Scientific answers for political questions: Creating universality in the UNESCO Race Statements, 1950- 1951.

by

Bram Harkema

Submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in the
History and Philosophy of Science
Faculty of Natural Sciences
Utrecht University

23rd July 2017

Supervisor: dr. D.M. Baneke
Second reader: dr. F.H. Sysling

Table of contents

Abstract

In 1945 the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) was founded with the purpose of 'building peace in the minds of men.' Its directorate believed that if it could explain the 'misconceived notion of racism' to the world, it could end worldwide racism. To do so, UNESCO brought together a group of renowned scholars, that published a Statement on Race. This scientific summary suggested to replace the term 'race' with 'ethnic group'. Controversy arose when a group of British anthropologists criticized and this statement on scientific grounds. In reaction, UNESCO published a second, more modest statement. In this thesis, I focus on the strategies employed by UNESCO and how this supra-national organisation adhered to scientists. I investigate how UNESCO's Committee of Experts created a new universal picture of race. In trying to give scientific answers to political questions, it shaped the outlook of race after the Second World War.

Acknowledgments

This thesis is the result of a long project of research and rewriting what I have just rewritten. Finishing this project would not have been possible without the help of some people to whom I would like to express my gratitude here.

First of all, I would like to thank David Baneke for supervising me throughout my thesis. I appreciate the confidence you had in me. Your thoughtful remarks and instant feedback have been of utmost help to me.

I am also grateful my second reader Fenneke Sysling. During our brainstorming sessions I learned a lot, and your expertise on the subject has been very helpful to me.

I would also like to thank the Descartes Centre for allowing me the support to travel to Paris to visit the UNESCO archives.

Additionally, I would like to thank Richard van Alphen, of the Royal Tropical Institute for helping me out and allowing me (digital) access to the disclosed archives of the Institute. Without your help I would have never found sources concerning the Dutch connection to the Statement on Race.

I am equally grateful to Jelle Gaemers of the National Archives of the Netherlands for allowing me to study the disclosed files of the Royal Tropical Institute archives. Your helping hand allowed me to scrutinize the Dutch reception of the Statements.

Over the course of the last half year, I discovered that writing a master thesis is also a training in discipline. Therefore, I would like to express my gratitude to my fellow students of our 'thesis club': Jelke, Lieven and Folkert, our joint discipline has kept me motivated to study long hours in the library, whilst our coffee breaks have helped me concentrate throughout these months.

Yet, completing a RMa would not have been possible without the eternal support of my parents and sister. I am truly grateful for your support and encouragement over the last six years.

Finally, I would like to express my utmost acknowledgment to my girlfriend Kyah for listening carefully to all my considerations. Your energizing support have encouraged me to study day after day. Throughout these months, you inspired me to finish this thesis in the best possible way.

Introduction

'Physical anthropology's study of race changed from an interesting but merely theoretical science into a science with major practical significance. Subjects with no relation to every day life now became matters of life or death.'[1] In 1947, the Dutch physical anthropologist Rudolf Bergman explained how the Holocaust had changed the outlook on the concept of race. To large parts of the world, the Second World War had shown the disastrous consequences of racial classification. To prevent a Third World War, the the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was founded in 1945. This specialized agency of the United Nations (UN) believed that wars begin in the minds of men, which led to UNESCO' constitution in which it assigned itself to: 'building peace in the minds of men'.[2]

These organisations were founded upon cosmopolitan hopes, hopes that atrocities like the Holocaust could be prevented through genuine solidarity between people of all countries. A good example of this prospect can be found in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which stated that every man and woman should have equal rights, regardless of his or her 'race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.'[3] This declaration, published under the authority of the UN, was the first international document that intended to end racial inequality. In the light of this famous document, UNESCO compiled a scientific summary on the current status of the concept of race.[4]

Already in the 1930s and 1940s, the ontological status of 'race' was debated, but it was only after the Second World War that political discussions were intensified. UNESCO also contributed to these discussions, by providing the scientific outlook on race. To do so, it brought together a group of experts to speak out on the term 'race'. In this thesis, I will explain why and how UNESCO published this statement and how it communicated the outcomes of this scientific study to the world. To change the worldwide outlook on race, it also sought

---

[1] Professor Rudolf Bergman, retrieved from: David Duuren et al., *Physical Anthropology Reconsidered. Human Remains at the Tropenmuseum* (Amsterdam, 2007), 34.
[2] UNESCO, *Basic Texts*, (Paris, 2004), 5. The original words used by UNESCO were later changed into: 'in the minds of men and women.'
[3] UN, *Universal Declarations of Human Rights* (Paris, 1948), 1.
[4] Siep Stuurman, *De uitvinding van de mensheid. Korte wereldgeschiedenis van het denken over gelijkheid en cultuurverschil* (Amsterdam, 2009), 463; S.E. Graham, 'The (Real)politics of Culture: U.S. Cultural Diplomacy in UNESCO, 1946-1954', *Diplomatic History* 2 (2006), 231.

broad support for this statement. This is why UNESCO built a large network of scientists who signed this statement. Throughout this thesis, I will explain that for this organization, the scientific study into race was not its purpose; it was a means to ban racism worldwide.

It was no surprise that this organization initiated a large campaign around its statement, as it lay in UNESCO's Constitution to ban racism around the world. This campaign consisted of the publication of a series of books explaining race from various perspectives, but also of active cooperation with newspapers and magazines around the world. Furthermore, UNESCO's science officials attended conferences in biology and anthropology, UNESCO's Social Science Department also funded research projects that studied racial relations in depth. UNESCO's large Department of Mass Communication worked constantly to distribute its scientific ideas concerning race.

When the statement was published in 1950, it was quite controversial because it suggested to replace the term 'race' with 'ethnic group'. UNESCO's Committee of Experts believed that the Holocaust had discredited the term 'race' and that this word should be replaced with the more neutral term 'ethnic group. And even though the Statement on Race attracted lots of positive attention in the international press, a few weeks after publication it was criticized on this point. A group of renowned scientists commented in the British anthropological journal *Man* that the UNESCO statement was unscientific and that erasing the word 'race' would not settle the discussion. This criticism changed the outlook on the statement dramatically. In reaction, the UNESCO directorate understood that something needed to be done to overcome this critique. First, it tried to iron out the controversy by responding to the criticism by showing the crooked logic that was behind the idea of racial classification.[5] Shortly after this response was published, UNESCO organized a second conference on race issues, at which a revised version of the 'Statement on Race' would be drawn: the 'Statement on the Nature of Race and Race Differences'.

The two statements on race are important events in the history of racism in the twentieth century. Not only because the Statement on Race was the first international condemnation of racism, it is also an interesting case because UNESCO published two statements shortly after another. The statements provide an excellent case study how a supra-national organization like UNESCO used science for its political purposes.

[5] Henri Vallois, 'U.N.E.S.C.O. on race', *Man* 1 (1951), 15-16.

Historiography

About the early years of UNESCO and its race statements, surprisingly little has been written so far. With this thesis, I hope to contribute to a better understanding of UNESCO's Statement on Race, because I believe this can shed some light on the role of experts in political processes. As these statements have not often been studied in detail, I also hope to clarify some issues concerning the publication of this statement. I will therefore nuance some points made in the historiography or add some important details.

Roughly speaking, the UNESCO Statement on Race is mentioned in relation to race issues from the 1980s onwards.[6] In the early works, the Statement on Race is described as a UN request following the UN's Universal Declarations of Human Rights. The statements are generally seen as a scientific endeavour by UNESCO trying to provide a scientific summary on the current status of race after the Second World War. Nancy Stepan for instance, describes the Statement on Race as 'the scientists' view on race after the war, sponsored by UNESCO.'[7] Yet, this image of the statements changes over time, as the historiography slowly gets an eye for the political aspects of the statement. At the end of the 1980s, Donna Haraway was the first to do so. Even though her story was centred around the scientific disciplines concerning race, her book explained how human interaction has changed the outlook on race. She showed how politics and science were largely intertwined in the process of writing the UNESCO statements.[8] In the 1990s this development continued as the historian Elazar Barkan showed how different academic disciplines have evolved and how political processes have shaped the different outlooks on race.[9]

In the beginning of the twenty first century, Pat Shipman and Siep Stuurman addressed the political process of writing these race statements, as they explained how the geopolitical

[6] In the 1960s and 70s, the UNESCO Statements on Race are only mentioned sporadically in the history of postwar racism, as most attention was devoted to the Universal Declarations of Human Rights. From the 1980s onwards, the UNESCO statements slowly attract more attention.

