

H. B. ISHERWOOD

RACIAL  
INTEGRATION

the rising tide  
of colour

All who are genuinely concerned about the destiny of our nation and people should ponder on what is set out in this book. It is an analysis of what is popularly called The Colour Problem. It is not a comprehensive study of the question but seeks to direct attention to the reality that lies beneath the surface of social tensions which are racial in origin.

The author rests his case on the self-evident truth of the natural inequality of men, that men are not born equal and that because of the varying limitations of their inborn talents they can never be made equal by upbringing, education or artificial law. Amongst these basic inequalities are the genetic racial ones, both of body and mind. The author claims that racial equality is a political myth.

The human races have been brought into being at different times and in different places through complex evolutionary and historical processes by the hand of God, with the result that each race is endowed with unique characteristics by which it can be identified. Colour of skin is the most conspicuous of these, but although it furnishes a natural means of identification it is not the most important of the racial features. Much more important are those associated with character and the brain.

From earliest times there have been migratory movements across the world of men of fundamentally different breeds, but all such movements have been from populated areas to unoccupied or sparsely inhabited areas.

With the present migration into Britain, where the coloured population already exceeds a million and is rapidly increasing, it cannot be argued that immigration can be balanced by emigration on a numerical basis, since the exchange involves quality as well as quantity.

Earlier immigrants entering England such as the Flemings and the Huguenots were of the same racial strain as the English with similar historical and Christian backgrounds and were congenially absorbed into the English community. Jewish immigrants, however, have never sought to be fully

*[Continued on inside back cover]*

7s 6d net (\$1.00)

## RACIAL INTEGRATION

*By the same author :*

**RACIAL CONTOURS—**

**The Factor of Race in Human Survival**

© H. B. Isherwood 1965

Printed in Great Britain in 11 on 13 point Baskerville on SEB Antique wove paper by B.P.S. Printing Co and published by Britons Publishing Company, 111a Westbourne Grove, London W2

# RACIAL INTEGRATION

**The Rising Tide  
of Colour**

---

by

H. B. ISHERWOOD



LONDON

BRITONS PUBLISHING COMPANY

1966

## DEDICATION

*This book is dedicated to a just appraisal of racial qualities as the only sure way towards a better understanding between the peoples of the world.*

## CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	7
1.	RACIAL DIVISIONS . . . . .	11
2.	RACES DIFFER BIOLOGICALLY . . . . .	18
3.	RACES DIFFER POTENTIALLY . . . . .	26
4.	AFRICAN NEGROID BACKWARDNESS . . . . .	29
5.	MULTI-RACIALISM . . . . .	34
6.	APARTHEID . . . . .	40
7.	THE (BRITISH) COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS . . . . .	44
8.	BLACK INVASION OF BRITAIN . . . . .	51
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	73
	INDEX . . . . .	75

“The idea that all men are equal is a palpable incredibility and a delirious absurdity.”

**Thomas Carlyle**

“Any unchecked mongrelizing destroys the symmetry of a national type.”

**The Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D.**  
(Late Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral)

“The . . . call of assimilation, in all its multi-faceted aspects, is a soul-destroying tragedy that quenches the altar-fires of our faith and idealism, leaving only the cold ashes of a forgotten glory, of a rejected mission, of a trust betrayed.”

**Israel Abrahams, Chief Rabbi of South Africa**  
*South African Jewish Times (Sept. 1964)*

“. . . the right of any nation . . . to regulate its demographic composition should be considered as sacred by any liberal-minded man.”

**Don Salvador de Madariaga**  
*The Times (Oct. 1964)*

“Now therefore make confession unto the Lord of your fathers, and do his pleasure; and separate yourselves from the people of the land, and from the strange wives.”

**Ezra x: 2**

## INTRODUCTION

AS THE world population increases towards explosion point and as each race becomes more conscious of itself in the struggle for survival much talk is heard on racial matters, but rarely do discussions on the subject rise above the level of emotion and sentiment. Preconceptions and prejudices, not to speak of intolerance, loom large when racial comparisons are made.

A catch phrase such as 'racial equality' is bandied about as though it enshrined some hallowed truth or had meaning with respect to the real nature of mankind. A moment's rational reflection would make it clear to the simplest mind that racial equality is not a scientific truth but a political concept. It is in the nature of a political fiction introduced by agitators to facilitate a trend towards a grey and characterless cosmopolitanism.

Men of all races are units of humanity, and spiritual equality amongst them there may be, but racial equality is a contradiction in terms. 'Equality of being' seems to be deliberately confused with 'equality of status' as part of a sinister dialectical game.

The notion of treating individual men as identical political pawns, all equally endowed by nature and all equally susceptible to a uniform culture, first gained currency at the time of the French Revolution, a leveling doctrine that was later put into pseudo-scientific

form by Karl Marx, whose atheistical philosophy is the basis of all modern systems of Socialism and Communism, an ideology that regards man as nothing more than a soulless economic unit, distinguishable from other men only by 'class', all the playthings of ruthless material forces, subduable only within a mechanistic society.

What is the truth? Firstly, we know without a shadow of doubt that men are not born equal, nor can they ever be made equal by upbringing or training. Every man has a personality of his own indelibly stamped on him by nature; each has his peculiar aptitudes; each has his own innate capacity and potentiality. And each has a free will and a moral responsibility – though this is questioned by Socialists and other determinists who prefer the rather meaningless concepts of 'collective moral responsibility' and 'conscience of the nation'.

Secondly, we know with equal certainty that mankind is divided by nature (as humanity is divided by the hand of God) into separate and distinct races (subspecies), each characterized by its own physical and psychological attributes. And the races in turn are split into many sub-races, all identifiable by inheritable (i.e. non-cultural) qualities.

Lest any misapprehension should still be harboured as to what is exactly meant by race it may be appropriate here to quote the definition offered by Arnold J. Toynbee, the renowned world historian: 'Race is a term used to denote the possession of some distinctive and inheritable quality in particular groups of human beings.'

It is self-evident that each nation reflects the innate racial character and unique idiosyncrasies of its people,

and history shows quite clearly that a nation becomes socially unstable and loses some of its cohering discipline if there are set up within the realm enclaves of people of alien races who by their contrasting natures and different ancestries can never be congenially assimilated, particularly if such assimilation is against the wishes and instincts of the indigenous people, as in Britain, for example. Whether or not there exists any natural or instinctive antipathy between races that could be likened to cultivated national antipathy, we know from historic examples that racial integration of any magnitude could spell national disintegration.

And finally we know from the science of genetics that an advanced society would in time become irreparably degenerate if subject to any considerable infusion of disharmonic genes, the disruptive dysgenic process that tends to eliminate the finer evolved qualities. Taking the long view, in this process can be seen the greatest of all the evils of racial integration.

Habits and cultures deemed to be superior may be envied and copied by inferior races, but the creative genius that first gave rise to them is an attribute of the superior races only.

The letters reproduced in the following pages, all written by the same hand and all published in the national press, may seem repetitive, but this should serve to emphasize the case they present. That in all material respects the letters went unchallenged may be taken as a pointer to the validity of their contentions and the reasonableness and worthwhile nature of the recommendations made in them.



# I

## RACIAL DIVISIONS

FOSSILS OF human remains and artefacts dug up in different parts of the world yield convincing evidence that the human races did not all make their appearance on earth at the same time. For them to have done so would indeed have been a miracle. Each race came into being at the end of its own long line of evolutionary selection and divergence, a circumstance which in itself would be sufficient to account for the organic differences existing between the races to-day and for the astonishing disparities between their respective cultures.

The many factors, both simple and complex, by which the separate races can be identified and classified (the ethnic differentiation), together with the vital significance of such characteristics in social relationships, cannot be set out here in any detail, suffice it to say that the racial divisions of mankind to-day can be seen as the reticulate growth of the primary races as first created.

The primary races with their approximate ages are as follows :

Caucasoids	-	250,000 years
Mongoloids	-	150,000 ,,

Neanderthaloids	-	75,000 years
Negroids	-	50,000 „
Australoids	-	40,000 „
Amerinds	-	20,000 „

The Caucasoids include all the white European races and peripheral coloured elements among the mixed sub-races living under a warmer sun in northern Africa (Hamites) and in territories stretching eastwards from the Levant (Semites) as far as the Indian sub-continent (Indics).

The Mongoloids, the great Yellow Race, comprise the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Malays and the bulk of the Polynesian peoples of the Pacific. Such Himalayan peoples as the Tibetans and the Sherpas and Gurkhas are Mongoloid, as also are the various peoples occupying the more easterly lands of the U.S.S.R.

Fossilized remains of the heavy beetle-browed Neanderthaloids have been found in widely distributed areas in Europe and farther afield across Asia. Though much bigger-brained than the Negroids of today this great archaic race became extinct some 40,000 years ago.

With their ancestral home in Africa the Negroids include not only the true Negroes (Sudanese and Bantu) but also such subraces as the Pygmies (Negrillos) and the Bushmen and Hottentots. Some anthropologists, however, are inclined to classify the last two groups as a primary race (Khoisanoids). Also akin to the Negroids are the frizzy-haired Negrito peoples of the Pacific, collectively known as Melanesians.

The ancestors of all the Negroids in the Western Hemisphere came from Africa, mostly as slaves who had been sold into slavery by their own people. Fundamentally, therefore, the Negroes of America are little different in overall biological characteristics from the Negroes in Africa.

The evolutionary bed of the Australoids was in Java and the surrounding territory. From there they migrated slowly southwards until they reached Australia, where they were to remain the stone age fixtures we see today, the Australian aborigines, the Blackfellows, 'the rudest savages as to whom we possess accurate information', as Sir James Frazer has described them. Grouped with the Australoids are the Veddahs and similar primitive types of Ceylon and India. A more Negrito type of the Australoids, the Tasmanians, became extinct less than a hundred years ago.

The earliest ancestors of the Amerinds, the American Indians, were migrants of the proto-Mongoloid phylum who crossed the Behring Straits into America from Asia about 20,000 years ago, the very first humans to invade the Western Hemisphere. Other waves of immigrants followed them and man steadily hunted his way southward until at last he reached the southernmost tip of South America. Despite their great variability there seems little doubt about the ethnic unity of the Amerinds. Some experts, however, now prefer to treat them (with the Eskimos) as a subrace of the Mongoloids.

