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By W. E. B. Du Bois

RACE AND PERSONALITY

Allison Davis of the Department of Education, University of Chicago, writes in the Science Monthly on "Personality and Race"

Perhaps the belief in racial or ethnic types of personality is the most common and spontaneously expressed form of racial dogma. For example, southerners are taught from early life that Negroes, as a group, are childish, irresponsible, lazy and primitive. Italians, so our American folklore and popular literature tell us, are carefree, artistic, sensuous and hot-tempered. Filipinos, as seen by western eyes, appear innately vain and childish in their love for display, as well as irresponsible and frivolous. Even the Yankee has been considered, at least by certain other nationalities, to have a "racial" personality; he is supposed to run to the money-grasping, uncouth, aggressive type, and from the European viewpoint to be culturally naive and unsophisticated. Since there have always been numbers in each of these groups who exhibited the behavior which the myth said was inherent in their "racial" nature, it followed that anyone who believed the myth about Italian or Negro or Yankee personality could find some choice cases to confirm his emotional belief. The fact that the majority did not exhibit this stigmatized behavior did not discredit the myth for those who were taught to believe it. Furthermore, there is a general conviction in our society that personality, or character, is inborn, inherited, or predestined. Thus it is generally believed that nothing can be done to change personality; one is supposed to be born with it, just as one is born with race. For this reason, the myth of racial types of personality is even more deeply rooted in our folklore than is the myth of racial types of culture.

This analysis of the personality formation of Negro children in the South bears out the theory that personality is not inherited; it is learned. The fact that personality, disposition, and character form a learned pattern of behavior means that there can be no racial "inheritance" of personality. People are not born with their personalities; they acquire them by experiences in a social environment. Finally, it is evident that there are no racial types of personality because within each race there are several social strata, each of which has a different culture, and each of which teaches different kinds of behavior and psychological goals to its members.

If one wishes to know what one may expect of a man, one needs to know in what kind of a culture, not in what race, he has been reared. More than anything else about a man or a woman, however, one needs to know what his loves, his fears, his hates are, and what he considers valuable in life, and valuable beyond life. Certainly there is not one of us who has not met a man of another group or race who was congenial, or brave, or honest, or self-sacrificing or honorable. All of us also have met members of our own and of other groups, or races, who were cowards, or impos-
tors, or murderers at heart.

If one wishes to know whether one may depend upon a man, or trust him behind one's back, or with one's children, or stand shoulder to shoulder with him against a common enemy, one needs to know his individual nature, not his race. The troubles of this chaotic world of international anarchy in which we live are not made by this race nor by that race; they are made by men who hate, and lust for blood and revenge; by men who envy, and crave for personal dominance and aggrandizement. The greatest possible benefit to mankind which one can conceive would be the practice of dividing men into groups according to whether they wished to kill, to dominate and to plunder, or whether they wished to cooperate, to share, to advance human development one step beyond the jungle stage in which we now live—to be men of good will. Such a division of mankind would bring together men of every color and race.

SPENGLER ON THE COLORED WORLD

The Cassandra-voiced philosopher of Western Europe, Oswald Spengler, published his "The Decline of the West" in 1918. In 1933, on the threshold of the Hitler revolution, he wrote "The Hour of Decision" and analyzed the "Coloured World"

What, then does the "coloured" world include? Not only Africa, the Indians—as well as the Negroes and halfbreeds—of the whole of America, the Islamic nations, China, and India extending to Java, but, above all, Japan and Russia, which has again become an Asiatic, "Mongolian" State. When the Japanese beat Russia, a ray of hope shot up all over Asia: a young Asiatic State had, by Western methods, forced the greatest power of the West to its knees and thereby destroyed the aureole of invincibility which surrounded Europe. It was as a beacon, in India, in Turkey, even in Cape Colony and the Sahara. So it was possible to pay back the white peoples for all the pains and humiliations of a century! Since then the profound cunning of the Asiatics has been thinking out methods inaccessible after suffering in 1916 its second great defeat, from the West, has removed its "white" mask, to the mocking satisfaction of its ally England, has again become Asiatic with all its soul, and is filled with a burning hatred of Europe. It took with it the experiences of Europe's internal weakness and used its knowledge to invent new and crafty methods of fighting, which it has instilled into the whole of the earth's coloured population, with the idea of a common resistance. This, side by side with triumph of Labour-Socialism over Society among the white nations, is the second real consequence of that World War which brought us no nearer to understanding any one of the actual problems of world policy and has settled none. This war was a defeat to the white races, and the Peace of 1918 was the first great triumph of the coloured world: symbolized by the fact that today it is allowed to have a say in the disputes of the white states among themselves in the Geneva League of Nations—which is nothing but a miserable symbol of shameful things.

That Germans abroad should be ill-treated by coloured people at the orders of English and French was not a surprisingly novel procedure. This method began in the Liberal Revolution of the eighteenth century: in 1775 the English enrolled men of Indian race to attack, burn, and scalp the American republicans, and it should not be forgotten how the Jacobins mobilized the Negroes of Haiti for the "Rights of Man." But that
coloured men from all over the world should be massed on European soil to fight for whites against whites, that they came to know the secrets of the most modern war-method and the limits of their efficacy, and were sent home with the conviction of having beaten white powers, all this fundamentally altered their view of the world's power-distribution. They came to feel their own common strength and the weakness of the others; they began to despise the whites as erstwhile Jugurtha despised mighty Rome. It was not Germany that lost the World War; the West lost it when it lost the respect of the coloured races.

PLANS FOR PEACE

Not only the national leaders of Russia, the United States, England and China have lately laid down their outlines of peace after this war, but many public and private organizations have found voice. Much more often than formerly these latter organizations have voiced frankly the problems of color and race.

The Moscow Conference of Foreign Secretaries said in October

The governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China jointly declare:

That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other States except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

The Cairo conference said

President Roosevelt, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Prime Minister Churchill, together with their respective military and diplomatic advisors, have completed a conference in North Africa.

The several military missions have agreed upon future military operations against Japan. The three great Allies expressed their resolve to bring unrelenting pressure against their brutal enemies by sea, land and air. This pressure is already rising.

The three great Allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan.

They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion.

It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific, which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the first World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the republic of China. Japan also will be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed.

The aforesaid three great powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent.

With these objects in view the three Allies, in harmony with those of the United Nations at war with Japan, will continue to persevere in the serious and prolonged operations necessary to procure the unconditional surrender of Japan.

The Teheran conference said

We, the President of the United States of America, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met these four days past in this capital of our ally, Iran, and have shaped and confirmed
our common policy. We expressed our determination that our nations shall work together in the war and in the peace that will follow.

And as to the peace, we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the co-operation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they may choose to come into a world family of democratic nations.