[7] Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800-1960* (Oxford, 1982), 172.

[8] Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions: Gender Race and Nature in the World of Modern Science* (New York & London, 1989), 197-203

[9] Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars* (Cambridge & New York, 1992).

context changed the outlook on 'race'. [10] In the recently published standard work by John P. Jackson Jr. and Nadine Weidman, the political context is given equal importance as the scientific context.[11] And with the UNESCO History Project in 2005[12], more historians were encouraged to study the organisation itself, resulting in some excellent works on this organisation.[13]

Still, on various issues, these scholars have disparate opinions. Especially with regard to the origins of the Statement. Several scholars argue that the statement was a direct result of the UN's Universal Declarations of Human Rights. According to Stuurman, Haraway and Selcer this document merely answered a UN request to give a scientific summary on this term that occurred prominently in the UDHR.[14] However, the historian Poul Duedahl is inclined to believe otherwise, as he shows how UNESCO initiated this study itself.[15] In this thesis, I will stick with Duedahl's interpretation and explain why his thoughtful approach is apprehensive. In its early years, UNESCO's directorate actively searched for its role in international cooperation, focussing on themes that overstepped national issues. UNESCO's first director-general Julian Huxley understood very well that its organisation needed to have a neutral outlook in relation to certain countries, cultures or ideologies. The British biologist Huxley knew that if UNESCO would implement for instance Catholic practises, that would incur hostility to its Islamic member states.

Another remarkable development in the historiography of the Statement on Race, is the attention that is devoted to the author of the statement, Ashley Montagu. In the literature, the Statement on Race is often depicted as a follow-up of Montagu's controversial

---

[10] Stuurman, *De uitvinding van de mensheid*; Pat Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism: Human Differences and the Use and Abuse of Science* (Cambridge, US; 2002).
[11] John P. Jackson Jr. and Nadine Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science: Social Impact and Interaction* (London, 2006).
[12] With the UNESCO History Project, scholars from all over the world were invited to contribute to the history of UNESCO. A large committee was set up to facilitate interdisciplinary research on this organization and its accomplishments. For more info visit: http://www.unesco.org/archives/multimedia/?pg=54&pattern=UNESCO+History+Project.
[13] Poul Duedahl, *A History of UNESCO* (New York, 2016).
[14] Stuurman, *De uitvinding van de mensheid*, 463; Haraway, *Primate Visions*, 197-203; Perrin Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index: Negotiating Politics to produce UNESCO's Scientific Statements on Race', *Current Anthropology* 5 (2012), 173.
[15] Poul Duedahl, 'UNESCO Man: Changing the concept of race, 1945-1965' (Paper, Aalborg University, 2008), 8.

publication *Man's Most Dangerous Myth*. A large number of scholars state that the forceful tone and the far-reaching consequences of replacing the word 'race' were merely Montagu's ideas.[16] In this thesis, I try to nuance this picture by explaining who selected Montagu and other members of the committee that wrote the statement. I argue that UNESCO tried to develop a new outlook on racism and was very aware of Montagu's reputation. Thus, UNESCO's Social Science Department must have been aware of the possible consequences when it chose this activist as author of the statement.

Historians of science that studied the UNESCO Statement have often concluded that the criticism arose from a group of physical anthropologists, and that anthropologists were not invited to UNESCO's conference on race issues.[17] However, in this thesis, I argue that this picture it too simplistic. Notwithstanding the fact that the British scholars who criticized the statement were all anthropologists, I argue that the committee already included four anthropologists, so the claim that their discipline had not been consulted is incorrect. By referring to the scientific context, I will argue that the criticism did not originate out of a feud between physical anthropologists and other disciplines, but merely a dispute between American and British anthropologists.

Earlier research has shown that political views can effect the outcomes of scientific studies: some scholars suggest that political events shape the scientific outlook on controversial issues.[18] Several scholars have argued that immediately after the Second World War, the majority of scientists felt that the war had changed the meaning of race completely,

---

[16] Nadine Weidman, 'An Anthropologist on TV: Ashley Montagu and the Biological Basis of Human Nature, 1945-1960', 217, in: Mark Solovey & Hamilton Cravens, *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy and Human Nature* (New York, 2012); Anthony Q. Hazard Jr., 'A Racialized Deconstruction? Ashley Montagu and the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race', *Transforming Anthropology* 2 (2011), 175-179; Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism*, 161; Hirschman, 'The Origins and Demise of the Concept of Race', 398-400; Michelle Brattain, 'Race, Racism, and Antiracism: UNESCO and the Politics of Presenting Science to the Postwar Public', *American Historical Review* 5 (2007), 1386-1413

[17] Jenny Bangham, 'What is Race? UNESCO mass communicating and human genetics in the early 1950s' *History of the Human Sciences* 5 (2015), 82; Gavin Schaffer, '"Like a Baby with a box of Matches": British scientists and the concept of race in the inter-war period', *The British Journal for the History of Science* 3 (2005), 309; Michelle Brattain, 'Race, Racism, and Antiracism: UNESCO and the Politics of Presenting Science to the Postwar Public', *American Historical Review* 5 (2007), 1386-1413.

[18] Charles Hirschman, 'The Origins and Demise of the Concept of Race', *Population and Development Review* 3 (2004), 397-399.

now that the consequences of ideological racism had unfolded. However, recent studies have debated this picture, as they state that the scientific image of race before and after the War was surprisingly alike.[19] They showed how for some scholars nothing had changed: they still believed race could also be seen as a neutral concept and emphasized the difference between racialism and racism. The UNESCO Statements, should therefore not be seen as a turning point in the history of racial thinking, but rather as an eye-catcher.

In this thesis, I will devote special attention to the scientific context and the various perspectives that arose within the discipline of physical anthropology in which a new dispute concerning the nature of 'race' began: Scientists engaged in fierce discussions about the social constructing of race.[20] Because physical anthropologists slowly gathered authority on the concept of race, anthropologists played an important role in defining the term 'race'. The statement is mentioned for its attempt to replace the term 'race' with 'ethnic group'. This ambition is seen as both an important landmark in the history of racial thinking, but sometimes also seen as a naïve endeavour. Some authors praise the race statements for its courageous plans to end racial discrimination, but others have pointed at UNESCO's failure.

Still, these events are often placed within the context of the changing perspective of racism. Virtually all scholars agree that the repudiation of racism was a direct result of the Second World War. The Nazi administration had shown the cruel consequences of racial thought. Thus, the statements are genuinely seen as an important step, because it was the first international statement that refuted racism so clearly.[21]

This thesis investigates why and how UNESCO published its Statements on Race and how it communicated the outcomes of this 'scientific' study. To do so, I will asses UNESCO's ambitions, its strategies and the contexts in which these statements were published. I will scrutinize how UNESCO's Social Science Department used science as a value-free instrument to strengthen its beliefs: that race was a social construct and should be abandoned. Because these two statements appeared shortly after another, a comparison shows if the second

[19] See for instance: Veronika Lipphardt, 'Isolates and Crosses in Human Population Genetics; or, A Contextualization of German Race Science'*, Current Anthropology* 5 (2012), 69-82.
[20] Duedahl, 'UNESCO Man, 7-10.
[21] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 199-202; Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*; Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index'.

statement can be seen as an addendum or a replacement to the original statement. The controversy that arose after the publication of the first statement showed that the term 'race' was somewhat problematic. To get a clearer picture of the context, I will also devote a chapter to the scientific and the geopolitical context of the Race Statement. Finally, I will combine these aspects and research to what extent the second Statement on Race was influenced by these developments.

