

Ideas and Studies. *In the preface to his recent study of the making of the Constitution, "The Great Rehearsal," Carl Van Doren emphasized the parallel between the task of uniting thirteen disparate states in 1789, and the present problem confronting the advocates of world federation. The parallel was close, with one basic exception: a world federation today must unite, in the face of rampant nationalism, far more widely diverse racial and cultural groups. This is the central problem of our times, and it is admirably brought out in the discussion of the three books reviewed below. It is just as easy to fall prey to facile theories of race, especially if they contribute to a more comfortable conscience, as it is difficult to create a legal and political basis upon which all men can meet; but the alternative to the latter is world chaos.*

"We-Group" and Guests

RACE AND NATIONALITY. By Henry Pratt Fairchild. New York: Ronald Press. 1947. 216 pp. \$3.

Reviewed by MILTON R. KONVITZ

BASICALLY this book is a statement of the author's views of American nationality and a plea for our support of them. The essence of nationality, says Professor Fairchild, is feeling; it is a feeling of identity as members of a "we-group." Members of a nationality have the same or similar "ideas, ideals, standards, aspirations, and life objectives." They are united in emotion and spirit and desire to share a common life. "They wish to be combined in the ordering of their own essential institutions and enterprises. They wish to cooperate in the pursuit of their shared objectives. . . . They recognize a spiritual, emotional, and intellectual kinship, and on the basis of those bonds they wish to be united into a sympathetic, harmonious, and homogeneous unit." A lack of identity in language, religion, family system, economic structure, or the basic moral code "is a serious threat to nationality, and a detraction from its completeness." In the ideal nation the people speak a common language, have one religion and one body of moral traditions, are descended from common ancestors. At the end of the American Revolution, the American people emerged "as a genuine nationality in its own right. All its essential characteristics were well established. Later comers must logically be thought of as being admitted into a going nationality, not as helping to build one."

The author finds it difficult to fit the Jews and Negroes into the American nationality, the latter because of their race, the former because of their own nationality or cultural traits. Their presence operates prejudicially against genuine national solidarity.

The laws excluding certain racial groups from coming as immigrants, and the immigration quota laws, are justified as measures protecting our national integrity. We have gone as far as we could have safely gone in permitting, "in the name of humanitarianism and liberalism," the dilution of our nationality.

On St. Patrick's Day in 1945, Professor Fairchild reminds us, 50,000 persons, linked to Ireland, marched up Fifth Avenue for almost four hours.

This was only a single case, symbolic of many other processions that might take place, or have actually taken place, composed of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Italians, Germans, Poles, and so on almost indefinitely. It is a mark of the essential liberalism of the United States that such a thing can occur. But it also raises the crucial question how far a nation can go in encouraging the persistence of groups, running into the second or even third generation, whose "hearts are linked inexorably" to some foreign land. A strong nationality can stand a good deal of this, but no nation can stand unlimited amounts of it.

A host, however, should always be courteous and just towards his guests. We must, says the author, treat our aliens with consideration; we must try to root anti-Semitism out of our hearts; Jim Crow laws should be repealed; the Negro should be permitted to enjoy the franchise without special restrictions. We can achieve these and similar results, however, not by resort to law. The general effect of legislation "will much more often be to intensify bad feeling than to subdue it. What liberals and progressives of every stamp should work for is the humanizing of the heart of man."

Many Americans will not be able to recognize in this picture the character of American nationality as they



Henry Pratt Fairchild's "is no authentic American voice; he is the foreigner in our midst."

know it. If Professor Fairchild had written this book about Polish or Rumanian nationality, it would have hit the mark. But what, in heaven's name, does it have to do with the America we know?

Several months ago the President's Committee on Civil Rights made public its report, "To Secure These Rights," in which, paraphrasing the language of Thomas Jefferson and H. M. Kallen, they said that the concept of equality knows no kinship with notions of human uniformity or regimentation. "We abhor the totalitarian arrogance which makes one man say that he will respect another man as his equal only if he has 'my race, my religion, my political views, my social position.' In our land men are equal, but they are free to be different. From these very differences among our people has come the great human and national strength of America."

Where Fairchild sees weakness, other Americans, looking at America with the eyes of Jefferson, Madison, Whitman, Emerson, see strength; where he sees danger, they see glory. Fortunately, Fairchild's is no authentic American voice; he, and not the "Irishman" who joined the St. Patrick's Day parade, is the foreigner in our midst.

Whatever may be true of other nationalities, ours is founded on the principle of equality without uniformity, on what Kallen has called the principle of orchestration. Not cultural monism, but cultural pluralism, is the bedrock of American democracy. In a recent case in the Supreme Court Justice Jackson pointed out that the Bill of Rights protects the freedom

to be intellectually and spiritually diverse or even contrary, and that this freedom is enjoyed without fear that it will disintegrate the social organization.