◆ The New York Times in a full page editorial says

The agreements they reached in a five-day conference attended by top-flight American and British military leaders involve nothing less than a decision to put Japan back in the position she occupied in 1853 when Commodore Perry opened to the “hermit kingdom” the doors of the occidental world. Emerging from the three-Power statement is a picture of a Japan shorn of her war potential, a small insular appendage to an Asia in which China will either be the dominant Power or will share with Russia the control of a new Asiatic system. In this picture two things are strikingly apparent. The first is that the military plans made at the conference envisage a complete and crushing defeat of Japan. Otherwise the drastic and far-reaching policy determined on by the three war leaders could not be carried out. For this policy means the reorganization of the Pacific world.

This is the second point written in letters of light in the communique. It implies revolutionary changes in the geographical and political structure of Asia, and even more revolutionary changes in the inter-relations of the Eastern and Western Powers and in the responsibilities all assume toward one another and the world at large.

Here we see more plainly than before that the defeat of Japan, to which this country is unanimously and implacably committed, carries with it an inexorable responsibility for the reorganization of Asia. And in that great task, involving millions of the rising peoples of our world, the Powers of the West will face the supreme test of their capacity to cooperate for the general good.

All that can be said at this time is that the three-Power declaration marks a landmark in the evolution of the Pacific world. It raises grave and searching questions for the people of the United States as well as for the other nations involved.

Nothing is said here of colonies; nothing naturally of disgorging colonial loot on the part of European interlopers in Asia. Peculiarly significant is the silence on Hong Kong, not to whisper, India. Race and culture are avoided.

◆ At a post-war meeting held for club women in New York in September, the “Seventh Pillar of Peace,” was set up by Francis B. Sayre

For the building of the coming peace one of the fundamental issues will be the problem of foreign rule over alien peoples. Shall the post-war world in Asia and in Africa be based upon nineteenth century patterns or must we look for something different?

The answer is clear. We are com-
ing to see that the only possible foundation upon which a peace that will last can be built is that of Christian brotherhood; and this is as applicable to alien peoples as to home folks. Brotherhood allows no room for the exploitation of one people by another for the sake of selfish gain; it is incompatible with racial or national intolerance.

Ultimate autonomy for every subject race is the goal. "It has been our purpose in the past—and will remain our purpose in the future," declared Secretary Hull, "to use the full measure of our influence to support attainment of freedom by all peoples who, by their acts, show themselves worthy of it and ready for it."

What are the concrete directions in which we must move in the coming peace treaty in dealing with the problem of alien rule?

In the first place, the twentieth century method of approach must be fundamentally different from that of the past. The goal must be not exploitation for another country's profit, but the preparation of an underprivileged people for self-development and self-rule. This means a task infinitely more adventurous and more difficult than nineteenth century methods of imperialism. It means not how to extract natural wealth and trading profits from a backward people but how to build shoulder to shoulder with them schools and hospitals and roads and water systems, how to improve their public sanitation and to reduce their death rate, how to raise their general standard of living, and, above all, how to stimulate and inspire in them the ability and the desire to build for themselves.

In the second place, those undertaking the responsibility for alien rule in areas not yet ripe for self-government must work out with leaders of the subject race a forward-looking program, marking by definite steps the advance toward autonomy, and this program must be publicly declared. This involves progressively handing over to the subject people the responsibilities of government in one field after another; for the difficult art of self-government can be learned in no other way except by trial and error, costly as that may be. The acid test of sincerity will be the implementation of such declarations by concrete action, which cannot be too long delayed. The peace of the world depends upon this implementation.

In the third place, this progress toward autonomy must be subjected to international control, since the problem of alien rule is part of the problem of peace.

E. Sylvia Pankhurst, former suffragette and supporter of the Russian Revolution, more recent defender of Ethiopia, says in an Open Letter to the United Nations:

"Gentlemen, we appeal to you, in the name of the millions who fight in defence of your policies, do not make nonsense of the Atlantic Charter. . . ."

"We would urge most especially on the Governments of the smaller peoples and the less industrially equipped, an injury to one member of the international body politic is an injury to all. We would urge this on China, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia, Holland and Belgium, Norway, Poland—all the less powerful States. The League of Nations, with its Covenant against the use of aggressive force and of mutual assistance against the aggressor, should such force be used, was the great hope of peoples for the maintenance of a stable peace after the last war. China was attacked by Japan, China was a Member of the League of Nations, but the Governments of the Great Powers of the League were not prepared to operate the Covenant in her defence, and
China had to suffer the loss of Manchuria.

We all remember how Ethiopia became the next victim; how public opinion in Britain, and indeed in all Europe, was stirred to plead for unarmed Ethiopia’s protection from the wanton and unprovoked aggressor; how fifty-two States representatives of the League, assembled in Geneva declared Ethiopia the victim of unjustified aggressions; how Sanctions under the Covenant were agreed by the States’ representatives to restrain Italy, but Sanctions were never seriously applied.

You have not forgotten that when sanctions to defend Ethiopia were withdrawn, the whole policy of mutual support against aggression went to pieces. The lawlessness of the Italian Dictatorship having passed unchecked, supposed expediency being the guide of governments, instead of justice, Hitler understood that he could advance with impunity against the Czechs, whose territory and whose splendidly equipped factories were to prove so valuable to Germany in her subsequent aggressions.

The Czech Government, when on the recommendation of Great Powers they agreed to recognize the Italian conquest of Ethiopia, little thought how speedily their own people would be abandoned to the fury of the Axis, with even less ceremony than was accorded to the African State.

Gentlemen, we beg you to realize that the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter must inevitably stand or fall, as did the League of Nations and the Covenant, by the honour and solidarity of the peoples and Governments of the Member States. However perfect the rules and machinery which may be devised for the United Nations and their International Institution, however powerful the forces placed at their disposal, if the will to act resolutely, justly and impartially is absent, all these will fail and the world will be plunged into a yet more terrible conflict.

◆ Labor Discussion Notes touches a too often slurred over point in post-war reconstruction

One thing must be made clear straight away. No Socialist can want full employment for its own sake. You can have full employment with slavery; you can (for a time at least) have full employment under Fascism. As Socialists we must have a higher aim than full employment. We must ask: Full Employment for what?

We must have Full Employment for maximum social welfare—for a rising standard of material, moral and cultural welfare benefiting all members of the community. This it is that distinguishes our socialist policy of Full Employment from the policies offered by the various conservative groups.

Let us quickly re-examine in this light the financial technique for maintaining full employment which we described in our last issue. In its simplest terms this technique consists of the borrowing by the State of that part of the incomes of rich individuals and concerns which would otherwise become “unused savings.” Under capitalism these unused savings are wasted purchasing power and they convert a capitalist boom into a slump by reducing at the height of the boom the amount of purchasing power available to buy the goods that a capitalist boom can produce.