To do so, I will first take a closer look at the organisation of UNESCO. For this recently established organisation, the Statement on Race was a perfect opportunity to present itself to the worldwide academic community by bringing together renowned scientists and granting scholarships. UNESCO knew that with good publicity, this opportunity could strengthen its role in international cooperation. So when the Statement on Race was criticized, UNESCO tried to iron out the controversy of its attempt to seek consensus in this political topic.

In the first chapter, I will zoom in on the Department of Social Sciences, responsible for compiling the first (and later also the second) statement. This section stood under the direct supervision of UNESCO's director-general Jaime Torres Bodet. As a former Minister of Foreign Affairs in Mexico, Torres Bodet understood the importance of diplomacy and contributed to the Race Statement whenever possible. To understand how and why UNESCO published this statement, I will investigate the strategies of its Social Science Department by devoting attention to their predicted outcomes, the scientists consulted, their reviewing process and the 1950 UNESCO statement on Race itself.

The second part of this thesis is devoted to UNESCO's strategies to distribute its ideas around the world. Not only did UNESCO have a large Department of Mass Communication that published books and educational programmes, UNESCO also frequently worked with national committees. In these national committees, scientists and other experts discussed UNESCO topics on a national level. This exchange of ideas worked two-sided: for scholars this was an easy way to get in contact with UNESCO, and at the same time it helped UNESCO to distribute its projects on a vast scale. To explain the working of these committees, I will use the example of the Netherlands, because this is an interesting case: after a lively discussion broke out among Dutch scholars, the Dutch national UNESCO committee set out an inquiry to gain knowledge why the reception of the Statement varied. The results of this inquiry were published and discussed at the second Conference on Race Issues in Paris in 1951, at which a new statement was drawn.

Another way in which UNESCO's scientific endeavour should be understood is in terms of their tremendous belief in science. UNESCO can even be accused of scientism. In the 1950s, it believed that there existed one scientific method that could bring a worldwide truth.[22] But rather than believing in this 'universality' of science, UNESCO also helped shaping the idea that science was universal: by proclaiming the statements it tried to establish the idea of unanimity among scholars over the fact that racism was outdated and should be abandoned.

In the third chapter, I will provide the scientific context to these statements. By assessing the history of the term 'race', I will research how the academic discipline of anthropology have shaped the outlook on race. Furthermore, I will explain why certain British anthropologists criticized the 1950 statement, as they felt that their voices had not been heard. I will also asses the influence of the Second World War on the outlook on race and how the Holocaust had influenced the idea of racism. Finally, I will explain how the scientific context was important in relation to the UNESCO statements.

In the fourth chapter, I will scrutinize the geopolitical context to the statements. In this part, I will assess to what extent the scientific summary of UNESCO's experts was politically laden. Part of the cosmopolitan hopes of UNESCO was to provide value-free scientific answers to global problems. How do we assess the role of experts concerning political debates? More specifically, some scholars have argued that the UNESCO statements were a direct result of the decline of colonial powers, but others have proposed that years of colonialism had normalized our conception of race.[23] In this chapter, I will also place the statements in the broader political context and show how it contributed to UNESCO's strategies.

In the final chapter of this thesis, I will finally focus on the revised statement that UNESCO published in 1951, 'the Statement on the Nature of Race and Race Differences'. I will investigate how the Social Science Department selected scholars for the second conference. I will also describe how the criticism of the first statement influenced the decisions for the second statement. After the harmful commotion, UNESCO organised another meeting at which primarily physical anthropologists – who felt underrepresented in the first statement –

[22] Elazar Barkan, 'The Politics of the Science of Race: Ashley Montagu and UNESCO's Anti-Racist Declarations', in: Larry Reynolds and Leonard Lieberman, *Race and Other Misadventures. Essays in Honor of Ashley Montagu in his Ninetieth Year* (New York, 1996), 96-97.

[23] Hirschman, 'Origins and Demise of the Concept of Race', 395.

could contribute to the existing scientific summary of race. But rather than writing an appendix to the Statement on Race, the conference produced a new, revised statement. To what extent did this statement differ from its predecessor? Did UNESCO change the process of writing these statements and was this visible in the revised statement? Finally, I will also place these two statements in the perspective of a third and fourth UNESCO Statement on Race.

1. UNESCO and the publication of the Statement on Race

This chapter explains why and how UNESCO published its Statement on Race. After I elaborate why it compiled this scientific summary, I will stress out why and how it brought together a group of experts to summarize the current scientific status on the issue of race. I will specifically look at the the early years of UNESCO, its Social Science Department and why it invited a group of experts for the statement. I will address how UNESCO seized this opportunity to show its added value to the world by explaining the consequences of racism. I will thus scrutinize the conference, correspondence, reviewers and the statement itself. Consecutively, I will devote special attention to the way in which UNESCO tried to distribute the statement around the world. I will finish this chapter by assessing the criticism that arose after the Statement on Race was published, and how that affected the statement.

Foundation of UNESCO

But before I will elaborate on the process, let me first explain a few things about the foundation of UNESCO, that I consider important in context to their Statement on Race. UNESCO was founded after the Second World War, believing that war was predominantly the result of mistrust and suspicion. In its Constitution, UNESCO stresses the importance of overcoming cultural differences, which meant treating others with dignity, equality and mutual respect. In this Constitution, racial inequality was explicitly mentioned as a causal agent for war. Thus, it was no surprise that the UNESCO Statement on Race was directed against racial thought, as it lay in UNESCO's constitution to be against racism and all of UNESCO's member states agreed that racism had to end.[24]

In a book published to celebrate the foundation of UNESCO, its first director-general Julian Huxley explains that in the 'new world order'[25] there was no place for racial inequality. Huxley explains how a supra-national organisation, with its disparate members, can never be

[24] UNESCO, *Basic Texts*, 7-8.

[25] The phrase 'the new world order' was commonly used by UNESCO to visualize a new world order, based on solidarity and international cooperation that was slowly shaping after the Second World War.

sectarian or base its view on one ideology only, because of the different political and ideological views of its member states: 'such an attempt would immediately incur the active hostility of large and influential groups, and the non-cooperation or even withdrawal of a number of nations.' Thus, UNESCO refrained from national issues and focussed on worldwide tensions. Therefore, its constitution 'expressly repudiates racialism and any belief in superior or inferior "races," nations or ethnic groups.'[26] In short: racism was a global issue and all its member states agreed that this needed to end.

The ideas behind UNESCO's constitution are clearly visible in the Statement on Race. According to the sociologist Michael Banton, the experts believed that 'once the erroneous nature of racist doctrine would be exposed, the structure of racial prejudice and discrimination would collapse.'[27] In an UNESCO publication that looks back at the 1950 Statement, Hanna Saba adds that it lay UNESCO's Constitution to combat inequality around the world.[28]

Tensions project

The ambition to abandon racism formed an inspiration for UNESCO's 'Tensions Project'. Executed from UNESCO's first General Conference in 1945, the 'Tensions Affecting International Understanding Project' was designed to discover and examine international tensions that were seen as a causal agent for war. With the Tensions Project, UNESCO provided scholarships to research global tensions such as the spread of stereotypes. UNESCO's Social Science Department scrutinized global anxieties, to get an indication how and where wars could possibly be prevented.[29] Hence, it believed that science could contribute to building peace around the world. The Tensions Project assigned itself to:

[26] Julian Huxley, *UNESCO: Its Purpose and its Philosophy* (Washington, 1947), 6-7.
[27] Michael Banton, 'Social Aspects of the race question', in: UNESCO, *Four statements on the race question* (Paris, 1969), 17-18.
[28] Hanna Saba, 'Human Rights', in: Gian Franco Pompei et al., *In the Minds of Men: UNESCO 1946 to 1971* (Paris, 1972), 226-229.
[29] Duedahl, 'UNESCO Man', 6-7.