From an analysis of statistics published from time to time by the United Nations and other authorities the racial strength of mankind as at the end of 1964 may be

represented reasonably accurately by the following figures :

Caucasoids (Whites)	–	980,000,000
Caucasoids (Browns and Blacks)	–	890,000,000
Mongoloids (Yellows and Browns)	–	1,140,000,000
Negroids (Blacks)	–	250,000,000
Australoids (Blacks)	–	300,000
Amerinds (Reds)	–	12,000,000
<hr/>		
Total world population	–	3,272,300,000
<hr/>		

The extensive marginal interbreeding which has occurred as a result of migrations over the centuries does not appreciably affect the genetic racial composition of mankind as reflected in the totals given.

According to figures published by the United Nations in September, 1965, the world population is increasing at a rate approaching 60,000,000 a year, the coloured races at a greater percentage rate than the white.

Problems arising from racial intermingling are cropping up all over in the world as national populations expand, especially in territories where space is limited as it is in Britain. In Ceylon about half of the 1,000,000 Tamil-speaking Hindus are now being sent back to India. In Burma some 300,000 Hindus are being forcibly repatriated. The Nagas in India are refusing to be integrated into Hindu society. Negro and Hindu are at deadly loggerheads in British Guiana, where both races are eliminating the native Carib Indians. The Chinese, keeping to themselves in Malaysia and else-

where, are now looking with growing admiration at expanding China.\* In Algeria 2,500,000 Berber Kabyles are restless under Semitic Arab rule, despite a common religion. The non-Arab Nilotics of Southern Sudan are steadily being thrust out. In South Africa the Hindus as well as the Europeans never contemplate intermarrying with the Negroid Bantu. The proud Nilotic Tutsi will never lie down with the racially inferior Bahutu Bantu in Rwanda. Greek opposes Turk in Cyprus, one Caucasoid and Christian, the other Mongoloid and Moslem. The native Polynesians and Melanesians in the Fiji Islands are now outnumbered by the Hindu immigrants. And in Mauritius the Hindus to-day constitute a well-organized racial majority. In Iraq the non-Semitic Kurds are still embattled against their Arab overlords, still hoping to gain their national independence. And Jew faces Arab in Israel.

The racial tensions in the Western Hemisphere are widespread and conspicuous and are so deeply-rooted that it is unlikely they will ever be eradicated in the foreseeable future, an endemic condition putting a brake on civilized progress that only racial homogeneity and social stability can sustain.

Before the International Court of Justice at The Hague on June 23, 1965, Professor Ernest van den Haag of New York University, an acknowledged expert on the question, unequivocally declared that one of the consequences of unregulated contact between ethnic groups was social disorganization resulting in an in-

\* Purely for racial reasons Singapore, with its Chinese population of over 1,000,000, was forced out of Malaysia in August, 1965, and became an independent nation.

creased rate of delinquency and a higher rate of suicide. Studies in the United States, he said, showed that delinquency reached its maximum when a community was half white, half Negro.

The races with their characteristic traits had their origins at different times as part of a universal evolutionary process involving the creation of genes (the factors of organic inheritability) by breeding in isolation where such genes (or their mutations or combinations) conferred some continuing advantage for survival in an environment where they were free from contamination by genes of less evolved creatures.

And as modern man, despite his scientific presumptions, is no more exempt from natural selection than were his primeval progenitors, it may not be unreasonable to believe that the natural creation of racial diversity is purposive in some way so far inexplicable, and that man has a sacred duty to preserve his racial integrity by racial discrimination, as indeed is enjoined on him in the Bible, as something of supreme value in the divine scheme of things.

To reduce mankind to a common level of organic uniformity is to reverse the process of evolution which depends for its forward movement on an increasing diversity.

No philosopher is ready to say into what ideal form man will evolve on earth, but it may be asserted without reservation that if man is to continue his progress or even maintain his present civilized standards it is imperative that the genetic composition of the white subraces be kept free from further adulteration. In short, any

social relationships that might incur the risk of mixed racial marriages should be avoided. Every effort should be made to keep the races genetically apart – as seems to be God's decree.

## 2

### RACES DIFFER BIOLOGICALLY

DURING THE past thirty or so years, possibly as the outcome of prejudice engendered by what was happening in Germany, widespread publicity has been given to the fallacy that all the human races, despite their different origins, are biologically alike and that any apparent differences relate solely to their customs and cultures. In denying that mankind is divided into races biologically, a professional anthropologist of Cambridge University, in a letter to *The Times* as recently as 15th October, 1964, even went so far as to declare: 'The nature of men is identical; what divides them is their customs.' The implication in this piece of Cambridge 'scholarship' is that a Pygmy Negrillo becomes transformed into an English Nordic if he wears a top hat and uses a knife and fork at table. A rebuttal of such nonsense hardly seems necessary.

It is now generally acknowledged that the brain (the central nervous ganglion) is the physical seat of consciousness, of all thought, reason and moral sensibility, so there is no alternative but to accept the fact that the biological (that is the organic physical and physiological) qualities determine in one way or another a person's

mental or intellectual calibre. As with a person, so with a race. On average the Negroid brain is smaller in size and less developed than the European Caucasoid, and other more technical cerebral differences are noted, including variations in the rate of growth, all the outcome of a fundamental evolutionary differentiation that had its beginnings at the dawn of Creation. This means that although the Negroid may in a limited way be able to emulate modern European cultures and activities with relative efficiency the complete intellectual gulf can never be bridged. To a certain extent the existence of this gap has been confirmed by laboratory intelligence tests (after due allowance has been made for any variability in upbringing and background), and in school experience, both in Africa and in America. The known history of Negroid Africa, with the negligible exception of the artistic culture of Benin and Ife, also supports this conclusion.

Notwithstanding the availability of scientific knowledge on the matter, all the organs of publicity, practically without exception, propagate the false theory that the races are physically and mentally equal and that any suggestion to the contrary is wanton prejudice. However, *The Sunday Telegraph* of 6th August, 1961, did allow the following letter contradicting this view to appear in its columns – a letter to which there was no reply :

Sir – In his review of Philip Mason's book on racial comparisons Mr T. E. Utley says ' . . . no serious thinker any longer contends that races are biologically unequal'.

To such a view, so demonstrably untrue, could very well be attributed much of the social and political unrest and discontent that vex the world to-day, and as a small corrective it may be worthwhile publishing more authoritative opinions.

In *The Race Question in Modern Science* edited by Sir Julian Huxley and published by Unesco, we read: 'Races consist of groups of men who differ from other groups in their inherited biological characteristics,' and again: 'Negro and White are in no respect identical either physically, intellectually or emotionally.'

One of the world's greatest anthropologists, Sir Arthur Keith, gave it as his considered opinion that 'the races of man are differentiated in the same way as well-marked species of animals'.

Students of anthropology and specialists in ethnology could quote many similar findings, but little prominence is given to such conclusions to-day.

As to whether one race is superior to another is, of course, a different question.

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Under the title of 'Race and Patriotism; Dominant Part in Forming Nations', *The Daily Telegraph* on 17th May, 1963, allotted a conspicuous position to the following letter:

Sir - Although your leader of May 14 points to certain distinctions between the racial tensions in America, South Africa and Britain, actually the

phenomena all spring from a common root, namely the deeply-embedded instinct for survival, racial survival, which necessarily expresses itself in social attitudes, often strongly felt and irrepressible.

For purely political purposes it is of course now fashionable to assume that all the various races of mankind are potentially equal, an *a priori* generalisation which is associated with the notion that all the divergently-evolved races are biologically uniform, with no real differences between them except the outward bodily and the social and cultural ones.

To the unprejudiced mind the evidence against this supposition is overwhelming.

Whether one race has more progressive innate qualities than another and whether mixed racial breeding would in the long run be advantageous to mankind as a whole are questions which should be decisively answered before racial integration or racial assimilation is positively advocated as a feasible or desirable political end.

The racial factor has always played a dominant part in forming nations and in inspiring patriotism, as we know from our own history. To-day in Africa the main urge behind the desire for self-government is unquestionably racial. The leaders of renascent China have solemnly declared that the 'Chinese people are superior in the nature of things', and in the Soviet Union the national heroes are not acclaimed as international Communists but as noble Russians, meaning, of course, Slavs who have distinguished themselves in the service of their fatherland.

Similar manifestations of a racial nature could be quoted by the thousand, and no nation is exempt.

With the above considerations in mind one may perhaps be able to form a more realistic view of such controversial matters as the so-called colour bar, apartheid and immigration, and may in the end come to realise that it is not altogether 'against reason, against Christian ethics and against political expediency' for people to demonstrate their preference for their own kind and their own kith and kin in what is fundamentally a racially-competitive world.

Yours faithfully,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

In *The Daily Telegraph* of 17th June, 1964, the further letter as below was published under the title of 'Law and Racial Issues: Risks Inherent in Interbreeding'.

Sir – Although your leader of June 13 dealt judiciously and fairly with the distressing racial strife in America, it did not probe very deeply into the real cause of the trouble, which is more than skin-deep.

Legal statutes may confer equality before the law – a civilised concept – but in no sense can they ensure or enforce social equality. Still less can they compel belief in the myth of biological racial equality.

If they behave naturally birds of a feather will flock together, freedom to do so being regarded as a right, and there seems nothing immoral – certainly not from a Christian viewpoint – in white citizens

(or coloured) wishing to keep their own exclusive company in a multi-racial community. Looked at tolerantly from this angle, the exercise of free choice or discrimination, particularly where family relationships are involved, may not appear quite so objectionable or provocative.

As regards the inherent differences between the races, it is at last being realised that all the races did not start on their long evolutionary journeys from *homo erectus* to *homo sapiens* at the same time in the history of the world, nor in the same territory, as was once supposed; which means that they could not possibly occupy the same position on the evolutionary scale.

This inference is of supreme importance when consideration is given to the possible disruptive consequences to the European races, and to mankind as a whole, if any intimate inter-racial association is sponsored that might lead to widespread inter-breeding. Economic rivalry, privileges and prejudices apart, it seems to be the case that it is against such a potential risk that the white people in America both north and south of the Mason-Dixon Line, and in South Africa, are showing their determined resistance.