If the State borrows these potential idle savings and distributes them as purchasing power (either to individuals and families or as “collective purchasing power” in roads, schools, hospitals and the like) then a condition of full employment (or, which is the same thing, permanent boom) can be maintained. The State can draw on these potential idle savings by tap-loans which will absorb any
savings the rich want to lend to the State and by Treasury Bills, which take up any money that the rich leave in their banks. In both cases, so long as the government retains control of the banking system, the power to fix the rates of interest rests with the State. The only precaution that the State must take is to control the export of capital, so that there are no flights of capital which would place the potential unused savings of the rich beyond the reach of the tap-loans and Treasury Bills. That is the technique. How far will it serve an increasing standard of social welfare? . . .

The first point on which we must be clear is that a full employment policy is no substitute for socialism. Private ownership of the means of production—with its corollary, production for private profit—will remain unless we take specific steps to remove it by nationalization or some other form of communal ownership and control. A community working harmoniously together for social ends cannot be achieved without socialism. So long as persons are guided mainly by the profit motive they cannot be trusted to carry out effectively and wholeheartedly plans which are conceived in the interest of the whole community. And so long as the decisive means of production are in private hands the owners will still possess great economic—and social and political—power, which will enable them to thwart and circumvent the regulations and controls of a government which is trying to plan for maximum social welfare and full employment.

ETHIOPIA

In 1597, Queen Elizabeth of England wrote to the Emperor of Ethiopia:

To the most invincible and puissant King of the Abassens, the mightie Emperor of Aethiopia the higher and lower

Elizabeth by the grace of God Queene of England, France and Ireland, defender of the faith, etc. To the most high and mightie Emperour of Aethiopia greeting. Whereas it is a matter requisite and well beseeming all Kings and princes of what lands or nations soever, be they never so much dissembled in place or differing in customes and lawes, to maintaine and preserve the common societie of mankinde, and, as occasion shall be offered, to performe mutuell duties of charitie and benevolence; we for that cause conceiving most undoubted hope of your princely fidelitie and courtesie, have given unto this our subject Laurence Alersey intending to travell into your dominions, these our letters to be delivered without faile unto your Highnesse, to the end they may be a testimonie of our good will towards you and of our saide subject his departure from England. Who, after his travels in many forren countreyes, being as yet enflamed with a desire more thoroughly to surveigh and contemple the world, and now at length to undertake a long and daungerous journey into your territories and regions; both the sayd Laurence thought, and our selves also deemed, that it would very much availe him, as well for his owne safeties as for the attayning of your favour, if, being protected with our broad seale, hee might transport unto your Highnesse a testimonie of our loving affection and of his departure from hence. For silence almightie God the highest creature and governour of the world hath allotted unto kings and princes his vice regents over the face of the whole earth, their designed portions and limits to be ruled and administered by them; and by this his gift hath established among them a certaine law of brotherly kindnesse, and an eternal league by them to be observed: it will not (we hope) seeme unpleasant unto your highnesse, when you shall have intelligence of our loving letters sent so huge a distance over
sea and land, even from the farthest realme of England unto you in Aethiopia. On the other side our selves shall take great solace and delight, when as by the relation of our own subjects, the renowne of your name shall be brought unto us from the fountains of Nilus, and from those regions which are situate under the Southerne Tropike. May it please you therefore of your princely cleemencie to vouchsafe so much favour on this our subject, that he may, under the safeguard and protection of your name, enter into your highnes dominions, and there remaine safe and free from danger. Which favour and courtesie wee doe likewise most earnestly request at the hands of other princes, through whose Seigniories our said subject is to passe; and we shall esteeeme it as done unto our selfe and for our honours sake. Neither do we require any greater favour in this behalfe, then we are upon the like occasion most ready to graunt unto the subjects of all princes and the people of all Nations, travelling into our dominions. Given at London the first day of November, in the thirtie and ninth yeere of our reigne: and in the yeare of our Lorde 1597.

Nothing illustrates better than this letter the fact that international relations and comity in the 16th century did not depend on color. On the other hand, today in the 20th century, there is indication that Italy intends to get back her African colonies, including at least a part of if not all of Ethiopia. The New Times and Ethiopian News quotes the London Star:

Count Sforza's Action Party is reported to be insisting that Italy should be given a mandate over Abyssinia after the war, according to Merrill Mueller, N. B. C. correspondent in Italy, quoted by Reuter. The News adds

We are rendered deeply anxious and disturbed by the official announce-
ment that the "long-term" armistice between Italy and the United Nations envisaged by article 12 of the "short-term" armistice, was signed on September 29th, and that the terms are not at present to be made public.

Anything that draws closer the ties between the government of the United Nations and those at present acting as the Government of Italy must be regarded as highly regrettable.

If the terms are purely of a military and strategic character, publicity might connote military objections. It was stated, however, in the original armistice, that political conditions would be imposed later.

If political questions are concerned, and especially if the interests of the nations which have been attacked and injured by Italy are affected—then immediate publicity is essential. Open agreements openly signed are of vital importance.

To enter into any secret political or territorial bargain with Italy would indeed be a dangerous and tragic folly, which would bring misfortune upon millions of innocent people. The results of the Treaty of London, 1915, secret at the time, but afterwards published, which Italy exacted as the price of her entry into the last war, should be a warning to the government of to-day. By that Treaty, Britain and France promised Italy territorial rewards in Europe, and, in vague terms, also in Africa. President Wilson basing his action on the right of peoples to self-determination, justly opposed many of the territorial claims which the rapacious Italian diplomats of that time endeavoured to extort. There was a public then in Italy which supported President Wilson.

The claim that Italy did not get what her diplomats regarded as her full pound of flesh under the Treaty of London has been made the excuse for her attack on Ethiopia—an utterly
immoral argument.

The memory of the Treaty of London and of the more recent Hoare-Laval Plan should render wary all who desire to maintain international justice without which there can be no lasting peace for any nation.

AMERICA AND AFRICA

For the first time in history the Department of State of the United States Government has made a statement concerning the relations between America and Africa. Henry S. Villard, great-grandson of William Lloyd Garrison and Assistant Chief of the Division of Near Eastern Affairs, said August 19, 1943.

Our first contact with Africa is traceable to the iniquitous practice of slave trading. To our forefathers, perhaps, as in the case of the other raiding nations, it did not seem particularly wrong to land upon an alien coast, seize its helpless people and consign them and their descendants to slavery—all in the name of progress and the upbuilding of civilization. The inhuman traffic in slaves and rum carried on by early traders and businessmen in the Ivory Coast, the Gold Coast and the Slave Coast of Africa had a lasting influence not only on our own society but on the outlook of the African tribal communities, and reflects the dark record of those who participated in the spoils....