> … better understanding and the removal of tensions arising from preconceived, stereotyped ideas about foreign countries and their inhabitants; and on the authority of its [UNESCO's] Constitution, which states that 'wars begin in the minds of men' and that 'it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed', the Organization decided to include in its programme a systematic co-ordinated study of social tensions and their repercussions in international life.[30]

At the head of this project stood Otto Klineberg, a Canadian-American social anthropologist, who was best known for his study in which he showed how the mental capacities of coloured children did not have a biological origin, but should be considered a social problem. For this research, Klineberg showed how the IQ of African-American children rose after they had been placed in integrated schools.[31] Klineberg was an expert of anti-racism and as the director of the UNESCO Tensions Project, he was known as the 'stalwart leader in conflict studies'.[32] Together with Huxley and Gunnar Myrdal,[33] Klineberg laid the basis for the Race Statement. In 1948, they wrote a memorandum to the recently elected director of the Social Science Department, Arthur Ramos. In this memo, these scholars described racial hierarchies as social constructs and explained how current research in anthropology had failed to define the concept of race: 'Contemporary science does not admit the concept of race as meaning a division of mankind into different parts, each of them characterized by a complex of special traits, both physical and mental.'[34]

[30] UNESCO, 'The Nature of Conflict', *Studies on the Sociological aspects of international tensions* (Paris, 1957), 9.
[31] Otto Klineberg, *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research* (Paris, 1950).
[32] Alva Myrdal, 'UNESCO and Peace', in: Pompei et al., *In the minds of Men*, 269.
[33] Gunnar Myrdal was a Swedish sociologist and economist who achieved world fame through the publication of his book: *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York, 1944). In this work he described a vicious cycle in which whites oppress blacks and then point to black people's poor performances as a reason for this oppression. With this verdict, Myrdal laid the groundwork for later racial integration and affirmative action
[34] Duedahl, 'UNESCO Man', 7.

Social Science Department

According to the historian Poul Duedahl, in accordance to this memo, Ramos proposed at the fourth General Conference in September 1949 that – because racism was seen as a causal agent for war – this concept needed to be studied in detail. Contrary to most scholars, Duedahl presents evidence that the question to study 'race' did not come from its member states in the General Conference, but was initiated by UNESCO's scholars Klineberg, Myrdal and Huxley. At the General Conference, UNESCO's member states agreed upon three goals: 'to study and collect scientific materials concerning questions of race; To give wide diffusion to the scientific information collected; To prepare an educational campaign based on this information.'[35] Once this resolution was passed UNESCO's Social Science Department took action. Its director dr. Arthur Ramos decided to install a committee of experts to prepare a study into race.

> This programme has two emphasies (sic.). 1) to disseminate the best scientific information concerting race as widely as possible, so that popular misconceptions may be dispelled; 2) to conduct research on aspects of race problems where our present knowledge is inadequate.[36]

Ramos, a Brazilian anthropologist and outspoken critic of racial inequality, compiled a list of renowned experts in the fields of sociology, biology, genealogy and physical anthropology in 1949. These scholars were invited to the UNESCO conference on race problems that took place between 12th and 14th December 1949. At this expert meeting, eight renowned scientists discussed the current state of the term race.

It is unclear how Ramos selected the scholars for this conference, but correspondence between UNESCO and several scholars shows a preference for English speaking, Western oriented, but above all outspoken scientists. According to Duedahl, Ramos solely invited scientists that clearly perceived the race concept as a social construct.[37] Scholars who were unable to attend, were often asked if they could recommend colleagues for replacement.

---

[35] *Records of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Fourth Session: Resolutions* (Paris, 1949), 22.
[36] UNESCO Archives, Paris, (UNESCO), inventory number: 323.12.A.102: Aim of the Race Project, 1949.
[37] Duedahl, 'UNESCO Man', 8.

Furthermore, it has become increasingly difficult to find out how Ramos select his experts, as he died suddenly on 31st October 1949, just six weeks before the start of the UNESCO Conference of Experts on Race Issues.

His successor was dr. Robert Angell, who temporarily took over Ramos' job to organize the conference. Angell was a sociologist himself and was best known for his studies of individuals and how they interact in various groups. As a scholar at the University of Michigan, Angell had been a member of the US national UNESCO commission and was recently employed at UNESCO's Social Science Department in Paris. His acquaintance to the department, made him the best short-tem solution to Ramos' sudden demise.

The Experts

The best known contributor to the UNESCO Statements on Race was Montague Francis Ashley Montagu (1905-1991). This Jewish-American scholar – born as Israel Ehrenberg – was best known for his controversial publication *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York, 1942) in which he argues that 'race' is no biological fact, but merely a social myth. In this book that reads more like a manifesto then a scientific publication, Montagu states that race is nothing more than a group of people that belong to the same species, but have in their history taken a different path. Racial mixing, he explains, is therefore harmless: if pure races are a social construct and all men derive from the same species, 'racial purity' has never existed, so in mixed marriage there is no purity to be lost.[38] The historian of science, Nadine Weidman explains how after his activist publications, Montagu had gradually changed from a renowned scholar to a public anthropologist; instead of publishing in academic journals he wrote for popular magazines and attended television shows. Once he was invited to chair the UNESCO conference on race, his academic influence had waned and he was commonly seen as popularizing anthropologist, in academic exile. According to Weidman, UNESCO invited him 'because of his prominence as a spokesman', rather than as an authority in the field.[39]

[38] Weidman, 'An Anthropologist on TV'.
[39] Ibid., 215-218.

Arthur Ramos, as an anthropologist himself, must have known very well that Montagu was no longer a credible scientist. But his outspoken view on this issue made him a good candidate. if Ramos would have wanted to influence the outcomes of the expert meeting, he could have also asked another scholar that believed race was a social construct. However, in choosing Montagu as the 'rapporteur' of this conference, Ramos chose for the 'highly visible warrior in the war against prejudice and racism.'[40] Not only was Montagu asked to compile a first draft, he was also the first scholar to be invited.[41]

After Montagu accepted the invitation, Gunnar Dahlberg was invited. Dahlberg, a Swedish physician, geneticist and eugenist was an outspoken scholar who had clearly condemned the Nazi administration, but was a credible scientist and expert in the field as well. Unfortunately, Dahlberg was unable to attend, but he suggested his close colleague dr. Erik Sköld. This former secretary at the Institute of Human Genetics, was invited, but had to cancel for health issues, according to the book Montagu later wrote about the Statement on Race.[42]

Sköld was last-minute replaced by Luiz de Aguilar Costa Pinto, a young Brazilian sociologist who was researching race relations in Brazil on a research project funded by UNESCO. On behalf of this organisation, he studied how people from different races or groups had harmonious relations, something that – at that time – was deemed unique. According to the historian Marcos Choir Maio, this successful racial story played a major role in UNESCO's decision to sponsor a research programme in Brazil.[43] He suggests that UNESCO granted this scholarship because it wanted to use the (expected) outcomes in their campaign against racism. This could have played a role in his invitation as well.

In UNESCO's search for a non-Western scholar, it found the Indian scholar and diplomat Humanyun Kabir. In a letter to the psychologist dr. Hadley Cantril, Angell explained that UNESCO needed more diversity in their committee: 'In that connection, I should be very glad to get any suggestions from you with respect to a non-U.S. anthropologist. The Departmental Programme is going into the field of the less-developed peoples more and

[40] Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism*, 161.
[41] UNESCO: 323.12.A.102 (Race Question): Letter Ramos to Montagu, October 1949.
[42] Ashley Montagu, *Statement on Race: An extended discussion in plain language of the UNESCO Statement by experts on Race problems* (New York, 1951), 6.
[43] Marcos Chor Maio, 'UNESCO and the Study of Race Relation in Brazil: Regional or National Issue?', *The Latin American Research Review* 2 (2001), 118-136.

more, and an anthropologist is almost essential on our staff'.[44] Kabir and Cantril met each other at UNESCO's India Tensions Project, where both had been working on. It is interesting to mention that Kabir was a philosopher and publicist. As an educational advisor of the Indian Ministry of Education, Kabir had served in the Indian National UNESCO Committee.