And in this connection one might ask what is sinful or irrational or unpatriotic in the passionate desire of white Americans and white South Africans to leave behind descendants of their own quality and the quality of the great men who founded their nations.

Yours faithfully,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Most of the propaganda directed against the realities and social significance of racial differences is based on the assumption that no intrinsic differences exist between the races that could not be resolved by educational or cultural means. In opposition to this supposition the writer obtained space for the following letter in *Time and Tide* of 5th March, 1964, under the heading of 'Black and White' :

Sir – Miss Savage (*Time and Tide* of 6–12 February) is perfectly correct in saying 'the African and European are fundamentally different', and Mr E. Moss (*Time and Tide* of 20–26 February) is completely wrong in contending that 'the differences between the various races lie entirely in environment and education'. Indeed, Mr Moss must himself be aware of some fundamental distinctions (biologically inherent and apparent) between the separate races for him to quote – rather unscientifically – such examples as an Englishman, a Negro, a Chinaman and an Eskimo.

It is a common error to assume that interchangeability of blood between all humans is proof that biological racial differences do not exist, for it would even be possible under certain conditions for a human to receive without harm a blood transfusion from an ape.

Nevertheless, it is now being found advisable to segregate blood banks on a racial basis, as well as on a group basis, for rather complex reasons we cannot elaborate here.

All reputable scholarship agrees that one race differs from another on biological grounds that have nothing whatever to do with the immediate environment or political nationality. Racial characteristics and racial potentialities can never be flattened out by any form of culture or training. In short, all the education in the world will never transform an African Negro into an English Nordic.

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

### 3

#### RACES DIFFER POTENTIALLY

IT IS A truism in natural history that if an organism differs biologically it must in the evolutionary sense also differ potentially, a truth necessarily applicable to man.

Out of millions of Negroids, living and dead, no genius has yet appeared and only one or two have shown any noteworthy intellectual ability judged by Caucasoid standards, yet these rare exceptions have given rise to the exaggerated belief that Negroids might possibly have the same creative capabilities and potentialities as the white or European Caucasoids. It perhaps should at once be mentioned that the Negroids whose names have become known in the intellectual field have not in fact been markedly Negroid at all, but are coloured men heavily charged with the genetic qualities of a part white ancestry.

Following a radio lecture on 'The Colonial Reckoning' a discussion was carried on in *The Listener*, the magazine of the British Broadcasting Corporation, as to whether the Negro in Africa could create and sustain into the future a civilized society up to the technical standards of Europe, to which debate the following letter was contributed on 1st February, 1962 :

Sir – Mr Philip Somerville apparently imagines (from his letter in *The Listener* of January 11) that because Negroes when ‘given the right facilities for progress’ can conform to the standards developed by the white race the two races are potentially equal.

To be objective one must bring into consideration in such racial comparisons more important factors than the mere capacity to copy, amongst which may be mentioned the inborn inventive and creative genius, imagination and intellectual initiative, the innate impulse to explore and improve, and the rare faculty of philosophic perception out of which are conceived by reason and intuition the lofty ideals, secular and religious, that alone make any civilization worth while.

In these fields the Negroes, with a history under favourable circumstances possibly as long as any other modern race, have been singularly lacking; indeed, so far they have contributed practically nothing at all to the civilized arts, nor is there any anthropological reason to suppose that their overall instincts will ever allow them to catch up with the progressive potentiality of the white race.

Racial equality is political advocacy, not scientific reality. As the experts of Unesco say: ‘Negro and White are in no respect identical either physically, intellectually or emotionally’.

Yours, etc.,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Politicians and others who imagine that the characteristics that distinguish the races are superficial or cultural

in origin and that the more lowly races could be constitutionally improved in the genetic sense by education and training in a particular environment are harbouring the now discredited theory (of Lamarck and in our time Lysenko) that a person's body could be so moulded and his brain so conditioned by external influences that the changes so wrought in him during his lifetime would be inherited in the blood of his children. This fallacious theory, still an essential element in Communist ideology, seems to be at the bottom of much wishful thinking on matters relating to racial uplift, particularly in America.

Change in the racial potentiality of the mind is something that cannot be achieved in a thousand and one years.

## 4

### AFRICAN NEGROID BACKWARDNESS

AT THE Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1961 one of the experts gave this as his unprejudiced opinion of Africa, i.e. that part of Africa which had always been the Negroid's domain: 'No contribution to the arts of civilization has come from Africa, which has produced nothing but destruction and ruinous exploitation of its natural resources.'

Thus did a scientist endorse the opinion of the historian, Arnold J. Toynbee, who wrote: 'The black races alone have not contributed positively to any civilization as yet.' Toynbee further pointed out that the Negroids have had every opportunity over thousands of years to develop a civilized and worthwhile society and culture of their own. They roamed the healthy highlands as well as the malarial river basins. They had physical virility, as their endless bloodthirsty tribal wars proclaimed, so what must have been lacking was some mental quality. Seligman, the great authority on Negroid tribes and their histories, thought that this inherent deficiency was being made good by the infusion of genes

from the Hamitic and Semitic races to the north who had invaded the dark domains to obtain slaves.

Miss Margery Perham, an eminent writer on Negroid African affairs, suggested (on the radio in April 1963) that African Negroid backwardness could be ascribed to the absence of cultural contacts with more advanced races as a consequence of living in geographical isolation in the depths of the jungle. Opposing this viewpoint, the following letter was published in *The Listener* of 11th April, 1963, under the heading of 'Britain and Africa in 1963':

Sir – Until quite recently it was generally understood that the cultural backwardness of the Negro in Africa was due to some inherent biological quality, the natural product of the race's isolated evolution under tropical conditions. In other words, it was assumed that the selective evolutionary forces that had undoubtedly determined the Negro's body had also evolved his brain and his mental faculties, the quality of the latter being expressed in the patterns of the indigenous cultures he initiated.

It has now become politically fashionable to believe, as is implied in Miss Margery Perham's fascinating talk printed in *The Listener* of April 4, that the almost complete absence at any time of a notable Negro civilization approaching Western (or oriental) standards was solely due to the long cultural isolation of the race. If examined critically, however, such a supposition does not hold water, for we know that the race had a fairly intimate and prolonged contact

through Nubia with the advanced Hamitic culture of the Nile going back for thousands of years. And there was a substantial intercourse through ancient Numidia with Semitic Carthage and Aryan Rome. Nor should it be forgotten that the Negro in the western and southern coastal regions has been in close contact in war and peace with Europeans for many centuries.

But the most provocative cultural challenge (to use Toynbee's popular phrase) to the Negro came from the Arab incursions during the eighth century and onwards. From the Semitic Arabs and their associates (the Berbers, for example) the Negro acquired not only the disciplined religion of Mohammedanism but also, of far greater significance, the genetic factors we now see so prominently displayed by many of the leaders of the modern Negro nations with their colonial-drawn frontiers.

In considering African affairs the fact should always be kept in mind that many of the African nations are not of Negro provenance at all. None of the nations abutting on the Mediterranean and Red Seas is Negroid. The 26,000,000 inhabitants of Egypt, for example, are mainly Hamitic, though ruled by an Arab minority. Again, the dominant race in Ethiopia is Semitic Amhara, though constituting less than two per cent. of the total population. And we have just been presented with the spectacle of the Somalis of northern Kenya demonstrating their resentment at the proposal to bring them under a Negro government.

Though there is a natural official reluctance to admit it frankly, the racial factor is all-important in

African political development. African continental unity on the basis of a common African mind seems in the nature of things to be a pathetic illusion.

Human races are undeniably different in many fundamental respects and their instinctive urges necessarily assume different forms. Whether one race has superior qualities to another is a difficult question that can only be answered in the light of the criterion against which the respective racial characteristics may be measured. That all the races are 'potentially equal', biologically and culturally, as is contended by Miss Perham, is palpably absurd, having regard to what we know about the more subtle mechanics of evolutionary selection, from which, *ex hypothesi*, not even man and his artificial complex societies are immune.

Yours, etc.,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Miss Perham answered this by saying that biologists and sociologists 'have been moving away from the old and convenient theories of inherent racial differences, and have even found "race" itself a difficult concept to define'. This of course is not quite true, being applicable only to the school of thought that stresses the major importance of cultural adaptation during historical times, a concept that readily lends itself to political bias, but which is now being rapidly eclipsed as the science of genetics advances.

Despite the history of, say, Haiti and the awful spectacle of the Congo, she reiterated her view that the backwardness of the Negro 'has to be sought in environ-

mental factors' and not in his nature or his lack of ability, inclination or will-power to deal with his environment. At the same time she expressed a doubt whether the Negroes were as backward in the past as the evidence so far available proves. In discussing Kenya, she further did not seem to be sensitive to any difference in outlook between the Asiatic Indian, the Hamitic or Nilotic Somali, the Negroid Bantu and the European Caucasoid. Her conclusion seems to be that all the people in Africa could be conditioned socially until they were all permanently alike, a superstition which is part of the Communist technique of propaganda.

## 5

### MULTI-RACIALISM

A NEW term has come into the language, namely, multi-racialism, apparently to denote a society composed of clearly defined races within one nation.

Such nations are notorious for their lack of social cohesion and their inherent instability, a condition in which they must remain for a very long time even if one race becomes completely dominant or the races genetically combine by biological integration.

In multi-racial America, where the national stereotype of Uncle Sam is now obsolescent, the main racial minorities are Negroids (about 20,000,000), Semitic Jews (5,575,000) and Amerinds (about 600,000). Besides these there are some 1,750,000 other citizens who are neither white nor black and who are vaguely classified as 'other races' amongst whom are Mongoloids and Puerto Ricans and other swarthy people of part coloured descent. All these groups in a total national population of 192,000,000 (1964) clamour for special recognition and equal federal rights, all very conscious of their racial needs.

In Britain the main racial minorities are Semitic Jews, Negroids, Gypsies and Asiatic Indians (Hindus and Pakistanis), and also many men from the Mediter-

ranean area (Cyprus and Malta) who in some respects seem more alien to the native Britons than some men of colour. These separate racial groups, with their decidedly race-conscious attitudes and with their different cults, religions and customs, can never be brought effectively within the British racial fold, which is mainly Nordic with a Christian heritage, so Britain, once racially homogeneous, must now become reconciled to an uneasy and insecure future.