As I have previously suggested, on all the checkerboard map of Africa our ties with the Negro Republic of Liberia have been the most intimate. With a constitution, flag and government patterned on our own, with a history of American encouragement and supervision against possible foreign encroachments, it is natural that Liberia should constitute our main link with the Africa of today. Liberia looms out of all proportion to its size for a number of reasons.

For one thing, Liberia is a source of that vital commodity, rubber. The Firestone plantations, American-owned, are producing about 35,000,000 pounds annually. Another point is Liberia's favorable situation at the so-called narrows of the South Atlantic. According to precise measurement of the air routes, the Pan-American Airways base at Fisherman Lake, Liberia, is actually nearer to Brazil than the French port of Dakar. The implications of such a strategic location in the aerial age that is sure to follow this war are quite obvious.

The amazing accessibility of the Continent which is now a fact, the political aspects of the colonial question are also clearly of interest to the American people. I say this for two reasons: first, because Americans are intensely alive to developments all over the world; secondly, because the peaceful development and welfare of Africa inescapably affect the security of all the Western Hemisphere. The appearance of sore spots and frictions in the colonial systems of Africa is surely a matter of concern to us.

From the political standpoint, various solutions have been proposed here and abroad for the problem of colonies. The British Labor Party advocates a form of international supervision over the national administration of colonies, carried out by an International Colonial Commission functioning under a theoretical International Authority to be created after the war. This would leave the existing local administrations intact but would make them responsible to the bar of an expert public opinion. Others would go further and transfer the sovereignty now exercised by the controlling power to an international body charged with full legislative and administrative authority over a colony. Both these forms of international control embody the mandate principle, evolved after the last war, under which the victorious powers assumed the guardianship of certain backward peo-
ple "not yet able to stand alone" . . . .
When the time comes to formulate the conditions for the better world we all hope will follow the present struggle, I feel certain that the American principle of equality of opportunity in trade will remain a paramount factor in Africa, applicable in the colonies of whatever nationality. Furthermore, our interest in Africa is not that of the pirates of old who plundered and robbed and took without giving in return. Africa needs our skills and services in order to achieve greater productivity, just as we need access to Africa's resources. There will be ample room for cooperative effort in the working out of mutually beneficial economic undertakings . . . .

The Continent of Africa is bound to play a prominent part in any system of international security which may be devised for the future. At Dakar the presence of an American Naval Mission under Vice Admiral William Glassford is testimony to the importance of the Atlantic routes and to our cooperation with the French in making them safe for travel. Such a strategic locality as Liberia has been shown to be vital to the defense of this Hemisphere. Our traditional policy of the "Open Door," if applied uniformly to all colonial areas, is one which we confidently expect will aid in removing sources of economic conflict and contribute to the advancement of the native. If raw materials are made accessible to all on a basis of non-discrimination, one of the fundamental excuses for conquest by force will be destroyed and a real step will be taken toward a peaceful world.

◆ There is much commendable in this carefully considered statement of the State Department; but there is also an illogical mixture of the Open Door (equal right to exploit servile labor and cheap materials); God-bless-England (whose colonial record is perfect); Isolation (power without responsibility); Missions (opening wedge for trade and obedience); and Self-rule (for the few who want it and can use it).

COLONIES
◆ Increasing interest is being shown all over the world in the future status of colonies.

The Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society has issued a call for an International Colonial Convention

To-day about two hundred and seventy million people, or 13 per cent. of the world's population are living in colonial areas, covering some fourteen million square miles of territory. (These figures exclude India.) Of these 55 per cent. live in Asia or the islands of the Pacific, 42 per cent. in Africa and 3 per cent. in other continents and islands. At the outbreak of this war, one quarter were under British rule, one quarter under French, one quarter under Dutch and one quarter under the administration of other Powers including Belgium, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Spain and the United States of America. Of the two hundred and seventy million, eighteen and a half million were in mandated territories, administered since 1920 under the supervision of the League of Nations . . . .

An investigation is required into the final objectives of colonial government and into the machinery of colonial re-organization so that, by the time of the Armistice, material may be at hand on which final solutions can be based, and in the light of which immediate post-war measures can be taken. The peace-makers will decide the fate of the colonial peoples for a long time to come; their settlement once made will not be easily changed. It is therefore important that their plans should be based on sound principles.

India would add 316 million to these figures. Just why it is omitted, is a dark secret so far as this report is concerned.
At any rate there are nearly 600 millions in the world living in colonies.

The whole colonial question in its wider aspects should be considered as part of the general settlement following this world war. It is hoped that there will be a disposition among responsible governments at the Peace Conference to profit by the recent history of colonies and mandated territories and to adopt a policy more enlightened than hitherto and in keeping with the new spirit of freedom and social development in the world, both as regards the interests of the native peoples in backward areas under their control and as regards a wider justice in according to all peoples and nations equality of economic and social opportunity in those areas, and a balanced development of their economic resources.

◆ The following principles, among others, are suggested as a basis of colonial rule

The interests of an indigenous population shall not be subordinated, economically or politically, to those of a minority belonging to another race, however important in itself that minority may be.

All International Conventions relating to the recruitment and employment of labour shall be applied and enforced, including the standards of labour and social policy which are relevant to colonial conditions and which emerge from the Conventions and Recommendations of the International Labour Organization. Compulsory labour shall not be exacted for private enterprise. When permissible for public purposes it shall only be imposed under the direct super-vision of the Government and shall be paid the current rates of wages.

The right to form trade unions shall be granted to workers and the formation of trade unions shall be encouraged by the Government. Minimum wages shall be fixed by the Government for communities too backward to form trade unions. Adequate housing accommodation shall be made available for wage-earners who are living away from their homes.

Free and compulsory primary education shall be given as soon as possible to the children in all colonies devised with a view to the problems of life which lie before the people to whom it is offered, as well as to fit them to take part in governing themselves.

Land, minerals and water rights shall be treated as a national trust and any grant made to a corporation or an individual for the exclusive use thereof shall be subject to revision at prescribed periods.

Colonial development shall be related to a planned economy. Minerals, water-power, transport services and works of public utility shall be developed as far as possible by public enterprise. In cases where development is entrusted to private enterprise such enterprise shall be controlled, and the profits from such enterprise shall be limited by taxation or otherwise so as to secure a fair return in relation to the capital employed.

Co-operative production and marketing shall be encouraged and measures shall be taken to prevent economic domination by financial or commercial organizations or money-lenders.

It shall be a primary object of every Metropolitan State administering a colony to improve the economic, cultural, social and political conditions of the inhabitants and, with the object of fitting them for self-government, accord them an increasing share in the responsibility for directing local activities of every character, and particularly on governing and legislative bodies and in administrative and other public services.

Self-government shall be regarded as a goal to be reached as soon as competence for it is attained. A system
of periodic review shall be encouraged with the object of recording progress made and making appropriate changes. The form of self-government shall be that best suited to the traditions and circumstances of the people. Such form as may be chosen should be moulded with the object of securing the three essentials of democratic government, namely, (a) free selection of representatives, (b) free discussion and (c) the acceptance of majority decision.