Edward Franklin Frazier needed no introduction to Ramos or Angell: the sociologist who had specialized in the acceptance of African-American families in the US, had made some name in the American scientific community. He was among the first scholars studying race relations in the US, and the first black president of the American Sociological Society. As a black scholar, he was frequently consulted for race issues. All in all, Frazier made an excellent candidate for the UNESCO Conference on Race Issues.

Another prominent scholar at UNESCO's race conference was dr. Ernest Beaglehole. Born and raised in New Zealand, Beaglehole moved to London to do a PhD and a post-doc at Yale where he studied Pacific island ethnography. He became famous for his work on Pacific tribes and cultures, such as the publication *Some Modern Maoris* (1946). Throughout his life, he emphasised the decline of native cultures. As an anthropologist, he also was an obvious choice for Ramos.[45]

The Spanish-Mexican anthropologist Juan Comas was also a renowned scholar when he was invited to UNESCO's race conference. Comas was exiled from Spain after the Spanish Civil War and fled to Mexico when the dictator Franco seized power. In Mexico, Comas specialized in various groups in the American continent. He discovered how diverse the American continent is and that it is wrong to lump together Latin- and South-American populations. He was invited for his expertise on blood groups, arguing that blood types cannot define nor classify races.

Back in 1949, professor Claude Lévi-Straus was already a prominent scholar even though he was not as honoured as he is today. Lévi-Strauss is often depicted as one of the founding fathers of modern anthropology and is commonly known as the originator of the theory of structuralism and structural anthropology. As a renowned professor, he was very well suited to serve in UNESCO's committee of experts. Furthermore, he also contributed to

[44] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Angell to Cantril, 2nd November 1949.
[45] James Ritchie and Jane Ritchie, 'Beaglehole, Ernest', in: *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand,* accessed 3rd May 2017, http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/5b15/beaglehole-ernest.

UNESCO's Mass Communication series of *The Race Question in Modern Science*, by writing a booklet titled *Race and History*. He also published regularly in the specialized journal *UNESCO Courier.*

The last expert was no lightweight either: in 1950, the British sociologist professor Morris Ginsberg had served as an editor for *The Sociological Review* and was about to establish the British Sociological Association. As a well-known professor in sociology, he was another understandable choice. Especially with regard to one of the major themes in his work: the social responsibility of sociologists. Ginsberg believed that scholars needed to engage in public life more often. In short: Ramos indeed selected very outspoken scientists for the conference.

The conference

The conference at which these scholars were invited was held between 12th and 14th December 1949 at the former Hotel Majestic, at the Avenue Kléber in Paris, which had been UNESCO's headquarters since in 1945.[46] Looking back at this conference, Montagu remarks that less than five years ago, this hotel had served as the German military headquarters of France. 'Except only if our deliberations had taken place at Auschwitz or Dachau, there could have been no more fitting environment to impress upon the Committee members the immense significance of their work'.[47] This remark suggests Montagu's intentions when writing the statement. For this Jewish-American scholar, the aim of this project was to condemn the Nazi administration and speak out on racism. By using an activist language, he hoped to impugn racial thought.

After the experts had been welcomed by acting director dr. Angell, Franklin Frazier was appointed to chair this session, Montagu had already been assigned the role of *rapporteur*. In his memoires, Montagu explains that the process of deciding on the statement went very fast: The Committee had already decided on the rough structure of the statement after the first day. This draft, formulated by Montagu was circulated and discussed on the second and third day. According to Montagu, these last days were used to 'eliminate weak and debatable

[46] UNESCO housed in the former Hotel until it moved in 1958 to its current 'UNESCO House' at the Place de Fontenoy in Paris.
[47] Montagu, *Statement on Race*, 6.

points, to search out "holes" and doubtful statements.' He continues to state that after this revision, 'all members of the Committee were able to sign the Statement without any reservations'.[48]

However, this is Montagu's side of the story. According to the anthropologist Pat Shipman, Montagu took on a different role in the process of writing this statement. She remarks that Montagu 'impatiently burst out with his point of view and the committee asked him to write out a draft statement. By 1:00 AM he had completed what became the working draft, which was discussed and then submitted to a broader panel.'[49] It is no surprise that these stories differ to some extent, as Montagu published his story after the Statement was criticized. The fact that he mentions that all scholars agreed, with 'his' draft, could be his way of to ensure that he would not be blamed for the failed attempt.

Review

After the conference, Montagu elaborated on this draft and finished a first full statement against racism. At the conference, UNESCO had aimed to include scholars from all possible disciplines from all parts of the world. It consisted thus of three sociologists: Costa Pinto, Frazier and Ginsburg, four anthropologists: Beaglehole, Montagu, Comas and Lévi-Stauss and one philosopher: Kabir. But, the Social Science Department knew that race was also heavily debated in the natural sciences. To make sure scientists from all disciplines would agree on this document, the draft was sent to some notable colleagues for review, most of whom were natural scientists.[50]

Among the reviewers was the evolutionary biologist Julian Huxley. Huxley, as the former director-general of UNESCO suggested meaningful revisions. He suggested to use a more general tone and believed that with a more modest statement, scholars were more likely to agree. The other 'founding fathers' of the Race project, Myrdal and Klineberg were also consulted before the Statement was published. Hadley Cantril and Gunnar Dahlberg, who had been invited to the expert meeting, also suggested revisions for the draft, as did the biologist

[48] Ibid., 7-8.
[49] Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism,* 161.
[50] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Angell to Montagu, 8th February 1950.

Edwin Conklin, the geneticist Leslie Clarence Dunn and geneticist and biologist Theodosius Dobzhansky.

With revisions from Donald Hager, the sociologist Wilbert Moore, the geneticist Hermann Joseph Muller, the historian Joseph Needham and the geneticist Curt Stern, UNESCO believed it included scientific outlooks from the natural sciences as well. Thus, it believed it could broaden the support for the statement, so that scientists from all disciplines would agree. UNESCO believed that with a wide scope of scientists, their statement had a larger chance of becoming commonly accepted: it consulted outspoken scientists and asked their feedback. UNESCO thereby deprived them of responding negatively in the media once this statement was published. This was – and still is – a well-known strategy to withhold criticism.

Statement on Race

The final result of this thoughtful process was the 1950 Statement on Race. This statement aimed to provide a summary of the current scientific discussing concerning the nature of race. In the statement, the experts made a political statement in explaining how 'race' could be seen from a biological standpoint as one group of populations constituting of the species *homo sapiens.* These groups are characterized by some typical features. But according to this statement, these features were preconceived, rather than perceived. According to the signatories, this is problematic because national, religious or cultural groups are often seen as a 'race', when they clearly do not match the definition above. The statement explicitly uses examples as Jews, to show how the term 'race' is often misconceived.[51]

Furthermore, the statement elucidates that there are no differences among races; there is no scientific evidence that race mixture is harmless, thus there can never be a biological justification for prohibiting intermarriage between persons of different races. In fact, the committee argued that pure races have never existed and man is the result of continuous hybridization. The scholars thus suggested to replace the problematic term 'race', with 'ethnic group'. This way, the misconception of this 'social myth' could be debunked. In

[51] UNESCO, *Statement on Race* (Paris, 1950), 1.

creating this new vocabulary, the statement hoped that readers could finally recognize the unity of men.[52]

The above shows a desire to 'debunk the social myth' and to explain that the current conception of 'race' was an illusion. But as the scholars knew that the science concerning 'race' was contested, they presented the illusion of unity in the statement. The scholars strongly believed that by presenting a clear straightforward picture would strengthen the statement. Its first sentence therefore reads that: 'Scientists have reached general agreement in recognizing that mankind is one: that all men belong to the same species, *homo sapiens*.'[53] The scientific image of 'race' was thus presented as the only possible way to deal with this issue.

Criticism

When UNESCO published its Statement on Race on 15th July 1950, it was received well in the worldwide press: not only was the statement printed in newspapers from over eighteen countries worldwide, it was also frequently quoted in articles concerning the race question.[54] This reception can be seen as both a success for the Social Science Department as for the Department of Mass Communication. However, a little over a month after the publication, a group of British anthropologists criticized the statement in the journal *Man.* To their reading, in abandoning the concept of race, this statement was not scientific at all.