This country has come through two world wars as the victor over peoples whose systems of government and society were founded on monistic principles. We are free and strong despite and because of our diversities. No Negro or Jew—and no Irishman who has marched down Fifth Avenue—has been convicted of treason. The lack of identities in religion, language, race, or what-not has not, as a matter of fact, been found to constitute a threat to our nationality.

The colonists who came over here before the Revolution, says Fairchild, were pioneers; they were brave men. The immigrants who followed them (the forefathers of more than half of the American people) were, on the other hand, "the unsuccessful, the weak, the dependent, the followers instead of the leaders." It is these weak, dependent, unsuccessful men and women and their children who, with their sweat and blood, contributed to the building of the America that Fairchild enjoys; who fought against their former homelands to secure, protect, and strengthen the American nationality that Fairchild misunderstands. "Throughout our history," President Truman said in his message on civil rights on February 2, "men and women of all colors and creeds, of all races and religions, have come to this country to escape tyranny and discrimination. Millions strong, they have helped build this democratic nation and have constantly reinforced our devotion to the great ideals of liberty and equality." Were it not for our diversities, we would not be as free as we are; were it not for our freedom, we would not be as strong.

Milton R. Konvitz, Cornell University professor, is author of *"The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law"* (1946), *"The Constitution and Civil Rights"* (1947), and other works.

SOLUTION OF LAST WEEK'S DOUBLE-CROSTIC (No. 726)

BUTTERFIELD: THE AMERICAN PAST

We read in his diary: "About ten o'clock I bade farewell to Mount Vernon, to private life, and to domestic felicity; and with a mind oppressed with more anxious and painful sensations than I have words to express, set out for New York."

*Washington on April 16, 1789, for his inauguration, April 30.

Inequality of Man

HUMAN ANCESTRY: *From a Genetical Point of View.* By R. Ruggles Gates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1948. 442 pp. \$7.50.

Reviewed by M. F. ASHLEY MONTAGU

THE QUEST for certainty is such among men that even scientists have not always avoided the temptation of drawing far-reaching conclusions from inadequate evidence. In few fields has this, perhaps, been more often true than in the study of man's ancestry. Whenever a new fragment of bone or a few teeth are found that look at all humanlike, the attempt is very properly made to relate such remains to those that are already known. This is, indeed, the fundamental procedure of classificatory method. Where fossils are concerned it is the only method we have, crude as it is. The crudity of the method is, however, too often forgotten, and in the enthusiasm for the new discovery distinctions and relationships are often suggested which, as new materials become available, are subsequently shown to be anything but probable.

The fact is that we are not yet in a position to draw up an account of human ancestry, except in the most tentative and speculative manner. We have only recovered a small proportion of the human fossil relicts that remain to be recovered, and until our evidence is very much more complete, the subject of man's ancestry must remain tentative and full of unsolved problems.

It could have been wished that these points had been explicitly made by Dr. Gates in this significantly contrived book. The alert reader will, however, discover them for himself as the additive effects of the author's "probablys," "presumablys," "possiblys," and "seems" make themselves felt.

Even if all the material were available, the problem would still remain of discovering the mechanisms or factors which operatively affected the evolution of man in producing all the various forms by which we know him. This is the problem with which Dr. Gates is principally concerned in the present volume. "It is only by learning," he remarks in a very doubtful proposition, "how man has come to his present state that we may hope intelligently to control in any measure his future development. This book is offered as a small contribution to that end. In the present disturbed state of the world it is important that questions of race and population be recognized as the fundamental problems they are."



My Current Reading

Our reading list this week comes from Walter White, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, whose hard-hitting article in *SRL* Oct. 11, 1947, "Why I Remain a Negro," has been widely noticed:

TO SECURE THESE RIGHTS: *The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights* (Simon & Schuster)

TOWARD FREEDOM: *The Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru* (John Day)

KINGSBLOOD ROYAL, by Sinclair Lewis (Random)

KNOCK ON ANY DOOR, by Willard Motley (Appleton-Century)

INSIDE U.S.A., by John Gunther (Harper)

POSTSCRIPT TO YESTERDAY: *America the Last Fifty Years*, by Lloyd Morris (Random)

THE HIGH COST OF PREJUDICE, by Bucklin Moon (Messner)

THE GREAT REHEARSAL, by Carl Van Doren (Viking)

SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE HUMAN MALE, by Alfred C. Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy, and C. E. Martin (W. B. Saunders)

RICHER BY ASIA, by Edmond Taylor (Houghton Mifflin)

This passage from the author's preface gives us the clue to the motif of the whole book. Dr. Gates is convinced that the "races" of mankind are unequal, that some are mentally superior to others, that the "eighteenth-century political doctrine" that "all men are born free and equal" is "hopelessly at variance with the facts of science, and has been the cause of much obscure thinking." A discussion of potentially infertile but actually reproductively isolated animal groups leads Dr. Gates to deliver himself of the following interesting observation:

Disinclination to cross with widely different types is unfortunately a condition which has never developed completely in modern man, although