◆ The Labor Party of England in its recent conference declared

This Conference expresses to the Colonial people its appreciation of their participation in the United Nations’ war effort; it declares that the terms of the Atlantic Charter and the ‘Four Freedoms’ should become active principles in Colonial administration and proclaimed in a special Charter to the Colonial peoples; it demands that all forms of political and economic imperialism shall be rapidly liquidated; it urges the abolition of ‘Colonial status’ and the rapid realization of genuine partnership between this country and the Colonial peoples; it insists that the Government (in consultation with the Colonial peoples) shall press on with the social and economic welfare of their territories, including adequate education, health and nutrition services, and the attainment of political rights not less than those enjoyed or claimed by British democracy; it asks for the application of a Socialist policy in the economic organization of the Colonies, and the acceptance of the principle of international supervision and accountability in Colonial policy and administration.

◆ On the other hand there are those who regard an even liberal attitude towards colonies with unabated suspicion.

George Padmore writes in England and says

In an analysis of British Imperialism one salient fact must always be kept in mind: that England without an Empire would be merely a geographical expression, an insignificant island of 46 million people off the fringe of Western Europe. England’s world greatness is based upon her imperial structure, chiefly upon India, that brightest jewel in the Crown of the British Raj. For this reason, whatever concessions or modifications the post-war world may witness in colonial reconstruction, no British Government—Tory or Labour—will ever voluntarily relinquish Britain’s hegemony over her sources of raw materials, markets and reservoirs of manpower. And this is all the more true as it becomes evident that America will emerge from this war the greatest imperialist nation of the twentieth century, and as such, Britain’s chief commercial competitor for the markets of the world. Guided by this principle of self-interest, she is determined to preserve her status as a great world Power, come what may.

Before this war, Britain drew annual tribute amounting to £200 million from her overseas investments, which returned to this country in the form of foodstuffs and raw materials. Today, with the loss of a number of her investments sources, British imperialists must cling more strongly than ever to the advantages which a Colonial Empire provides.

The covert struggle between Britain and America for imperial mastery is being pushed more and more into the open as the determination of the war is considered to be approaching nearer. And this struggle is being voiced by prominent British and American capitalists. There is knowledgeable recognition that “a fundamental difference in psychology existed in Britain and America which would make team play between the two nations extremely difficult after the war.” This is the expressed opin-
ion of no less a figure than the President of the American Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Eric Johnston, who imparted it to a press conference at Washington (on September 2), after a three weeks’ visit to Britain. Britain, Mr. Johnston went on to say, believed in controlled markets, the United States in free competition. It was not, he asserted, necessary to reconcile these two divergent views but it was necessary to recognize them.

Wendell Willkie also believes in free competition on the world’s markets, and particularly on the markets of those territories now forming parts of the British Empire. This is the underlying motive of his ostensibly democratic championship of freedom for colonial peoples, which he puts forward in his book, One World. Freed from the political control of their present British rulers, the native bourgeoisie would inevitably turn to America for the provision of capital, capital machinery, and all the other instruments necessary for the development of industrial economy. For there is no doubt that with its greater industrial potential, most advanced technology and financial resources, America today occupies the same relationship towards world economy as Britain did during the last half of the nineteenth century, when she was the workshop of the world, and the City of London the greatest money market. Hence wider markets are an absolute necessity for U. S. capitalism, and as things stand, they can be secured only at the expense of the British Empire.

Capitalists in both countries recognize this most clearly, and that is why, as Mr. Eric Johnston stated, Britain believes in controlled markets, the U. S. in free competition. But while, as Mr. Johnston further maintained, it was not necessary to reconcile these two divergent views, there are sections, both within the British Empire and the U. S. A., which believe that they can be reconciled through some form of mutual co-operation. This will be expressed through a closer working agreement with America and the British Dominions in the exploitation of colonial territories, especially Africa.

The political blue-print of this new Anglo-American partnership was first expounded by General Smuts, the wily Boer statesman responsible for the imposture of the Mandates System. He comes forward once more as the strategist of the new Colonial Imperialism. “Condominium” will now supersede “mandates.” The cloak of altruism will once again screen imperialist self-interest.

◆ The New Republic adds

Lord Wavell knows what we shall be up against in the reconquest of occupied Asia unless we can offer the people a program more attractive than that of the Japanese. He knows how much depends on the invading army’s receiving the active cooperation of the inhabitants. He has warned that the natives of Southeast Asia will oppose a return to the old colonial system. What indications are there that we intend to heed his advice?

Last July the British Colonial Secretary, Colonel Oliver Stanley, so far improved upon Mr. Churchill’s well-known statements as to announce the government’s willingness after the war to collaborate closely in the British colonies with neighboring and friendly nations. But he did not disclose when the “progressive approach to self-government” would be likely to reach its goal, the only real interest of the peoples concerned.

◆ The English Left carries an article by Felix Morrow

It will take the bloodiest convulsions in the history of mankind to win the independence of the subject peoples of Britain, above all India’s four hundred millions. “Without India the British Empire could not
exist,” said Lord Curzon in 1892, and it became truer with every passing day as Britain’s commercial and industrial superiority waned. Curzon warned the British bourgeoisie that its last desperate battle would be in Asia: “The future of Great Britain . . . will be decided not in Europe . . . but in the continent whence our emigrant stock first came, and to which as conquerors their descendants have returned.” Unless forestalled by a proletarian revolution in England, the British bourgeoisie will fight in India so long as it can mobilize cannon fodder . . . .

To smash British rule will require a gigantic effort of the colonial masses. To summon the Indian masses into the struggle against Britain, however, means to encourage their own demands—against the landlords and usurers and capitalists. Hence the colonial bourgeoisie fears to summon the masses, and is therefore incapable of overthrowing British rule. The Indian bourgeoisie has demonstrated this once again during the past year. One can predict with confidence that the struggle for independence at the next stage in India will be directed not only against the British Raj but also against the Indian landlords and capitalists. That is not what Willkie prescribes, but history will not follow his recipe. Willkie proposes independence for India as an alternative to social revolution; but in the living process they are one and the same.

EDUCATION

◆ The Atlanta Constitution compares the cost of education in Fulton County, Ga., where Atlanta is situated, and Bibb County which contains Macon.

The per diem cost of schooling for each Atlanta pupil is listed, in the records of the State Department of Education, as $1.12 per day for whites and 40 cents for Negroes. Contrast this with Macon’s 63 cents for whites and 15 cents for Negroes, considering also the fact that Macon schools have an equally high scholastic rating, and the extravagance of a dual school system becomes increasingly evident.

The “dual system” complained of is not the white and colored schools, but the division into city and county systems. Consolidation might enable Atlanta to approach Macon’s 15 cents.