It may not be out of place here to refer to what is probably the most common of all the false theories disseminated (usually by those who seek to undermine patriotism by decrying the pedigree and racial balance of Britons) about the racial composition of the people of the United Kingdom, namely, that because the native British population has been built up of Iberians, Picts, Celts, Romans, Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Norsemen, Danes, Normans, Flemings, French Huguenots and later European immigrants it is racially mixed. Though this supposition is officially taught by the United Nations for their own sinister motives it has no factual foundation whatsoever. All the peoples mentioned (not in ethnological terms) are congeneric, all Caucasoids, almost entirely of European Aryan or Nordic/Alpine stock, all readily assimilable into one homogeneous society. On the other hand the coloured races who have been allowed to invade Britain in their hundreds of thousands since the last war belong to different races or subraces altogether, the Negroids from Africa and the West Indies being more remote from the European Nordic stock than most of the coloured Indians.

The Semitic Jews in Britain constitute both a racial and a socio-religious group, which largely accounts for their corporate strength and influence. They do not seek to be fully integrated into the rest of the community (any more than they did in Ancient Egypt) since they claim for themselves a national destiny as the Chosen Race under Jehovah, to await the coming of a Messiah to make them the rulers of the world. To-day fewer than 3% of them marry outside their race. Judaism is a nationalist religion and the Jews in effect practise a most stringent and laudable form of racial discrimination and apartheid – which, however, they are wont to condemn in other races. Living as a separate race amongst Christian people their spokesmen often unwisely condemn Christianity as one of the causes of anti-Semitism, their scholars asserting that it was not the Jews but the Romans who demanded that Jesus the Christ should be crucified, and that the story in the New Testament is a pack of lies.

The coloured Pakistanis, constituting another well-defined racial minority group, are all Mohammedans and they too have shown little inclination to be completely absorbed into English Christian society.

Also faithful to their own religion and customs are the coloured Hindus who seem to prefer to keep segregated (socially if not economically) following the pattern they have set in other countries where they have settled.

The 'one man, one vote' despots in the various newly-constituted Negroid republics in Africa have made it quite clear that they will not tolerate any racial minorities within their nations and with a deplorable lack of

gratitude have already started to expel or otherwise eliminate the white people who in colonial days rescued them from savagery and tribal chaos and created their nations, providing them with the knowledge and the administrative machinery necessary for good government.

Drawing attention to what was happening in Africa the following letter was published in *The New Daily* of 25th June, 1964, under the title of 'Is Multi-racialism Dead?':

Sir – No discussion on African affairs now seems to be complete without the term 'multi-racialism' being brought in (as in Mrs Violet Munro's letter in your issue of June 16) yet rarely is this overworked term defined with any precision.

If it means a conscious or wilful shuffling of the different races sharing the one territory, it certainly does not, neither could it, apply to Africa, particularly if a stable and progressive society or civilisation on European lines is the desideratum.

On the other hand, if the term connotes no more than representative 'one man one vote' democratic government, with a formal Opposition, then we can already see how this has dismally failed wherever it has been tried in Africa, even in Tanganyika\* where representation on a racial basis has been written into the constitution.

As regards the purely political aspect of this question, it may be salutary to recall the opinion of Mrs Elspeth Huxley, one of the most experienced com-

\* Now Tanzania.

mentators on the African scene. In *The Times* of September 24, 1963, she says: 'Multi-racialism is dead beyond hope of revival. If the whites relinquish their grip then the blacks will take over. To urge whites in southern Africa to share their political power is to urge them to commit racial suicide'.

However, if 'multi-racialism' implies the need to recognise openly and preserve the distinctive characteristics and qualities of the separate races, then this is what the white people are doing in South Africa, where territory is being specially set aside to enable the Negroid Bantu to develop their own society and culture in accordance with their innate nature in fulfilment of their own destiny.

In saying that 'an African's brain is as good as ours', Mrs Munro must have some esoteric knowledge or a special criterion for her assessment and comparison, since from what we positively know of all the relevant factors – cerebral morphology, laboratory mental experiments, genetics, school experience, pre-history and history – the average Negroid brain is some way below the average European brain in the evolutionary sense.

Where there might be odd evidence of a quality in a Negro superior to the norm for his race, this can be attributed to an early Hamitic or Semitic (or later European) genetic admixture, a circumstance which gives rise to some misunderstanding when racial attitudes are associated solely with colour of skin.

To a certain extent the races of mankind can be classified on the basis of blood groups, and it is fal-

lacious to argue, as Mrs Munro does, that the races are equal because under certain conditions 'a Negro's blood can be used to save our lives in a blood transfusion'.

Feelings of inferiority or superiority may be engendered by political propaganda, but if any white person does suffer from what is called a guilt complex with respect to his historical relationship with the Negro, let him reflect on the fact that the white European races have given to the black races in Africa a civilisation and way of life the black races were incapable over thousands of years of giving themselves. And in this achievement let us not forget that the greatest contribution came from the much-maligned British Empire.

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

## 6

### A P A R T H E I D

LARGELY as a result of ill-founded propaganda and ignorance both of the science of ethnology and of the actual racial conditions obtaining in the Republic of South Africa, many intelligent people have allowed themselves to be indoctrinated into believing that apartheid is something evil, an offence against God as well as nature. The exact opposite is the truth.

Apartheid is an Afrikaans term used in politics to denote the 'apartness' of separate racial development. It is a procedure rendered imperative in South Africa in order to preserve unimpaired the inherited qualities of the white European stock of people, mostly of Dutch, French Huguenot and British kinship, and to ensure that the fine society they have created and the great civilization they have carved out of the wilderness shall remain intact for their children. The ideal is a most praiseworthy one, as anyone looking at the African scene with a clean and impartial mind can appreciate. But because the Government and people of South Africa are unalterably opposed to Communism and any violation of the integrity of their great nation from outside they have incurred the enmity of the United Nations, the U.S.A.,

the governments of certain other African nations – and the Socialists and Communists in Britain. Belligerent threats are repeatedly being made by the Socialist and Communist leaders, and also by the warlike ‘pacifists’ of the Church of England, to institute a blockade of South Africa in an attempt to force the white inhabitants to submit to Negroid or Bantu domination under a form of Communist tyranny or black dictatorship as in other African countries. Already (1965) the pro-Communist Government of the United Kingdom contemplate dishonouring their agreements to supply equipment to help South Africa where it is needed for defence against Communist subversion and invasion and the upsurge of black paganism.

Fortunately for Christendom the racial superiority of the South Africans will enable them to face such wickedness with unyielding courage and ability, secure in the belief of the rightness of their cause and in the invincible strength of their great nation.

To blockade a nation is a calculated act of aggression, but the United Nations, not being governed by Christian or any other moral scruples, would sanction it and would further have no compunction in sending in mercenaries to kill or murder the white people and the loyal Bantu, as they did in the Congo, a nation they reduced to a state of chaos, carnage and cannibalism.

Despite what the atheists and the political clerics may say, there is nothing unethical (according to the Holy Bible) in allowing races the freedom to develop their own societies and their own nations in accordance with their own natures, but because of the political

prejudices of those who hold the reigns of power it is rarely possible for the truth of the matter to be represented to the public. However, *The Times* of 25th November, 1963, did give some prominence to the subject in the following letter under the heading of 'Rather than Sanctions' :

Sir - Your second leader on November 20 about what kind of pressure could best be applied to the South Africans to make them adopt an internal policy that is deeply repugnant to them must seem to anyone at all conversant with the local conditions and the nature of racial tension both superficial and inconclusive.

As Mrs Elspeth Huxley has said (*The Times* of September 24), 'multi-racialism is dead beyond hope of revival. . . . If the Whites relinquish their grip then the Blacks will take it. . . . To urge Whites in southern Africa to share their political power is to urge them to commit racial suicide'. This view is one that is now being held by an increasing number of responsible people who are following the course of events in Africa.

Despite the spate of opinion to the contrary, the attempt by the white South Africans to preserve their integrity as a separate (but not necessarily superior) race can in no sense be regarded as immoral. Racial considerations were invoked in connexion with the establishment of certain nations after the First World War, when the principle of ethnic self-determination was held in high esteem. The racial factor, indeed, has

been the predominating consideration in setting up the independent Negroid nations, democratic representation on the basis of race in the case of Tanganyika even being written into the Constitution.

Implicit in such policies is the recognition of racial distinctions, in practice necessarily involving some form of racial discrimination and apartheid, which in the circumstances can hardly be condemned as 'indefensible and abhorrent to world opinion'.

The white citizens of South Africa, no longer colonials, are in effect pursuing the only sensible and feasible course open to them within the racially mixed society of their country – namely, partitioning the territory on a racial basis as a secure means of protecting and preserving their inherent qualities and heritage, while at the same time guaranteeing to the Bantu freedom and scope to live their lives as they wish according to their intrinsic natures.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Notwithstanding its avowed policy against any form of political racial discrimination *The Times* on 5th August, 1965, solemnly declared with respect to immigration that "Australia has the right to determine her own ethnic composition". If Australia has this moral right, why not South Africa or Great Britain?

## 7

### THE (BRITISH) COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

THE BRITISH EMPIRE arose out of the spirit of adventure and enterprise of Britons and associated peoples in exploring and opening up territories for an expanding industrial society – and in seeking freedom of expression and worship. Only incidentally was the Empire conceived as a colonizing operation.

Across the wide seas the flag was carried to the four quarters of the globe and with it went the English language, together with a knowledge of democratic institutions and usage. From Britain set out dedicated Christian missionaries such as Livingstone to campaign against barbarism and slavery, particularly in darkest Africa.

To the Indian sub-continent Britons took an impartial administration and justice, bringing to the people unity and peace at a time when lawless anarchy prevailed.

In uninhabited or sparsely populated lands colonies of Britons grew up into the great nations we see to-day.

Over the whole Empire lamps of enlightenment and progress threw their beams. Pax Britannica.

Now the picture is changed. The British Empire is no more. In its place is an unwieldy collection of ill-assorted independent states. Some of these new nations are showing pride in their racial fulfilment and they can no longer be trusted to align themselves with Britain in the council-chambers of the world. They are already abandoning British concepts of democratic rule, merely retaining an attachment to Britain for purposes of procuring assistance to sustain their national viability.