> (...) the too simplified statement that "race is less a biological fact than a social myth"; the proposal that the phrase "ethnic group" should be substituted for "race" in ordinary speech; and the concluding statement that man is born with biological drives towards universal brotherhood and co-operation, to which surely very few anthropologists anywhere would yet venture to commit themselves.[55]

[52] Ibid, 1-3.
[53] Ibid.
[54] UNESCO, *The Race Concept: Results of an Inquiry* (Paris, 1952), 7.
[55] 'U.N.E.S.C.O. on race', *Man* 50 (1950), 138-139.

The criticism consisted of a total of eight separate observations, that were published in *Man*. Eight of Britain's most prestigious anthropologists replied to UNESCO's statement, questioning its authority, its scientific grounds and its presumed unanimity. These were professor Le Gros Clark, professor Fleure, professor Harris, Dr. Osman Hill, Sir Arthur Keith, Dr. Morant, Miss Tildesley, Mr. Trevor and Professor Zuckerman. They suggested to compose 'a briefer statement, on which the chief anthropological societies, representing nearly all the world's physical anthropologists, could agree. They believed that this document would have greater effect than the present document in combatting racial prejudice.'[56]

This reaction shows that the critique was based on the absence of scientific arguments. According to Siep Stuurman, the criticism was raised because UNESCO and its experts believed that the scholars could produce genuine knowledge and moreover, that the knowledge that they produced would lead to the collapse of racism and thus to global equality.[57] The committee of experts believed in the positivistic idea that the Statement on Race could replace the common picture of racial thought, by which racism could finally be defeated. This 'scientism' might explain why the statement was initially received so well by journalists, but was criticized by scholars. This criticism proved to be very influential, as it changed the public opinion concerning this publication: especially in South Africa and the Netherlands a discussion began discussing whether scientists agreed with this statement.

But as I tried to convey in the introduction, the 1950 Statement on Race is generally seen as an unsuccessful attempt to summarize the current discussions concerning race. UNESCO believed that using scientific evidence, it would be able to debunk the misconceived conception of racial thought and alter widespread ideas that lead to inequality. However, according to the British scientists in *Man* the statement lacked scientific evidence and was above all a dogmatic attempt to use 'science' for political purposes. For UNESCO, this critique was no surprise: already before the statement was published, but after reviewing, Klineberg, remarked that the statement would be more effective and less open to attack if 'the tone of the Statement was less dogmatic that it is at present.'[58]

[56] Ibid.
[57] Stuurman, *De uitvinding van de mensheid*, 463.
[58] Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index, 177.

A failed attempt?

With its conference and review, UNESCO consulted scientists of various disciplines to speak out on race issues. However, this does not imply that all scientists would agree on this statement. And as I explained earlier, this statement was heavily criticized in the scientific community. Several historians therefore asked if UNESCO should not have foreseen that when writing a very outspoken statement on a contested subject like race, the scientific community could have been divided anyway?

Recent historiography is divided on this subject: some scholars depict the Race Statement as a failed attempt to desperately change the scientific concept of race, in order to end discrimination around the world. They state that UNESCO had a positivistic image of science and that this attempt was somewhat naïve.[59] Other scholars praise the UNESCO Statement on Race, for they believe that it was the decisive step in a longer series of events that eventually ended scientific racism once and for all. They see the Race Statement is seen as an important event in the history of inequality.[60]

In the archives however, I found correspondence between reporter Montagu and the acting head of the Social Science Department, Angell, showing how the Social Science Department urged for the writing of a more modest statement than Montagu's draft. This correspondence reveals that Montagu insisted on using a more activist language, even though the UNESCO Social Science Department was anxious to publish the statement in this manner.[61] Part of this dispute arose, when Angell suggested to select the feedback from the reviewers himself, before sending it to Montagu. The publicist responded annoyed: he believed that as the producer of the draft, he had the rights to read the feedback himself.[62]

The correspondence also explains Montagu's disclaimer in his publication on the statement: from these letters, it is clear that Montagu insisted on using a more activist language, even though Huxley, Klineberg and Angell did not agree with him. When this statement was criticized and a discussion broke out, Montagu knew that if UNESCO would

[59] Bangham, 'What is Race?', 82; Schaffer, '"Like a Baby with a box of Matches"', 309; Brattain, 'Race, Racism, and Antiracism', 1386-1413.
[60] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 199-202; Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*; Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index'.
[61] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Métraux to Montagu, 2nd March 1951.
[62] Ibid, Letter Angell to Montagu, 30th January 1950.

search for a scapegoat, he was going to take the blame for his activist language. He therefore stated in how own book about the statement that everyone agreed with his draft.

A new statement

But as UNESCO's scientific summary fell short, Angell and Torres Bodet understood that action was needed to overcome this bad publicity. Their initial response was a reaction in *Man* – which slowly became a platform for a lively discussion concerning the reality of race. Angell had asked a colleague to respond: The French director of the *Musée de l'Homme* dr. Henri Vallois responded to the British scientists. First, he responded to the critique that race was visible and should therefore be a reality. Vallois responded that this would have been a reasonable argument a hundred years ago. But anno 1950, as the term 'race' has been reduced to skin colour and nothing else, this argument was no longer valid.[63] Vallois also responded to the argument that racial differences do not contain mental capacities, by pointing out the confusion over the term 'race'. According to Vallois, replacing 'race' for 'ethnic group' would not diminish the term, as 'race' was already a word that was solely used for physical features. Shortly after, UNESCO understood that responding to this criticism would not settle the discussion; in South Africa and in the Netherlands, the Statement was also discussed critically. It is unclear why the discussion developed in these countries, though for South Africa, 'apartheid' had just started to play a role.

At the same time, UNESCO also took its time to search for a new director of its Social Science Department. Ramos' sudden death had complicated the work of this department, and now that the statement was criticized, the Department could not afford another miscalculation. Hence, dr. Alva Myrdal was appointed as the new director of the Social Science Department. Since 1948, Alva Myrdal was connected to UNESCO's race question by means of her husband, Gunnar Myrdal, who had reviewed the first statement. Mrs. Myrdal was a trusted sociologist herself and with her appointment at UNESCO's Social Science Department, she became the first female director of a UN agency.

[63] Vallois, 'U.N.E.S.C.O. on race', 15-16.

At the same time, dr. Alfred Métraux was appointed to assist her as the project leader of the race question. He was no stranger to UNESCO and as a Swiss anthropologist, he had taken part several of UNESCO's research projects, such as the Hylean Amazon Project in 1947 and the Marbial Valley Survey in Haiti in 1948.[64] Métraux would work directly under Myrdal and was only concerned with the Statement on Race, its conferences and overcoming the critique.

On 22nd January 1951, Métraux sent out a letter to Torres Bodet and his newly appointed executive, Alva Myrdal, expressing his concerns over the discussion in South Africa and the Netherlands. In this letter, he stresses that the public opinion was slowly tilting over and something needed to be done.[65] Just three days later, Métraux started to plan a second conference on race issues, by sending out invitations to a group of scientists.[66] The course and outcomes of the second conference will be explained in the final chapter.

In this chapter, I tried to nuance the picture that UNESCO wanted to rewrite the science concerning race. By shifting attention to UNESCO's networking skills, I have shown how its diplomatic competence was at least as important as its scientific expertise. In bringing together a large group of scientists, it had hoped to publish a statement with which everyone could agree. But UNESCO could not succeed in changing the concept of race as its statement yielded criticism.

[64] Charles Wagley, 'Alfred Métraux: 1902-1963', *American Anthropologist* 66 (1964), 604-605.
[65] UNESCO, 323.12.102: Letter Métraux to Torres Bodet, 22nd January 1951.
[66] Ibid., Letter Métraux to Fagg, 25th January 1951.