◆ In all the talk about Democracy, little is said of sheer illiteracy—widespread ignorance as the chief cause of its failure. In the United States alone, a nation which figures as modern and intelligent, 750,000 men have been rejected from the army because of illiteracy. The Southern Patriot says that 500,000 of these rejectees are white.

The Army’s definition of illiteracy is a practical one: the ability to read an ordinary newspaper. This is about the equivalent of having completed a fourth grade education. It is easy to see that a modern mechanized army has no use for men who cannot come up to these limited educational qualifications.

The 1940 Census showed that one out of seven Americans 25 years old or over can be classed as “functionally” illiterate on the basis of the Army definition, since they lack fourth grade education. As for the 18-19 year old group, the Selective Service System has stated that about 12% of Negro registrants have been rejected for educational deficiency, along with over 1% of white registrants of the same age group.

As for the general population age 25 or over, Census figures show 7,300,000 whites as functionally illiterate, and 2,700,000 Negroes. Of the whites, 4,200,000 are native born.

◆ The United States Office of Education has finished a national survey of higher education among Negroes. Dr. Ambrose Caliver summarizes the findings in the
final brochure. The summary is valuable and carefully done. It suggests the following action by Negro colleges:

That higher educational institutions for Negroes begin an aggressive attack on the problem of defining their purposes in light of: (a) the needs of the students they enroll, (b) the socio-economic factors of the area they serve, (c) the types of institution they are, and (d) the principles of democracy upon which they and our Nation are founded.

That colleges for Negroes provide comprehensive programs of vocational guidance for their students, based on personnel, institutional, occupational, and community studies.

The astonishing thing about the suggestions is the almost complete ignoring of the economic factors. Socio-economic studies cost money; where are Negro colleges to secure funds? In providing vocational guidance, shall the colleges direct Negroes into jobs now open to Negroes, or into jobs and wages which must be made available to them if they are ever to attain a civilized standard of life? And if for the latter, how are these students to live until the openings are available? If Negroes are to be trained for the menial jobs of labor and domestic service now mainly open to them, how is the group to progress? Negro colleges must refrain from offering too much “graduate and professional work.”

But if it is only in the professional field that Negroes of education can make a living income, shall they still be trained as locomotive firemen, when they know they cannot get work? 

◆ Just so in British Africa, the great hindrance to self-rule is illiteracy and the cause of illiteracy is systematic and planned poverty.

The following figures carried in a recent London dispatch, showing annual expenditures per child, give some idea of the shocking extent to which the general education of Africans is being neglected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African</th>
<th>European</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyasaland:</td>
<td>£0 1s. 10d.</td>
<td>£18 7s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Rhodesia:</td>
<td>0 4 6</td>
<td>28 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda:</td>
<td>0 5 3</td>
<td>14 10 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika:</td>
<td>0 5 7</td>
<td>10 18 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria:</td>
<td>0 11 0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rhodesia:</td>
<td>0 13 9</td>
<td>30 13 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya:</td>
<td>0 16 0</td>
<td>26 7 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone:</td>
<td>2 0 9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast:</td>
<td>3 10 10</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No figures for European education are available in Nigeria, Kenya and the Gold Coast.

The low figure for Nigeria is accounted for by the fact that the relatively good educational facilities for the urban minority are offset by the almost complete absence of facilities for the millions in the hinterland. The Northern Nigerian territories with a population of eleven millions have only 23,000 pupils in recognized schools.

◆ The British Labor Party in its declaration on colonies declares

The quality of education is the test of sincerity of the British pledge to help Africans towards self-government; that in many parts of Africa, even the beginnings of such a policy hardly exist; that the disparity between the outlay on education for European and African children is indefensible; that people called on to pay fees for the elementary schooling of their children are often too impoverished to be able to meet the charge; that there has been lack of a policy considered and consistent; that as soon as possible, there must be a general and compulsory elementary system, with three main objectives,
vocational, non-vocational, and selective, the last meaning selection of children most capable of benefiting by secondary and higher education; that there must be great and quick extension of secondary, technical and higher education; that concurrently with temporary migration of young men and women teachers from Britain to Africa (assured of resumption of careers on return) there must be temporary migration from Africa to Britain of African young men and women for teacher-training courses which could include study of the Netherlands and Russian education systems.

Colonel Oliver Stanley, British Colonial Secretary, in a speech made last July takes a clearer attitude on higher education for Negroes than our own Office of Education.

First, with regard to higher education. It is quite clear that if our goal of colonial self-government is to be achieved, colonial universities and colleges will have to play an immense part in that development. They are the centres of higher education in their respective areas. They will, first of all, have to meet the enormously increased need for trained professionals which increased social and economic services will necessitate. They will have to provide the agriculturists, the engineers, the doctors, the teachers, the veterinary surgeons, and the specialists and technicians which the approach to higher standards of life will entail. They will have, too, to do an immense amount of research. I am sure that as the field of our knowledge widens, more and more gaps in it will be disclosed, more and more subjects will call for investigation, much of which can only be done on the spot. Finally, with extra-mural activities and refresher courses they will be able throughout the areas of which they are centres to stimulate general progress and encourage the production of leaders from those who gain their knowledge and experience from their daily life.

The British Colonial Office has announced a Commission of Inquiry on higher education in colonies. This commission includes former colonial officials and English university professors, but no Negroes. However another commission on higher education in British West Africa includes one or two Negroes.

It is gratifying to learn that Mr. K. A. Gardiner, a West African Negro, who has recently visited America and who addressed the first convention of the Land-Grant Colleges on Social Studies, has been appointed principal of Fourah Bay College.

The West African Pilot says

The most significant thing about Mr. Gardiner's appointment is seen in the fact that he is likely to be the first African principal of this great West African institution. We know that an African had acted in this capacity in the past, but not as a substantive holder of the post. Looking at the issue from this standpoint, Mr. Gardiner's selection for the post, in spite of his youthful age, is certainly a great testimony to his capabilities and achievements.

F. E. P. C.

◆ The upheaval which the President's order against racial discrimination in employment has caused is symptomatic of racial attitudes in the United States. The latest result is the seizure of the F. E. P. C. records by a congressional committee, headed by Smith of Virginia. Smith is well-known as a reactionary and is leading the forces which would make discrimination against Negroes in industry not only permissible but compulsory.
This attitude is illustrated by the reply of the railroads to the F. E. P. C. findings and directives of November 18, 1943. The Atlantic Coast Line, the Central of Georgia and Georgia Railroads; the Louisville and Nashville, Seaboard Air Line, the Chesapeake and Ohio, Norfolk and Western, Illinois Central and other smaller lines, join in the statement. The chairman of the F. E. P. C. in his reply, put a finger on the characteristic evasion of this answer.