But still living in great territories overseas are millions of Britons or descendants of Britons and other white Caucasoid people who in their hearts are loyal to the Crown and who still look upon Her Majesty as Queen at the head of an unbroken racial dynasty, and who can still see the value of adhering to the British and Christian way of life.

In the Republic of South Africa, now no longer in the Commonwealth, are over 3,000,000 white Caucasoids, all proud of their European ancestry and heritage. Among them are many people of British stock who still like to regard Britain as their Mother Country.

In Rhodesia 225,000 Britons stand firm in their allegiance to the Throne despite sinister threats by Socialists and Communists who want to see their great country turned into a republic under a Communist form of Negroid dictatorship after the precedents set by other Commonwealth countries in Africa.\*

In Canada, Australia and New Zealand, with con-

\* Under pressure from the Socialist Government of the United Kingdom, the Government of Rhodesia formally declared the sovereign independence of their great nation on Armistice Day, 11th November, 1965.

stitutional governments under the Crown, the people, loyal to Britain, are determined to protect their racial unity and do not intend to allow their communities to be impoverished by any undue infiltration by alien coloured races who could never be assimilated with advantage.

In *The Times* a case was presented to show that the British Commonwealth of Nations had become an unrealistic association of states with irreconcilable objectives, a view which was supported by the following letter published on 8th April, 1964 :

Sir – The real test as to whether the British Commonwealth is a workable or worthwhile reality as far as Britain herself is concerned is surely the degree of loyalty displayed between the nations composing it. On this score the Commonwealth is most obviously in a process of disintegration, as ‘A Conservative’ so eloquently made clear in *The Times* of April 2, except perhaps in respect of those great nations of our own kith and kin whose monarchical constitutions have our Queen as their Queen.

Recognizing the accelerated trend towards racial divergence we should without delay associate ourselves more intimately with our own brethren, men of our own breed and Christian heritage, men in whom in the last resort we could trust – in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Southern Rhodesia and – yes, ultimately in South Africa.

As regards mixed immigration into our overcrowded isles it simply is not true to say that society in Britain will gain anything by becoming multi-

racial in structure, nor has any authority yet been able to show in what way the innate character of the indigenous people will be improved by absorbing dysgenic racial elements. Nor need Britain become multi-racial to qualify for membership of a multi-racial Commonwealth.

As Benjamin Disraeli said : 'The nation that ignores race does so at its peril,' so why should we not frankly acknowledge the truth of our real nature and drop the sentimental pose of equality of being?

The destiny of our nation is necessarily involved with that of other nations, but this does not mean that we should neglect to preserve our own kind or disconnect ourselves from our own history and traditions, as is enjoined on us by those whose shadowy faith is in a crumpling multi-racial Commonwealth or in the unstable United Nations – or in an inchoate humanity.

Yours faithfully,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Pleas have appeared in the national press for some positive action to be taken by the Government to consolidate a more intimate relationship between Britain and the lands where live hosts of British settlers who still look to Britain as their spiritual home. On 28th May, 1964, *The Daily Telegraph* published the following letter on this theme :

Sir – How much more convincing to people in the United Kingdom it would have been if the earnest

plea for the continued existence of the British Commonwealth, so eloquently expressed by Lord Casey (May 21), had come from, say, Dr Nkrumah or Dr Banda or Dr Kaunda or Mr Kenyatta or even from Bishop Makarios.

As the Commonwealth is now constituted millions of Commonwealth citizens are no longer subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, and their rulers have amply demonstrated by their speeches and actions that they are determined to have no stronger affiliations with Britain than with Russia or America or China.

The historic trend is clearly towards the disintegration of the Commonwealth which received its mortal wound when one of its great founder nations, South Africa, was compelled to withdraw.

The time has surely come for Britons to look ahead more realistically and to seek by every available means to align Britain more closely with those great countries where dwell so many of their loyal kith and kin.

Yours faithfully,  
H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Another letter on the same subject was published in *Time and Tide* dated 3rd September, 1964, under the heading of 'The Changing Commonwealth' :

Sir - As was foreseen (but apparently not by our Government) Kenya has now formally declared her intention to dispense with a democratic constitution

under the Crown and instead proposes to set up in December a Communist-type republic under a one-party dictatorship, thus following the precedent established by Ghana and other coloured countries of the Commonwealth after they became independent.

We have seen how Ceylon has refused to help Britain and Malaysia against Indonesia and how on occasion most of the coloured nations have voted against British interests before the United Nations.

The basic character of the Commonwealth as defined by the Statute of Westminster, 1931, is changing before our eyes and it seems obvious that the time has come for Britain to take the initiative and draw to herself more closely under the Crown those great nations, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Southern Rhodesia, where British traditions are still valued by so many of our own dependable kith and kin who loyally acknowledge our Queen as their Queen.

Into the orbit of the new British Empire should be attracted the Republic of South Africa, the only independent nation in the whole of the African continent on whom Britain can safely rely for practical help in the unremitting war against Communism and the rising tide of paganism.

In connection with the metamorphosis of the Commonwealth our Government should no longer feel obliged to consult the break-away nations as to whether their surplus nationals should be allowed to settle permanently in our already over-crowded islands even if they have work to do.

Looking ahead in the light of the new circumstances our Government would be wise to end forthwith all coloured immigration and at the same time provide facilities for immigrants already here and who in the nature of things will never be fully integrated to be repatriated to their own lands where they could freely enjoy the more congenial society of their kindred.

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

## 8

### BLACK INVASION OF BRITAIN

THE INFLUX into Britain during the past ten years or so of people of unassimilable racial natures is a general consequence of the continued existence of an illogical and ill-conceived association of nations made up of citizens of totally dissimilar and unequal races.

Attracted to Britain by the promise of state welfare and the relative prosperity of the country, the coloured migrants represent the overspill populations of nations with minor exceptions no longer acknowledging allegiance to the British Crown. The immigrants are thus political as well as racial aliens.

During the past ten years or so many public protests have been made about the disruption and distress being caused by the massive invasion of England by Negroes and Mulattoes, East Indians and Pakistanis and Eurasians and other people of assorted races, but the Government of the day have maintained a pose of indifference (though 'anxiously watching the position'), believing apparently that Britain herself ought to become multi-racial in order to be at the hub of a multi-racial commonwealth.

Because of a social imbalance in Britain, most of the

immigrants have filled temporary gaps in the labour market in hospitals, factories and transportation, and because this meets the economic requirements of the moment the Government, not caring about the intrinsic quality of the English people or their future, saw no reason to alter the arrangements.

The natural pride in being Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, or English, Scots, Welsh or Irish was, in fact, finally forsworn by the Government when in a statement as long ago as 8th December, 1959, they formally rejected the 'idea of any inherent supremacy of one race over another', thus relegating Britons to the level of the Hot-tentots who are now decaying into extinction.

Every day reports appear in the press of crimes committed by immigrants, which have indeed become so frequent that some newspapers no longer mention the race or origin of birth of the culprit lest offence be given to coloured readers. But because of the neglect of the Government to maintain in any methodical way ethnographic records it is difficult to comment on the incidence over a long period of law-breaking under the heads of racial types. Sir Harold Scott, however, who was Police Commissioner from 1945 to 1953, says in his book, *Scotland Yard*, that 'Cypriots, Maltese and coloured British subjects are responsible for a disproportionately large part of the offences connected with gaming, living on the immoral earnings of prostitutes, and the sale of drugs and liquor'.

In a debate in the House of Commons on 3rd April, 1958, on the criminal consequences of indiscriminate immigration the Government admitted that 'certain racial

types had a propensity to live on the immoral earnings of women and traffic in pernicious drugs'. And further that 'in certain areas some Negroes were disproportionately prone to violence'. Again it was stated in the House of Commons on 29th October, 1958, that the number of coloured people, together with Cypriots and Maltese, convicted in London for organizing prostitution and trafficking in dangerous drugs was 100 times more than for the English.

Statements which went unrefuted in the House of Lords in June 1960 plainly indicated that these shameful conditions had become chronic. The matter was again talked about in the House of Commons in February 1961, but still the Government were not prepared to take any action to remedy the situation. In answer to a question in the Commons in May 1963 it was stated that more than half of the offenders convicted in London during the preceding ten months for living on the immoral earnings of women were immigrants.

In November 1960 the Chief Constable of Birmingham reported that crimes of violence had increased fivefold since 1939, which he attributed to the large influx of immigrants from countries where the use of knives was more prevalent. It was reported two years later in London that hardly a day passed without cases of stabbing or similar violence amongst immigrants being brought to police notice, and in the East End (Stepney) the open exploitation of sexual vice by coloured men had become accepted as a normal part of the social pattern of the district. The Cambridge University Institute of Criminology, after a close and objective survey, placed

it on record in March 1962 that 'the recent increase in crimes of violence in London is largely associated with immigrants from overseas'.

A vicar in the Church of England in a London parish which was being turned over to Negro occupation despairingly summed up the position by saying: 'We don't want our womenfolk knocked about. We don't want schoolgirls enticed from their parents. We deem it wrong that a couple should cohabit before marriage.' In another London parish the priest publicly protested in November 1961 about the way English people were being driven out of their homes by 'evil immigrants who live on vice'.

Relatively few Negroid immigrants legitimately marry English women, but Negroid 'husbands' tend to form extra-marital liaisons, a practice in itself sufficient to account for the squalid state of affairs uncovered.

Of the 731 applications for hospital maternity beds in Nottingham during 1961 nearly half were in respect of coloured immigrants, and half of these were unmarried Negresses. In his report of November 1963 the Medical Officer of Health of Birmingham disclosed that 1 in 7 babies born in the City had a coloured father.

In November 1964 the former Labour Mayor of Shoreditch estimated that '51% of illegitimate children are born to mothers who have come to Britain from overseas, that 20% of all women in British prisons are from overseas, and that 33% of Britain's juvenile delinquents are the children of parents from overseas'.

The social consequences of the indifference of Negroes to Christian marriage, provided sex was otherwise grati-

fied, was debated in the House of Lords on 20th March, 1962, when the Government, without any protest from the Lords Spiritual, indicated their official acquiescence of Caribbean concubinage as normal practice for the people concerned.

(It may perhaps be interpolated here that the rate of illegitimacy for Negroes in the U.S.A. is almost ten times the rate for the whites.)

