.

It can go the other way, too. In 1520 the ancient Mexicans
were like the Nazis. They talked like them, thought like them, in many ways felt like them. They, too, believed war to be man's highest mission. They, too, trained their children for it, placing their boys in great state schools where they learned little else but the glories of battle and the rituals of their caste. They, too, believed themselves invincible, and against small, defenseless villages, they were. But they were defeated in battle by the Spaniards with the help of the peoples whom the Aztecs had oppressed; their leaders were killed, their temples destroyed, their wealth pillaged, and their power broken. The Mexican peasant, who still speaks the Aztec language and in whose veins still runs the blood of Aztec conquerors, no longer dreams of glorious death in battle and eternal life in an Indian Valhalla. He no longer goes on the warpath, no longer provokes war with peaceful villages. He is a humble peon, wishing only to be left in peace to cultivate his little field, go to church, dance, sing, and make love. These simple things endure.

Americans deny that the Nazis produced a national character superior to that of Goethe's and Schiller's day, and that the Japanese during World War II were finer human beings than in those generations when they preferred to write poetry and paint pictures. Race prejudice is, after all, a determination to keep a people down, and it misuses the label “inferior” to justify unfairness and injustice. Race prejudice makes people ruthless; it invites violence. It is the opposite of “good character” as it is defined in the Christian religion — or in the Confucian religion, or in the Buddhist religion, or in the Hindu religion, for that matter.

**civilization not caused by race**

History proves that progress in civilization is not the monopoly of one race or subrace. When our white forebears in Europe were rude stone-age primitives, the civilizations of the Babylonians and the Egyptians had already flourished and been eclipsed. There were great Negro states in Africa when Europe was a sparsely settled forest. Negroes made iron tools and wove fine cloth for their clothing when blond Europeans wore skins and knew nothing of iron.

When Europe was just emerging from the Middle Ages, Marco Polo visited China and found there a great civilization, the like of which he had never imagined. Europe was a frontier country in those days compared with China.
Since the beginning of history an unusual collection of fortunate circumstances have been present among one race, sometimes among another. Up to now, every great center of civilization has had its day and has given place to others. The proud rulers of yesterday become the simple peasants of another era. The crude people who once threatened the great cities become later the kings and emperors in the same country. The peoples change, but the old arts of life are, for the most part, not permanently lost. They pass into the common heritage of mankind.

Inventions pass, too, from one continent to another when people trade with each other. This has happened since the dawn of history. About 5,000 years ago, when Europe was on the frontiers of the civilized world, Asiatics came to trade in Europe and North Africa in great caravans. They followed the main rivers — the Nile into North Africa, the Danube into Europe, and the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers out of Asia. People from all over came in contact with one another and compared notes on what they knew. In this way they pooled their knowledge, and out of this combined knowl-
edge came the great inventions of civilization — massive building and the arts of metallurgy, chemistry, writing, medicine, and mathematics; transportation on wheels. The idea of printing and the use of movable type are old Chinese inventions, and our power engines depend upon a knowledge of explosives that the Chinese worked out with firecrackers.

When Columbus discovered America, corn, “Irish” potatoes, tobacco, and “Boston” beans were unknown in Europe. They had been developed by American Indians. Within ten years corn was being planted in Central Asia and in the interior of Africa, and African tribes today think that corn was given them by their own gods “in the beginning.”

All races have made their contributions to human knowledge. Those who have lived at the crossroads of the world have invented

OUR FOOD COMES FROM MANY PEOPLES.
most; those who have lived isolated on islands or at the tip ends of
continents have been content to earn their livelihoods by old tradi-
tional methods. There was, for them, no “necessity” to be “the
mother of invention” after they found a way to live on the land.

Peoples who came into contact with strangers, however, gave
what arts of life they had and took what the strangers had. These
contributions to civilization accumulated over the centuries and on
this accumulation new discoveries are based. We are all the gainers.

The United States is the greatest crossroads of the world in all
history. People have come here from every race and nation, and
almost every race in the world is represented among our citizens.
They have brought with them their own ways of cooking food, so
that our “American” diet is indebted to a dozen peoples. Our
turkey, corn, and cranberries come from the Indians. Our salads
we borrowed from the French and Italians. Increasingly in recent
years we have enriched our tables with soups from Russia, vege-
tables from Italy, appetizers from the Scandinavian countries,
seafoods from the Mediterranean lands, chile and tortillas from
Mexico, and so on almost endlessly. At the same time, everywhere
we have gone in the world, we have popularized ice cream, beef-
steak, breakfast cereals, corn on the cob, and other foods that are
called “American.”

Industry in the United States has taken the hand-skills of our
immigrants and made machines to do the work; without their skills
we should not have known how. Our music, our buildings have
developed from patterns brought to our shores or learned from
every quarter of the world. Our country would be poorer in every
phase of its culture if different cultures had not come together here,
sharing and learning the special contributions each had to offer.

THE FUTURE OF RACE PREJUDICE
Nevertheless there is race prejudice in America and in the world.
Race prejudice isn’t an old universal “instinct.” It is hardly a
hundred years old. Before that, people persecuted Jews because of
their religion — not their “blood”; they enslaved Negroes because
they were pagans — not for being black.

Looking back now, moderns are horrified at all the blood that
was shed for centuries in religious conflicts. It is not our custom
any more to torture and kill a man because he has a different religion. The twenty-first century may well look back on our generation and be just as horrified. If that century builds its way of life on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, our era will seem a nightmare from which they have awakened. They will think we were crazy. “Why should race prejudice have swept the western world,” they will say, “where no nation was anything but a mixture of all kinds of racial groups? Why did nations just at that moment begin talking about ‘the racial purity’ of their blood? Why did they talk of their wars as racial wars? Why did they make people suffer, not because they were criminals or double-crossers, but because they were Jews or Negroes or non-Nordic?”

We who are living in these troubled times can tell them why. Today weak nations are afraid of the strong nations; the poor are afraid of the rich; the rich are afraid they will lose their riches. People are afraid of one another’s political or economic power, they are afraid of revenge for past injuries, they are afraid of social rejection. Conflict grows fat on fear. And the slogans against “inferior races” lead us to pick on them as scapegoats. We pin on them the reason for all our fears.

**race prejudice not inevitable**

Freedom from fear is the way to cure race prejudice. When aggression is made impossible by guarantees of collective security, those guarantees must cover countries of all races. Then race tactics such as *apartheid* in South Africa or segregation of school children will be outmoded. In any country every legal decision that upholds equal citizenship rights without regard to race or color, every labor decision that lessens the terror of being “laid off” and gives a man self-respect in his employment, every arrangement that secures the little farmer against losing his acres — all these and many more can free people from fear. Then they need not look for scapegoats.

With America’s great tradition of democracy, the United States should clean its own house and get ready for a better twenty-first century. Then it could stand unashamed before the world and condemn, without confusion, any doctrines of a Master Race. Then it could put its hand to the building of the United Nations, sure of the support, not of one race or of another, but of the universal Human Race.
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