These railroads have no response to make to your findings and directives addressed exclusively against various railway labor organizations and dealing with their practices concerning failure to admit Negroes to their membership, or to consult them in representations of employees, etc. . . .

Railroads are forbidden by law to interfere in any way with the self-determination or self-organization of their employes and are entirely without power to dictate to their employes, or to affect by unilateral action, any changes in such agreements. Such changes are controlled by, and can only be accomplished by, the procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

It is wholly impracticable, and indeed impossible, for these railroads to put into effect your committee’s directives addressed against them. Any attempt on their part to comply with those directives, for instance, to promote Negroes to locomotive engineers or train conductors, would inevitably disrupt their present peaceful and cooperative relations with their employes, would antagonize the traveling and shipping public served by them, would substitute conditions of chaos for the present condition of harmony, would result in stoppages of transportation and would most gravely and irreparably impair the whole war effort of the country. These railroads cannot assume the responsibility for precipitating such disas-
fere with the employment of Negroes as firemen on locomotives."

The firemen problem, and the problems of up-grading, job assignments and seniority rights of Negroes in the operating divisions and the shops were the subject of four days of FEPC hearings in September. The railroad unions chose to ignore the hearings. The carriers made a perfunctory appearance. Their letter now makes a bid for public disapproval of FEPC by viewing with alarm alleged pretensions of Negroes to be engineers and conductors . . . .

The carriers complain that its directives were too broad, branding them as "impossible and impracticable." Yet no carriers' move to remedy discrimination was made until these matters were publicly examined. The chance to talk this dilemma through with FEPC has been present ever since the hearing.

Four railroads did so. The Virginia Railroad complied and relieved itself of a complaint against it before the hearings began. The Union Pacific did so during the hearings. The Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central are in amicable and cooperative discussion with the FEPC looking toward solutions. The way is open for the remaining sixteen carriers.

The FEPC is an American committee, trying to help fight an American war. Its duty is to prevent discrimination against any worker, whatever his or her race, creed or nationality, who would be an acceptable war worker were it not for preconceived prejudice. We may not be able to wipe out discrimination overnight, but where war manpower needs are at stake we can and shall try.

In the meantime, legislation is being sought on the one hand by Southern reactionaries to curb the President's power; and on the other hand by David Dubinsky and A. Phillip Randolph to raise a fund in order to make the President's order a permanent instrument of government.

JEW AND ARABS

◆ The power-politics now being pushed in Great Britain and America is a discouraging combination with Hitler's anti-Semitic program. The first World War ended with a solution of the anti-Semitic agitation, first in the abolition of race discrimination by Russia; and secondly in the opening of Palestine as a national home for the Jews. Dorothy Thompson said on the 26th anniversary of the Balfour declaration

This November we celebrated an historic moment in the long life history of the Jewish people. We celebrated the historic acknowledgment by the world's greatest imperium, that the Jews are a nation; the historic expression of intention to provide them with a homeland in the country of their national origins; and we intend to discuss what Winston Churchill once called the "solemn undertaking" of the British government, to accomplish this purpose . . . .

Its promise to the Jews was that there should be established in their historic birthplace "a national home for the Jewish people it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which prejudices the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

Seldom, in so few words, has a policy been more clearly and unmistakably expressed . . . .

In Grand Policy, it is clear that the Jews are being used on the one hand to counterbalance strong Arab aspirations, threatening the power structure of the British in the Middle East, and with repercussions upon the British position in the Far East. The Jews have been used as a diversion.
Palestine is a very small part of the whole Middle Eastern complex and Arabian world. Its loss for the Arabs would be negligible if they could exchange it for their own security and opportunity for national development. And it could highly contribute to the economic and social regeneration and re-creation of the Middle East which, once the center of civilization, has fallen back through centuries of corrupt and dismal foreign rule.

- Jewish Palestine was established and made notable progress. Then came the Hitler pogroms. Millions of Jews were killed and millions today stand in danger of the annihilation. Not only is anti-Semitism in America closing as tight as possible the doors against Jewish migration, but worse than that, Great Britain has assumed the right to limit Jewish migration to Palestine and to support the nationalism of the Arabs. What does this mean? In the American Historical Review for July 1943, Phillip R. Hitti explains what is meant by the Arab States and what federation among them is possible

On the whole it looks as if all the raw material out of which a federation of Arab states, beginning with Syria and Iraq, could be woven is there; what is still lacking is the master weaver, the leader who Faysal-like may appear any day. The British in conjunction with the Free French have already expressed their approval of such a federation, as may be indicated by an announcement of Anthony Eden on May 29, 1941, endorsed by General Catroux on June 8. Around this nucleus Egypt and Arabia may some day in the future cluster. The trend on both the national and international levels is unmistakable. The indication of history is equally clear. Throughout their long and checkered career the periods in which the two horns of the Fer-

tile Crescent—Greater Syria and Iraq—stood severed were but brief episodes compared to those in which they were joined as parts of an integral whole. Whether the North African block could in the remote future be brought within the political orbit of Arabism depends upon national and international factors too complicated to be foreseen . . . .

The Pan-Arab congress of Jerusalem, which convened in December 1931, and attracted more representatives than any other one, adopted a covenant which enunciated three principles: (1) the Arab countries are a “complete and indivisible whole”; the Arab nation cannot recognize its dismemberment; (2) the inhabitants of all Arab countries must concentrate their energies on the achievement of complete independence to the exclusion of all separate tendencies; (3) imperialism in all its forms is incompatible with Arab aspirations and should be combated with all available resources. The pact was sworn by delegates from Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Iraq, and the Arabian peninsula. The League of National Action, which was held in Qurnayil, Lebanon, August, 1933, also emphasized the “unity of Arab lands” in Asia and Africa, without defining them. But the second Pan-Arab congress, held in 1937 in Bludan, near Damascus, under the presidency of the Egyptian ex-minister, ‘Allubah Pasha, defined for the first time the Arab lands as extending “from the Atlas Mountains in the west to the Persian Gulf in the east and from Turkey in the north to the Indian Ocean in the south.” Prior to 1900 we know of no congress that could be called representative of the Arab or Moslem world.

- The Jewish Frontier adds to this statement

The Jews will be the last to fail to express their solidarity with the national aspirations of any people, in-
cluding the Arabs. But aggressive and expansionist nationalism should everywhere be curbed, including in the Middle East, among the Arabs. Even according to the most modest plans, the Arab federation would contain enough of a promise for a great future without including Palestine. This is what we must insist on as a people, as a group which is vitally concerned about its own fate and its own future: Palestine must not become part of any scheme for an Arab federation. Even if the programs of the Pan-Arabists with respect to the Jews were radically different from what they are; even if they were to agree to a Jewish majority in Palestine, with a certain degree of autonomy for the country (which is, of course, the case only in Dr. Magnes' dreamland)—even then it would have been senseless and unjust to force the Jewish homeland into a theocratic, feudal Arab empire . . .