With regard to the pathological aspects of immigration, cases came to notice in 1963 of tropical trachoma, a contagious eye disease, and also brought in by immigrants was a rare type of V.D. hitherto only found in African and Asian countries. Hundreds of immigrants suffering from the dread disease of leprosy are now in England, necessitating the setting up of permanent quarantine centres. Amongst the thousands of Pakistani immigrants quite a few had small pox, a disease that had been practically eradicated in Britain. Cases of rickets have been noted amongst immigrant children whose racial constitutions needed more sunlight for health. Local authorities have reported that both T.B. and V.D. were rife amongst Pakistanis. In October 1964 the Medical Officer of Health of Peterborough called for compulsory X-raying of all immigrants after he had found that 25% of new cases of T.B. concerned immigrants. Medical authorities recommended in June 1965 that 12% of all would-be immigrants from the West Indies alone should be barred entry on account of the serious inherited racial diseases such as sickle cell anaemia and *thalassaemia* which this percentage suffered from.

Out of a group of 106 immigrants examined in 1962, nearly half had hookworm, a disease unknown in England.

The Government's Public Health Report of 1959 drew attention to the steep rise in the number of cases of gonorrhoea and other venereal diseases, showing that the incidence was most conspicuous in areas where immigrants were most numerous. Subsequent reports indicated no abatement in the conditions, indeed, if anything, there had been a worsening. A clinical report issued in September 1961 showed that in Manchester alone venereal disease among youths had increased in twenty years by 58% and among girls by 345%, a 'significant proportion of the young white women being infected by cohabiting with coloured men'.

A survey carried out in October 1962 of 161 clinics in Britain revealed that over half of the male V.D. patients were born abroad, and official statistics published in October 1963, covering the whole country, showed that immigrants accounted for more than half of the new cases of gonorrhoea.

Due to lack of scientific interest in the matter, demographic records have not been regularly maintained in Britain and consequently reliable ethnological statistics are not available, but it was officially estimated by the Government in October 1961 that at that date the total number of coloured settlers already exceeded 400,000, of whom 60,000 entered in 1960. The national census of 1961, it may be remarked, showed that a total of 1,657,906 people of all races were born abroad.

During the one year ended December 1961 about 125,000 coloured immigrants arrived, to be followed by

a further wave of nearly 125,000 during the six months to July 1962. And the authorities estimated in October 1963 that about 50,000 had entered on forged documents.

Legislation to damn the flood, resolutely opposed by the Socialists, was first tabled by the Government in November 1961, but it came too late to repair the great harm done to the English people.

Two years later (November 1963) the Government revealed in the House of Commons that immigrants were flooding in at the rate of about 100,000 a year and that almost 500,000 were on the waiting list ready to enter.

In a statement in the House of Commons on 17th November, 1964, the Home Secretary estimated that at least 800,000 coloured immigrants had entered the country. If to this figure are added illegal entrants, dependants and the children born of coloured parents then the total coloured population of Britain must already exceed 1,000,000. This means that by the end of the century, not a very long way ahead, if immigration is allowed to continue, the coloured minority groups will have passed the 3,000,000 figure – and many parts of England will have assumed the character of other coloured nations.

Medical records show that the birth rate of the coloured immigrants is at least eight times that of the white people, and in some English schools almost half the pupils are now coloured,\* some not even able to speak English, so the English children have to be kept

\* In November 1965 it was reported that in some cases black children greatly outnumbered white, to the despair of English parents who could see the harm being done to their own offspring.

back. In such schools British history can no longer be taught as it has no meaning or inspiration for those with an Asiatic or African or Caribbean background. The end of this process can be seen as a decline in the values hitherto put on the distinctive culture and traditions of Britons.

It has often been suggested that black and white children will play together quite oblivious of their contrasting colours or other racial differences. This is true to a certain extent (as it is in fact for many other creatures of nature), but maturity will bring to the surface mature instincts and these are often racially antipathetic.

The Socialist Home Secretary, himself a member of an unintegrated racial minority, appealed in the House of Commons on November 17, 1964, for an effort to be made 'to integrate the new arrivals in the fullest sense into the community' so that the population of Britain could be transformed into a half-breed condition in the shortest possible time. He advised the English people, who had to endure the hardships he was heaping on them, 'to take the longer view and relate their activities to the world scene'. In pursuance of his international viewpoint he further threatened the English people that the Socialist Government, with full Communist support, proposed to force them to accept Negroes and other unwanted coloured races into their family and social life by racial laws with respect to the management of hotels, boarding houses (private or otherwise), public houses (often the Englishman's club), swimming baths, restaurants and cafés, hair-dressing establishments, etc.\*

\* The Race Relations Bill passed its Third Reading in the House of Commons on 16th July, 1965, and became law in November, 1965.

The science of genetics establishes quite definitely that no form of miscegenation could improve the breed of the indigenous white people of England, and there is the added danger of congenital misfits of both races being born.

Medical authorities reported in December 1961 that 'the increasing number of half-caste children was producing more social problems'. In July 1965 it was revealed that every sixth Negro in Britain was living with an English female on some kind of marital basis. Human tragedies resulting from such racially mixed cohabitation are countless and the number is growing.

Those who pretend there is some social or moral value and a higher humanity in racial integration and miscegenation should dwell on these tragedies and not dismiss them just because such instances that come to public notice may seem to be relatively few and the victims do not happen to be their own children.

We have seen that the Government have been (and are still being) indifferent to the dreadful state of affairs they have allowed to develop, but what do the English people themselves think about it? Through public opinion polls, letters to the press, complaints to their Members of Parliament and the formation of protective societies the English people have decisively shown that they want coloured immigration to be stringently controlled, many indeed, particularly the manual workers, want coloured immigration stopped altogether. Their insular instincts and better judgements have been ignored by the Conservative and Socialist politicians alike.

One politician even went to the lengths of advocating that English people should emigrate to ease the over-

crowded conditions in Britain. In reply to this the following letter was published in *Time and Tide* of 14th May, 1964 :

Sir - To advocate that English people should leave their homeland for ever on the sole grounds that England is overpopulated, as Mr John Paul does in *Time and Tide* of 30 April-6 May, seems rather absurd seeing that immigrants, practically all members of the coloured races, continue to flock into the country in their tens of thousands.

It has been authoritatively estimated that at the present rate of inflow and allowing for the numbers already here and their abnormally high birthrate the coloured population of Britain will exceed the staggering total of 3 million in 25 years' time.

Surely the most practical and sensible way of easing the growing congestion and at the same time to obviate the unhappy consequences of future racial strife in over-crowded communities is to stop all immigration and to assist immigrants already here to return to the more congenial society of their own independent countries.

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

In *The Times* of 10th October 1964, Professor Kenneth L. Little of Edinburgh made an appeal for the Government to take more positive steps to deal with the problem of immigration and the integration of unwelcome immigrants. In answer to his letter *The Times* on 13th October published the letter below, which produced

another letter from Professor Little who explained that he, as a professional anthropologist, would like to see more attention paid to the teaching of facts about race in schools – a constructive suggestion with which the present writer is in complete agreement.

Sir – Professor Kenneth L. Little's plea on October 10 for the Government to take more positive action to deal with the problem of immigration loses some of its force by its underlying assumption that the issue is a simple one and by omitting to specify what means the Government should adopt to remedy the unstable situation that has been allowed to develop – and by not being strictly objective.

As regards the basic considerations, it is quite misleading to say that 'race is not necessarily a factor of great importance, and this has been demonstrated quite widely in the world', for a cursory survey of human history, not to mention current events, plainly reveals the exact opposite to be the truth.

The identifiable races and subraces have come into being at different times in the history of the world and under vastly different circumstances, with the result that the racial distinctions that divide mankind to-day, particularly those relating to the cerebral functions, are fundamental and ineradicable except by further evolutionary change.

The inborn racial qualities that determine racial attitudes have been expressed down the ages in various ways – in creativeness, social forms and achievements. And without any doubt at all it was the racial factor

that led to the creation of the separate nations in the first place, giving each nation its individual quality and character.

Brazil is quoted as the modern nation, *par excellence*, where racial tensions do not exist and where all the different races share the same community in complete harmony. In point of fact the indigenous inhabitants of the country, the Carib Amerinds, not being able to adapt themselves to modern conditions, are steadily being eliminated as a distinctive race, and the Negroes, the second largest racial group, invariably find themselves relegated to the bottom of the social scale. No official colour bar exists, but nevertheless there is a conspicuous tendency for the white (Caucasoid) races to occupy all the positions of eminence, while the coloured races (Negroes, Mesticos, Cafusos, etc.) strive to elevate themselves by intermarrying with lighter-coloured people.

Although associated with colour of skin (perhaps the least important of ethnic characteristics) this phenomenon seems to spring from an instinctive appreciation of racial merit rather than blind prejudice.

In Britain where the coloured population will soon exceed the staggering total of a million the English people (i.e. the indigenous and racially homogeneous natives) have demonstrated in a most decisive way through public opinion polls that they want to see coloured immigration strictly curbed or cut out altogether.

Quite irrespective, therefore, of any desire to oblige the independent coloured nations by allowing them to

shed their overspill populations on Britain the Government has a clear and urgent duty to heed the will of the people and legislate against further indiscriminate immigration. At the same time the Government should offer generous inducements to immigrants already here to return to their homelands.

Only thus, I submit, will social strife and distress in the future be obviated in our already overcrowded isles.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Because of their indifference or their sense of impotence or their prejudices, the political parties at the General Election of October 1964 contrived to smother all discussion of racial issues even though this question was of such vital concern to the electorate, so in a further effort to draw the attention of the public to the growing danger of society in Britain changing its racial composition the following letter was published in *Time and Tide* of 5th November, 1964:

Sir - Despite the attempts that will be made by the professional politicians to burke the issue there is no doubt at all (as you so timely warn us in *Time and Tide*, 22-28 October) that coloured immigration, because of its profound social implications and significance, will be a bigger (and more explosive) question at the next election, whether this be in five months' or five years' time.

During the election just held the main political

parties, by conspiring together to suppress any public discussion of this all-important social problem, evidently could not see that they were doing a grave disservice to democracy in not consulting the electorate on a matter of such immediate concern to all of us.