2. Creating universality: a case study of the Dutch discussion

In this chapter, I will zoom into UNESCO's efforts to create the idea that their scientific findings were universal and all encompassing. I will explain how UNESCO's Social Science Department tried to broaden support for their Statement on Race. In the previous chapter, I explained how UNESCO's Social Science Department consulted outspoken scholars to find support for the Statement on Race. I also argued how the Committee tried to create a universal picture by replacing the word 'race' with 'ethnic group'. This chapter will explain how its media strategy aimed to reach a large audience. I will also explain how the Statement was set out into national committees to spread the message of its statement in various countries.

At first, I will scrutinize UNESCO's Department of Mass Communication, and how it tried to distribute UNESCO's ideas around the world. This autonomous department developed its own strategies in favour of UNESCO's goals. For the Statement on Race this meant that it wrote press releases, approached newspapers and journals, published a booklet series and an illustrated children's book for educational purposes. In this chapter, I will research to what extent these popularizing events contributed to the universal picture of 'race'.

In the second part of this chapter, I will scrutinize the vast discussion concerning 'race' that arose in the Netherlands after the publication of the Statement on Race. UNESCO discussed the (implications of) the Race Statement in its national committees in an attempt to make this statement well-known, but also to gain support. I will present a case study of how UNESCO tried to win support for their statement in the Netherlands and how it dealt with the critique that followed. I will focus specifically on the Dutch situation, because I believe this is an important case of how UNESCO tried to tried to enlarge the support for the Statement on Race. At the end of this chapter, I will evaluate to what extent UNESCO had learned from the Dutch discontent and was able to prepare itself for a second conference on race issues.

Science for the masses

Part of the strategy employed by UNESCO and the UN resolution, was that the Statement on Race and the science that substantiated it would be available to a wide audience. UNESCO understood that 'building peace in the minds of men' meant that it needed to communicate

with the layman around the world. From the very first days of UNESCO's constitution, it had therefore set up a large Department of Mass Communication. Their task was to communicate UNESCO's vision as clear as possible to a vast audience. Their foremost task was 'promoting peace and human welfare through the production and distribution of articles, films and broadcasts.'[67]

It is interesting to remark that in the early years after constitution, UNESCO's first director-general and the initiator of the Statements, Julian Huxley remarked that: 'science and the scientific way of thought is as yet the one human activity which is truly universal'.[68] This idea that there is one scientific method and that science is universal can be characterized as scientism. Thus, if science was seen as the key universal translator, it is understandable that UNESCO asked scientists to speak out on the issue of race. This way, science could contribute to the retreat of racism.

Furthermore, before Huxley became involved with UNESCO's Race programme, he already had several thoughts about the presumed universality of science. In the 1930s, Huxley and other scholars such as Theodosius Dobzhansky made plans about a way to unify scientific disciplines to come to one true kind of knowledge of the world. They believed that all sciences occupied with the human species could be merged into an all-encompassing evolutionary world view.[69] The idea that combining scientific disciplines to gain better knowledge is somewhat positivistic, but might explain why UNESCO brought together a group of scholars from various perspectives to discuss the current scientific status of the term 'race'.

With regard to the Statement on Race, the Department of Mass Communication was heavily involved in the circulation of UNESCO's viewpoints. As the historian Jenny Bangham explains, it was their task to reduce the perceived gap between popular and scientific knowledge. This meant that before the Statement was published, it was sent to the Department of Mass Communication, who came up with a strategy that would enhance its impact.

---

[67] Bangham, 'What is Race?', 82.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Vassiliki Betty Smocovitis, 'The unifying vision: Julian Huxley, evolutionary humanism and synthesis', in: Harmke Kamminga and Geert Somsen (eds.), *Pursuing the Unity of Science: Ideology and Scientific Practise from the Great War to the Cold War* (London & New York, 2016), 40-42, 47-51.

'Propaganda'

For UNESCO, this Department was thus seen 'as a crucial component of UNESCO's machinery for promoting peace.'[70] Four months after the publication of the Statement on Race, it had yielded '133 news stories, 62 articles and editorials, 6 full reportages' and another 50 to 75 mentions of this statement.[71] UNESCO's Race question project leader Métraux, as a committed scientist himself, acknowledged the strength and popularizing skills of this department, referring to their work as 'propaganda'.[72]

One of its most far-reaching projects concerning the Statement on Race was the booklet series *The Race Question in Modern Science*, a series in which scientific studies into race are explained to the layman. For this book series, the Department of Mass Communication proposed scholars from various disciplines to explain why race and racial inequality pose a thread to society. This series consisted of no less than eleven booklets, all emphasizing why race is problematic from a different perspective. For this series a great number of authors and reviewers of the Race Statements were asked for a contribution. Juan Comas wrote a booklet on racial myths, Harry Shapiro wrote a biological history on the Jewish people, Claude Lévi-Strauss contributed to the story of race and history, Dunn completed a booklet on Race and biology, Klineberg wrote about race and psychology.[73]

The fact that UNESCO chose the format of books as their major source for spreading their ideas is no surprise. For UNESCO the semantic idea of a book proved to be so important, it even implemented its own book policy. This had everything to do with the idea that reading was considered as the ultimate form of human enhancement. UNESCO affirmed that a book is 'the best gift that can be put in the hands of a child.'[74] Its director Torres Bodet remarked that books can be seen as the most authentic factors of universal understanding.

---

[70] Bangham, 'What is Race', 84-85.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Alfred Métraux, 'Unesco and Race Problems', *International Social Sciences Bulletin* 2 (1950), 390.
[73] See: UNESCO, *The Race Question in Modern Science: Race and Science* (New York & Paris, 1961).
[74] Céline Giton, 'Weapons of Mass Distribution: UNESCO and the Impact of Books', in: Duedahl, *The History of UNESCO*, 51.

Furthermore, UNESCO knew that to reach a vast audience, it needed to educate children in understanding what 'race' meant. Thus, in 1953, when the controversy of the two statements was resolved, its Race question officer, Alfred Métraux approached Cyril Bibby, a British science educator for producing a handbook for schoolteachers. Bibby used the series *The Race Question in Modern Science* as the basis for this work, yet sought to simplify the language.[75] Simplifying this work meant that not all scholars eventually agreed with the exact wording of *Education in Racial and Intergroup Relations: A Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers*.[76]

With these examples, I argue that for UNESCO as a whole the distribution of the statement was at least of equal importance as the assertion in the statement. It had no problem rewriting their statement, if that was needed to overcome the controversy. Important elements in this conceived ubiquity were the authority of scientists and their universal scientific tone and the ability to distribute ideas around the world using schools, books and mass media. The Department of Mass Communication went all out to advertise these ideas around the world, with the hope that eventually racism would disappear.

Wording

This chapter has so far aimed to show how Métraux, Huxley and the Committee believed in the universal character of science and therefore aimed to use science for their campaign against worldwide racism. This 'scientism' was unwittingly and criticizing this attitude might be anachronistic. Besides, UNESCO's Social Science Department also actively created the picture that their findings were truly universal in an effort strengthen support for the statement. The language used in the statement also contributed to the idea that UNESCO's Statement on Race was the only scientific answer to the question of race. However, by proclaiming a statement with wide support from scientists from various disciplines, UNESCO actively created this universality itself. In the 1950 statement, sentences like: 'these are the

[75] Sebastián Gil-Riaño, 'Historicizing Anti-Racism: UNESCO's Campaigns Against Race Prejudice in the 1950s' (PhD diss.; University of Toronto, 2014), 326.
[76] Aigul Kulnazorova and Christian Ydesen, *UNESCO Without Borders: Educational Campaigns for International Understanding* (London, 2016), 209.

scientific facts'[77] can be found. An even stronger assertion is UNESCO-director Torres Bodet's remark at the UNESCO News, at the publication of the statement. It reads that 'Our weapon must be the truth, and nothing but the truth'.[78]

The above suggests that for UNESCO it was important that this statement would have broad support around the world, so that every citizen around the world would understand that racial classifications had no scientific ground. To do so, the Statement on Race aimed to present a simple and straightforward picture, as the idea of doubt would weaken the statement: 'The scientific consensus was forced, but this only suggests the strength of the antiracist position: the biological equality of the races was now presumed'[79], the historian Selcer concludes.