The problem is not which of the two civilizations is superior, nor whether the condition of the Arabs in one or another country is fixed and unchangeable—there is, in fact, no people in the world which is incapable of phenomenal development in the course of a few generations. The point is that today we are vastly different, and the fact of our being different, together with the vital problem which Jewish Palestine is called upon to solve, demand that Palestine be considered not as part of the vast Arab complex, but as a separate entity, requiring its own political solution. This solution should enable the Jewish people to achieve its own national liberation in its own way and in line with its own culture and traditions.

RACE RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Since the riots in Michigan, Texas, and New York, there have come voices and movements in the United States looking toward betterment in race relations. The most ambitious program is that of the American Missionary Association. It has a staff of ten persons, some part time, and has concentrated its work in areas of racial tensions.

This is given major importance at this time because of the acute racial situations centering around population mobility, industrial readjustments, housing shortages, problems associated with the military training program, general war hysteria, and direct incitations to racial unrest. Acute industrial problem areas are Mobile, Alabama; Charleston, South Carolina; Detroit, Michigan; Macon, Georgia; Beaumont and Port Arthur, Texas; Savannah, Georgia; Pensacola and Panama City, Florida; Philadelphia - Chester, Pennsylvania; Hampton Roads, Virginia; San Francisco and Los Angeles, California.

Similarly, acute racial situations, precipitated by the racial housing deadlock involving restrictive compacts and property protective associations, appear in Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, Philadelphia-Chester, South Bend, Milwaukee, Baltimore, Cleveland.

Destructive race riots have occurred within the past month in Mobile, Beaumont and Detroit, and minor outbreaks in several other points.

The objective of the work in these areas is the immediate one of dealing with the abnormal situations through community forces, and the less immediate one of preparing the community for the inevitable problems of post-war readjustment, industrial re-conversion, and the return of soldiers to civilian life.

◆ "A statement on the race relations crisis" has been widely distributed. It is signed by 317 outstanding citizens and says,

Good citizens agree that they want to use their wisdom to prevent re-
peated race riots throughout the country, to use foresight in creating the atmosphere in which no battles between races can occur.

Unfortunately, many Americans of good will think they have used all wisdom and foresight and have done their full duty when they serve on inter-racial committees that work on improving housing and recreational facilities for Negroes and decreasing job discrimination.

Necessary and important as such work is, it does not strike at the root of the problem. Neither does it convey to American Negroes the assurance of essential good faith which would sharply decrease the danger of further race riots . . . .

Negro Americans are outraged by segregation in our armed forces, where the gulf between professed war aims and their application to hundreds of thousands of Negro soldiers is so great as to make a mockery of the Four Freedoms. This policy of segregation proves an insurmountable barrier to true happiness or even human decency. It torments the Negro people daily like a dagger whose point is always in the flesh. At the same time, by setting white against black in the competition for jobs a fatal handicap is raised to every effort to achieve adequate economic standards and a genuinely democratic existence for the masses in the majority group.

If they are to stop fearing and hating each other, Negroes and whites must know each other. But how can they know each other so long as segregation fosters ignorance and fear in the people of both races? Therefore we call to all America:

Open wide the doors of all churches, all schools, all unions, all fraternal bodies and all businesses to people of every race and color. Only by working, playing and worshipping together, day by day, can you wipe out the misunderstandings which are fertile soil for race hatred. Unite Negro and white schools, churches and other institutions so that together you may help solve the economic, social and political problems which beset all people everywhere. Only in that way can we build a world of brotherhood, with peace, liberty and justice for all.

◆ The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America made an unusually strong statement in its annual race relations letter

One of the most pointed official statements on race discrimination ever issued by the Federal Council, the message declared that "the growing resentment by dark-skinned peoples against white domination and their feeling that they are deprived of the position properly belonging to free men in a democratic society make it mandatory for Christians to speak with prophetic voice and with apostolic conviction."

◆ Chicago, Pittsburg and Springfield, Mass., are using the public schools to better race relations. The superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools says in School and Society, in October

The logical place to teach a real and practical democracy is in the public school, and there also is the logical place to begin the practice of these ideals. In the Chicago Public Schools there is no discrimination against any group of people, regardless of race or color. And recently, the curriculum of the elementary schools has undergone a change which constitutes a real boon to better understanding between races. This change is an enrichment of the curriculum to include the study of the Negro's contributions to our country's greatness.

IN MEXICO
◆ In Mexico City in October, 1943, was celebrated the First Inter-American Congress of Demography. In the resolutions
an unanimous interest was demonstrated for the development of studies of the indigenous populations of America including the Negro populations brought from Africa, which form an important nucleus with many interesting intermixtures of cultures as well as many serious problems, economic and social as a result of racial prejudice.

For many years there has existed this idea of founding a center for studies consecrated especially to the problems of the Negro populations of America but each time opposition to this project has arisen. Fortunately, Dr. Fernando Ortiz, delegate of the Republic of Cuba to the above congress, proposed in some private conferences of ethnologists and sociologists that the moment has arrived for consummating this organization without official character and with merely scientific aims for the special study of these problems.

The idea was received with enthusiasm and on the 20th of October in Mexico City in accordance with the laws of the United Mexican States, the International Institute of Afro-American Studies was created. An executive committee was appointed to initiate these studies and to organize a directing council with representatives of the different countries not only in America but in the rest of the world because this new institute is international in the broadest sense and not exclusively inter-American. Dr. Fernando Ortiz of Cuba was elected president. See also pages 15 to 29.

A NOTE BY THE ASSOCIATE EDITORS

The Editorial Board of PHYLON is highly pleased to note the election of its Editor-in-Chief, W. E. Burghardt DuBois, to the National Institute of Arts and Letters, a society founded in 1898 for the furtherance of literature and fine arts in the United States, and composed of not more than 250 American citizens "qualified by notable achievements in Art, Music and Literature."

This high recognition of Mr. DuBois' contribution to American letters is an encomium consonant with the force of mind and skill of pen he has employed in behalf of the world's darker peoples for more than half a century. There is great significance in the fact that he becomes the first Negro member of the Institute. DuBois himself would say, in all probability, that there is greater significance in the indication that a person of color may give his life and talent to the problems of race and culture and live to see the literary treatment of those problems recognized as a vital pattern in the mosaic of American letters.

Nevertheless, the name of DuBois is a notable addition to the membership of the Institute's Department of Literature which now includes such eminent names as Charles Beard, John Erskine, Douglas Freeman, William Ellery Leonard, Robert Morss Lovett, Archibald MacLeish, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Christopher Morley, Bliss Perry, Carl Sandburg, and Carl and Mark Van Doren. The recognition of the Institute is a worthy manifestation of respect for one who has prolifically propagated a doctrine of human equality in distinguished and inventive writing.