From the evidence of public opinion polls and from the many letters which have appeared in the Press over the past decade there is no doubt at all that the English people want coloured immigration rigorously restricted or stopped altogether. Such an expression of the public will should not be ignored.

Everyone seems to agree that our isles are already too crowded for comfort or for any increase in our own population, so on this score alone immigration should be curtailed. Our railways and hospitals would not break down if deprived of coloured labour, nor would there be any loss in social efficiency anywhere.

If our 'island race' completely absorb the coloured immigrants then they will become mulattoes or eurasians, and accompanying the loss of fairness will be a loss of something greater – their innate character. Surely this is a matter worthy of some thought by our rulers?

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Racial tensions are simmering ominously in industrial areas where racial enclaves are proliferating like fungoid growths, and the truth about the danger to English life can no longer be suppressed.

The following appeal for a more open recognition of

racial distinctions and qualities appeared in *The Daily Telegraph* of 4th November, 1964, under the title of 'Race and Culture' :

Sir – Apartheid or the social procedure of separate racial development has often been condemned in your columns as the implementation of an evil prejudice, thus putting such aspects of the matter as coloured immigration into Britain and racial integration on a moral basis. But is this quite a practical or rational way of looking at a problem which is now assuming such alarming proportions, and which will undoubtedly be one of the great issues at the next General Election?

From Mr Alfred Sherman's circumstantial articles (October 28 and 29) it would seem quite clear to the least prejudiced mind that something should be done without any more delay to apply in Britain what is in essence the formula of apartheid – firstly by putting a stop to further coloured immigration, except perhaps on a reciprocal national basis, and secondly by providing special facilities for immigrants already here to set up their own institutions (schools, shops, clubs, etc.) within their own enclaves, or to offer financial help to those who would prefer to return to their homelands.

That there are many fundamental biological and psychological differences between certain races no authority now questions, and surely racial pride would not be offended or any human dignity lost if such indelible distinctions were openly recognized. Would

it not be an act of true statesmanship if such inborn factors were frankly acknowledged as having supreme significance in human 'confrontations', as indeed they already are in Africa, in Chinese Asia and elsewhere?

Yours faithfully,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Not infrequently talks broadcast by Negroes and others over the radio on the problems arising from mixing willy-nilly racially incompatible black and white people in the one community in Britain tend to distort the circumstances with irrelevancies and more often than not openly support the case of the uninvited coloured immigrants against the case of their reluctant white English hosts. Under the heading of *Britain's Coloured Immigrants* an article based on one series of such talks appeared in *The Listener* of February 25, 1965. Commenting on this article the following letter was published in *The Listener* of March 4, 1965 :

Sir - While it is true, as Mr Richard Hooper says (*The Listener*, February 25), that 'immigration and emigration are nothing new' it seems a little unreasonable to advance this as an argument in favour of immigration into overcrowded England. Nor is it reasonable to set off emigration against immigration on any numerical basis as is so often done.

Practically all migrations in the past of differently evolved types of humans have been from populated areas to unoccupied or sparsely inhabited territories. And in every case where constitutionally different im-

migrants have settled in lands already occupied, the indigenous people have suffered eclipse.

Earlier immigrants into England, such as the Flemings, the Huguenots, and other European people, were all of the same racial blend as Britons, and all had similar historical and religious backgrounds, so there was no great difficulty in absorbing them into the community. Integration is defined as the process by which an imperfect thing is made whole, and it seems utterly futile to expect a time will come when the non-white races now coming to Britain will be assimilated in this sense.

It seems wrong that a Sikh should be expected to drop his customs to become fully integrated into a Christian society or that a Muslim should be required to conform to the English Christian heritage. These are social matters which will result in a natural segregation of people according to their own kind.

Each nation reflects the racial composition of its people, an expression of a natural, congenial kinship. Associated with such unity are innate qualities of a similar character, a common history and a shared birth-right. To destroy the stability that is inherent in such a society by injudicious immigration is to destroy something of supreme value, to the nation and to humanity.

Competitive racial attitudes may not be apparent among children any more than among the very young in variations of other species. The racial instincts become combative in adult life, resulting in the tensions we see in England, in America, and indeed in every other country where racial minorities exist. Taking the

realistic view, therefore, it seems vain to hope that the English people will ever be induced (or forced by law) to absorb, socially and biologically, coloured citizens, a constitutional fact that politicians should take heed of if they have any concern for the future of what was once called 'the island race'.

Yours, etc.,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Two letters purporting to be replies to the foregoing letter appeared in the edition of *The Listener* for March 18, in answer to which the following further letter was published on March 25, 1965:

Sir—Both Mr Michael Banton and Mr Akin Akinsanya (*The Listener*, March 18) have somehow contrived to misunderstand what I said or implied in my letter (*ibid*, March 4). I most emphatically do not subscribe to the concept of 'fixity of species', which is an out-moded religious, not a racist, notion associated with the belief that man was made in the form in which we see him today by the Almighty in one instantaneous flash of creation. This idea was discarded long ago (but not by all theologians) because it could not be reconciled in any rational way with the only inferences that could be drawn from what can be seen as the play of evolutionary selection, the process by which the indelible racial differences, including superiority and inferiority, have at different times been brought into existence.

From what we now positively know, we have no

reasonable alternative but to accept the evidence that man's biological nature, for example, the evolved organic structure of his physical brain, has something to do with his behaviour, his modes of thought, mental capacity and intellectuality – and therefore his culture. I am quite sure that Mr Banton must know that all the pupils in his class are not equally educable. And if he were to widen his experience he would, I am certain, find, as others have found, that such variability in inherent calibres also has a racial significance. To illustrate the principle by ethnic examples, the physical brain capacity of the Australoid is about twenty per cent. less than the average for the European Caucasoid, a fact now acknowledged as having a direct bearing on the circumstance that the Australoid has remained a 'pathetic palaeolithic fixture', as one anthropologist describes him. Further, the average size of the Negro's brain is also below the European average, and it markedly differs in evolved complexity as well.

I do agree with Mr Banton when he says that the 'results of recent studies indicate that intergroup harmony is best achieved not by trying to make everyone alike but by allowing groups to retain their distinctive private customs . . .'. This recommendation, I think, should also apply to the English people, who should still be allowed to have their own exclusive clubs and pubs where they could enjoy intercourse with their own kind free from 'gate crashers' of another race. Free association (birds of a feather fashion) and not enforced integration with penal attachments seems to be the only sensible way of en-

sure that racial antagonism in our multi-racial community does not arise. Unfortunately, the already overcrowded conditions in England will militate against the success of such social segregation, hence the dire need to restrict immigration.

All humans should be treated as humans, but to ignore racial realities and pretend that racial differences do not exist is a sure way of engendering prejudice and racial contempt.

Yours, etc.,

H. B. ISHERWOOD.

Because of the ineradicable inborn disparities between its constituents, a multi-racial society can never in the nature of things become a fully integrated society. By disregarding this truth nationhood itself is imperilled.

Chronic instability is a predictable condition of any community built up of races divided from each other by their evolved natures and their separate ancestries and histories. Because of such ineradicable differences between its constituents, a multi-racial society can never in the nature of things become fully integrated into a united body.

One lesson that may be learnt from history and brought home to the mind by what is happening in the world today is that a nation allowing irreconcilable elements to be introduced into its society tends to lose a vital part of its characteristic coherence and discipline, its birthright and its unique heritage, and its warm sense of patriotism, and has taken the first step on the downhill road to national dissolution.

Eyes undimmed by political prejudice can clearly see that the Achilles Heel of America is the existence within the nation of substantial groups of racial minorities whose inborn nature places them beyond complete assimilation by any cultural or legal means conceived as a process of fashioning a united people with a worthwhile destiny.

Though mainly concerned with what is happening in Britain, where the native white people are now being forced against their better instincts and to their detriment to absorb into their society some 1,000,000 coloured immigrants (a number growing at the rate of about 100,000 a year), this book on the urgent need to heed the racial factor in human affairs could perhaps fittingly be rounded off in relation to mankind as a whole by the following observations, free from political bias, of Professor C. D. Darlington, F.R.S. of Oxford :

‘It is absurd to pretend that water and vinegar are equal. Water is better for some purposes, vinegar for others. Vinegar is harder to get but easier to do without. So it is with people. For 200 generations the advance of mankind has depended on those genetically diverse groups (races) which have been able to practise mutual help and show mutual respect. The future of mankind will depend on the continuance of such abilities and habits; a happy aim which cannot be assisted in the long run by make-believe, certainly not by a make-believe of equality in the physical, intellectual and cultural capacities of such groups.’

‘Races of technically unenterprising types, which would not be capable of surviving unassisted, are now multiplying. They are multiplying out of all proportion to those

racés to whose enterprise they owe their ability to multiply.\*

\* *Genetics and Man*, C. D. Darlington (1964), George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE works below are recommended as being among the most up-to-date and authoritative for the purpose of obtaining an objective and unprejudiced picture of the racial tracery of mankind and its importance as something fundamental to the future of humanity.

For the reader who may not have the time or the inclination to study the question very deeply it will suffice if he read the two little essays by Professor W. C. George.

Most valuable information on racial comparisons will also be found in *The Mankind Quarterly* published in Edinburgh by Dr the Gayre of Gayre.

*The Origin of Races*

Carleton S. Coon  
Jonathan Cape Ltd

*Races of Mankind: Their Origin and Migration*

Calvin Kephart  
Peter Owen Ltd

*A Study of History*

Arnold J. Toynbee  
Abridgement of vols. I-VI by D.C. Somervell  
Oxford University Press

*Race and Reason*

Carleton Putnam

Britons Publishing Company

*Race, Heredity and Civilization*

W. C. George

Britons Publishing Company

*The Biology of the Race Problem*

W. C. George

Britons Publishing Company

*Genetics and Man*

C. D. Darlington

George Allen and Unwin Ltd

*Racial Contours*

H. B. Isherwood

Times Press Ltd

*The Unarmed Invasion*

Lord Elton

Geoffrey Bles Ltd

*The White Races*

George Pile

Britons Publishing Company

## INDEX

- Aborigines (Australian), 13  
 Acquired characteristics, 28  
 Africa, 12, 13, 19, 21, 26, 29, 30,  
     31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 44, 66  
 Algeria, 15  
 America, 13, 16, 19, 22, 23, 28, 34,  
     40, 48, 67, 70  
 Amerinds, 12, 13, 14, 34  
 Amhara, 31  
 Angles, 35  
 Anti-Semitism, 36  
 Apartheid, 22, 36, 40 seq., 65  
 Arabs, 15, 31  
 Aryans, 35  
 Asia, 13  
 Australia, 13, 43, 45, 46, 49  
 Australoids, 12, 13, 14, 69  
  
 B.A.A.S., 29  
 Bahutu, 15  
 Bantu, 12, 15, 33, 38, 41, 43  
 B.B.C., 26  
 Benin, 19  
 Berbers, 15, 31  
 Biblical authority, 16, 36, 41  
 Biological differences, 18 seq., 71  
 Birthrate, 54, 55, 57, 71  
 Blood groups, 24, 38  
 Brain, The, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30,  
     38, 61, 69  
 Brazil, 62  
 Britain, 9, 14, 30, 34, 35, 36, 41,  
     43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51 seq.  
 British Commonwealth of Nations,  
     44 seq.  
 British Empire, 39, 44, 45, 49  
 British Guiana, 14  
 Britons, 35, 44, 45, 48, 58, 67  
 Burma, 14  
 Bushmen, 12  
  
 Canada, 45, 46, 49  
 Caribs, 14, 62  
 Carthage, 31  
  
 Caucasoids, 11, 12, 14, 19, 26,  
     35, 45, 62  
 Celts, 35, 52  
 Ceylon, 13, 14, 49  
 China, 15, 21, 48, 66  
 Chinese, 12, 14  
 Christianity, 15, 22, 35, 36, 41,  
     45, 46, 67  
 Church of England, 41, 55  
 Communism, 8, 28, 33, 40, 41, 45,  
     48, 49, 58  
 Congo, 32, 41  
 Crime, 52 seq.  
 Cypriots, 15, 52, 53  
 Cyprus, 15, 35  
  
*Daily Telegraph, The*, 20, 22, 47,  
     65  
 Danes, 35  
 Darlington, C. D., 71  
 Diseases, 55, 56  
 Disraeli, 47  
 Drugs, 52, 53  
 Dutch, 40  
  
 East Indians (Indics), 51  
 Egypt, 31, 36  
 Equality, 7, 19, 21, 22, 27, 32, 39  
 Eskimos, 13, 24  
 Ethiopia, 31  
 Eurasians, 51, 64  
 European races, 12, 15, 19, 23, 26,  
     31, 33, 35, 39, 45, 69  
 Evolution, 11, 16, 23, 30, 32, 38,  
     68  
  
 Fiji, 15  
 Flemings, 35, 67  
 Frazer, Sir James, 13  
 French Revolution, 7  
  
 Genetics, 9, 16, 29, 31, 32, 38, 58,  
     71  
 Ghana, 49

- Greeks, 15  
 Gurkhas, 12  
 Gypsies, 34
- Haiti, 32  
 Hamites, 12, 30, 31, 33, 38  
 Hindus, 14, 15, 33, 34, 36  
 Hottentots, 12, 52  
 Huguenots, 35, 40, 67  
 Huxley, Mrs Elspeth, 37, 42  
 Huxley, Sir Julian, 20
- Iberians, 35  
 Ife, 19  
 Illegitimacy, 54, 55  
 Immigration, 22, 43, 46, 49, 51,  
 56, 57, 63, 71  
 India, 12, 13, 14, 44  
 Indics (see East Indians, Hindus,  
 Pakistanis, etc.)  
 Indonesia, 49  
 Instincts, 9, 21, 27, 32, 58, 59, 62,  
 67, 71  
 Intelligence tests, 19  
 Iraq, 15
- Japanese, 12  
 Java, 13  
 Jehovah, 36  
 Jews, 34, 35, 36  
 Judaism, 36  
 Jutes, 35
- Keith, Sir Arthur, 20  
 Kenya, 31, 33, 48  
 Khoisanoids, 12  
 Koreans, 12  
 Kurds, 15
- Lamarck, 28  
 Levant, 12  
*Listener, The*, 26, 30, 66, 68  
 Livingstone, 44  
 Lysenko, 28
- Malays, 12  
 Malaysia, 14, 15, 49  
 Malta, 35  
 Maltese, 52, 53  
 Marx, Karl, 8
- Mason-Dixon Line, 23  
 Mauritius, 15  
 Melanesians, 12, 15  
 Misccegenation, 9, 21, 22, 23, 34,  
 46, 54, 58, 59  
 Mohammedanism, 15, 31, 36, 67  
 Monarchy, The, 45, 46  
 Mongoloids, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 34  
 Mulattoes, 51, 64  
 Multi-racialism, 23, 34 seq., 37,  
 38, 46, 51, 69, 70
- Nagas, 14  
 National character, 8, 21, 46, 67  
 Natural selection, 16  
 Neanderthaloids, 12  
 Negritos, 12, 13  
 Negrillos, 12, 18  
 Negroids, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 24, 25,  
 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38,  
 43, 51, 54, 55, 58, 62, 66, 69  
 Negroids, American, 13, 34  
*New Daily, The*, 37  
 New Zealand, 45, 46, 49  
 Nilotics, 15  
 Nordics, 18, 25, 35  
 Normans, 35  
 Norsemen, 35  
 Nubia, 31  
 Numidia, 31
- Pakistanis, 34, 36, 51, 55  
 Patriotism, 20, 21, 35, 70  
 Perham, Miss Margery, 30  
 Picts, 35  
 Polynesians, 12, 15  
 Population, world, 14  
 Prejudice, 7, 18, 19, 40, 42, 63, 65,  
 70  
 Puerto Ricans, 34  
 Pygmies, 12, 18
- Race, definition, 8, 32  
 Racial differences, 8, 11, 16, 18  
 seq., 32, 38, 61, 68, 71  
 Racial discrimination, 16, 20, 23,  
 36, 43, 65, 70  
 Racial divisions, 8, 11  
 Racial inequality, 7, 19, 21, 22,  
 27, 32, 39, 47, 51, 68, 71

- Racial legislation, 22, 58, 63, 68  
 Racial mixing, 9, 15, 21, 22, 34,  
 35, 37, 46, 52, 58, 62, 65, 66  
 Racial origins, 11, 16, 18, 23  
 Racial self-determination, 21, 41,  
 42, 43  
 Racial potentiality, 21, 26, 32  
 Racial purpose, 16  
 Racial superiority, 9, 16, 20, 21, 32,  
 38, 39, 41, 52, 68, 71  
 Rhodesia, 45, 46, 49  
 Romans, 35, 36  
 Rome, 31  
 Russians, 21  
 Rwanda, 15  
  
 Sanctions (blockades), 41, 42  
 Saxons, 35  
 Scott, Sir Harold, 52  
 Seligman, 29  
 Semites, 12, 30, 38  
 Sherpas, 12  
 Sikhs, 67  
 Singapore, 15  
 Slavery, 13, 30, 44  
 Slavs, 21  
 Socialism, 8, 41, 45, 57, 58  
 Somalis, 31, 33  
 South Africa, 15, 23, 38, 40, 41,  
 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49  
  
 South America, 13  
 Sudan, 15  
 Sudanese Negroids, 12  
*Sunday Telegraph, The*, 19  
  
 Tamils, 14  
 Tanganyika, 37, 43  
 Tanzania, 37  
 Tasmanians, 13  
 Tibetans, 12  
*Time & Tide*, 24, 48, 60, 63  
*Times, The*, 18, 38, 42, 43, 46,  
 60  
 Toynbee, Arnold J., 8, 29, 31  
 Turks, 15  
 Tutsi, 15  
  
 United Nations, 13, 14, 20, 35, 40,  
 41, 47, 49  
 U.S.A. (see America)  
 U.S.S.R., 12, 21, 48  
  
 van den Haag, Ernest, 15  
 Veddahs, 13  
  
 Western Hemisphere, 13, 15  
 West Indies, 35, 55  
 Westminster, Statute of, 49  
 World population, 14



*[Continued from front cover*

integrated, wishing instead to preserve their "racial apartness". No such considerations apply to the dark immigrants now trying to settle in the land.

It may be assumed that the black immigrants will never become an integral part of English society. In any case why should a Sikh, for example, be expected to drop his customs to conform to English Christian standards or a Moslem or a Hindu be required to renounce his traditional faith in order to facilitate his absorption into the community?

These are the superficial aspects of racial integration representing the social side of the problem. Nevertheless they will tend to bring about a natural segregation of people according to their own kind. If racial minorities can claim the right to enjoy their own company so then can the English majority—and their right is a prescriptive one under natural law and therefore paramount. Any attempt by legislation to deprive the English of their inalienable right to discriminate in favour of their own people will surely engender a form of racial hatred that will be difficult to subdue.

Further, the author points out that race-consciousness is not apparent in very young children and only comes into play in adult life as a dynamic urge for survival when races are thrown together in a haphazard way as they have been in England. No Englishman should be criticised if he is repelled by the idea of his daughter consorting with a Negro or a member of any other coloured race. His attitude is a natural one, for it is this sensitive appreciation of pedigree qualities that will insure a worthwhile future for his own race. Racial attitudes, the product of racial attributes, do not in themselves constitute racial prejudice.

Each nation tends to reflect the racial composition of its people: its innate qualities of mind, a common ancestry and history and a shared birthright. The introduction of alien races into such a community disturbs the social balance and perceptibly weakens the nation's will to survive as an entity.

This book by giving facts and figures without bias, sounds a warning note to all who would work for the survival of the English way of life.

---

H. B. ISHERWOOD has made a prolonged study of the Racial problem and believes that it is only by a realistic approach that a better understanding between the peoples of the world can be brought about.

His first book *Racial Contours* published in 1965 has attracted considerable notice. It is a scholarly work of 423 pages, price 18s. 0d. net. "Forceful . . . full of meat, dealing with vast problems in a very readable and objective manner." *Mankind Quarterly*.

This present, but smaller work, *Racial Integration*, points out the many fallacies in the arguments of the Integrationalists and it should become a useful Handbook for Social Workers and others who are worried by the rising tide of colour and yet seek to solve the problem with humanity and understanding.



BRITONS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Beamish House

111a Westbourne Grove

London, W.2

---