The fact that the statement was perceived quite well in the international press, had everything to do with the idea that the statement portrayed a clear image that was easily understandable to a wide audience. It was meant to educate the layman around the world, for it believed that translating science to a wide audience involved an easy story. Science translators (including Montagu) believed it was best to present a crystal clear story. Explaining uncertainties, they believed would harm the power of the statement.

So far, I have used the words universal and universality explaining the aim of UNESCO's committee of experts. As I explained in the first chapter, the Social Science Department brought together a group of scholars from various disciplines with the aim of stressing the universal character of science. 'Science' should provide an honest answer to the questions concerning 'race'. Not only was 'science' and 'the scientific' method seen as a value-free translator to the world population, also the fact that 'all scientists' agreed should strengthen UNESCO's statement. In the 1950s, 'science' was seen as something neutral and objective and scientific results bore the promise of being both a diplomatic tool and a social remedy that would allow all people in the world to understand one another.[80]

Another way in which the statement adhered to a wide audience, is by addressing the atrocities of Nazi Germany. In an attempt to abandon racism around the world, the statement

---

[77] *Statement on Race*, 2.
[78] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: UNESCO News: No Justification for Racialism', 12th June 1951.
[79] Perrin Selcer, 'Patterns of Science. Developing Knowledge for a World Community', (PhD. Diss.; Philadelphia, 2011), 289.
[80] Bangham, 'What is Race?', 82.

eschewed controversial examples of racism. Rather than mentioning segregation issues or colonial practice, the Statement on Race explicitly mentions that Jews should not be considered a race and that race mixture is harmless: two important elements of the Nazi doctrine. According to Duedahl, this was a necessity for UNESCO, as the majority of its member states (which consisted of Western countries) still coped with colonialist policies. It would have been hypocrite and impossible for France or Britain to sign a statement that condemns colonialism, as they still collected taxes in overseas territories. Shifting attention to Nazi Germany was easier, as the entire world agreed upon castigating the Holocaust.[81] According to the historian Selcer, this was an easy way to prevent political discussions, as the entire world disapproved of the atrocities of the Second World War.[82] Considering the fact that more controversial consequences of racial thought, such as segregation issues in the US or colonial relations were not mentioned in the statement, this can also be seen as a means to pick up support for the statement. The Holocaust was an easy scapegoat for UNESCO and its member states.

National Committees

Another 'tool' UNESCO used to allocate its ideas and its work was the establishment of national committees. As the historian Hazard explains, to reach a wide audience, UNESCO frequently worked with national committees, that discussed the topics that UNESCO dealt with.[83] By discussing these topics on a national level, UNESCO hoped to gain more support for their projects.

> The National Commissions (…) are, so to speak the Organisation's roots in the cultural soil of Member States and which, all year round, provide solid nourishment to the centre. Within countries, they serve as a link between the organized State and free culture and they prepare

[81] Duedahl, 'UNESCO Man', 6.
[82] Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index', 174.
[83] Hazard, 'A Racialized Deconstruction?',180.

the material which will be given political purpose and legal form by the sessions of the General Conference.[84]

These committees were thus top-down organized from the UNESCO headquarters in Paris and consisted of UNESCO representatives, but also of scholars from that respective country. The Netherlands also had such a committee, but as the Netherlands was not very active in UNESCO, their national committee was inactive too.

There was one thing peculiar about the Dutch involvement in UNESCO: even though the Dutch top-down structures in UNESCO were inactive, in 1949, the Netherlands was the first country to open a UNESCO Centre. Founded by two students, the UNESCO Centre was a bottom-up organisation that was involved with the circulation of UNESCO's ideas in the Netherlands. The Centre had a library that consisted of all UNESCO's publications and important anti-war and anti-racism literature. It was established to support in international conflicts by sending volunteers to war regions and assisting children in the Third World. It seems as if UNESCO was embraced these initiatives, as it sent its director Torres Bodet to open this centre. [85]

The Dutch situation

In this part, I will describe the reception of the UNESCO Statement on Race in the Netherlands and how criticism arose here. Then, I will explain how UNESCO tried to overcome this criticism by investigating the problems with the statement. In doing so, I will research how the UNESCO structure worked and how that contributed to the circulation of its ideas. Finally, I will pay attention to the inquiry the Dutch national UNESCO committee set out and how the results of this report were used for the second statement.

The first thing that comes to mind is that the publication of the Statement on Race on 18th July 1950 had immediate attention in several newspapers in the Netherlands. A few short

[84] Gian Franco Pompei, 'History of the Organization', in: Pompei et al., *In the Minds of Men*, 22.

[85] 'Unesco-centrum in de hoofdstad: studenten namen het initiatief tot de oprichting', *Haarlems Dagblad* 8th November 1949, 5, retrieved from: *Krantenviewer Noord-Hollands Archief*, http://nha.courant.nu/issue/HD/1949-11-08/edition/0/page/5.

news articles were devoted to this event on the same day the statement was published. In these articles, the content of the statement is copied, together with the claim that this is the most authoritative publication considering 'race' ever produced.[86]

Yet, following the criticism in *Man*, the statement was also criticized in the Netherlands by a group of anthropologists. It was the Netherlands Anthropological Society that expressed their unease with the statement. Even though it strongly admired UNESCO's attempt to condemn race discrimination, it has substantial objections against the exact wordings of the statement. The board of the society was 'concerned that the race question has a biological origin, but believes that race discrimination is based on other grounds.'[87]

However, rather than openly criticising the statement, the Netherlands Anthropological Society contacted the Dutch national UNESCO committee and proposed to set out an inquiry under Dutch scientists to see if this problem was shared by other scholars. Because UNESCO had just decided that it would organize a new meeting in which the statement would be revised, the national UNESCO committee and the Society believed this inquiry could be of great interest to the UNESCO experts in Paris.[88] The national UNESCO committee therefore asked the UNESCO Centre and the Netherlands Anthropological Society to conduct this research.

Two board members of the Netherlands Anthropological Society, professor Rudolf Bergman and dr. A.J. van Bork-Feltkamp, with help of the Centre's first chairman, E. Alderse Baes, translated the statement into Dutch and sent it to scientists of various disciplines. After reading the statement, these scholars were asked: 1. Do you agree with the tendency of the statement? 2. Do you agree with the argumentation of the Statement? 3. Could you explain your problems with this statement? This investigation harvested no less than 79 answers from doctors, biologists, genealogists, mathematicians, philosophers and social scientists. The outcomes were surprisingly similar. A very large majority was unsatisfied with the argumentation.

---

[86] This statement was for instance published in the Dutch newspapers: *Het Nieuws, Dagblad van het Noorden, de Leeuwarder Courant, de West*. Data retrieved from: *Delpher.*

[87] Leiden University, Special collections, Archives Nederlands Bureau voor Anthropologie, KITLV inventory 147, 1456, number 43: Letter UNESCO-Centre and the Netherlands Anthropological Society to scientists, January 1951.

[88] Ibid.

> They took objection over the use of the word 'Ethnic group' instead of race. First of all because '"ethnic" designates a unity which is essentially different from "race", secondly because it is already widely used, and a change in use would entail a lot of confusion.[89]

Furthermore, the inquiry asked to what extent the scholars agreed with the tendency of the statement and if they were 'satisfied' with it. The majority of the scientists agreed with its tendency, but hardly no one was satisfied with it. Some scholars felt the statement was 'too emotional in its expression', 'not realistic enough' or 'more like a wish, than the ascertaining of a fact'. Bergman concluded that 'the mixing of scientific and ethical arguments is generally disapproved of. Giving each of these arguments its full value, it seems better to distinguish them categorically.' [90]

In short, the Dutch criticism was similar to the British criticism in *Man*: it disapproved of the term 'ethnic group' and the mixing up of science and ethics. Yet, Van Bork-Feltkamp and Bergman tried to show the importance of tackling the problem of racism. In the conclusion, they stress the preposterous logic of racial discrimination:

> An example of the way people look at this problem [racism] was given by a distinguished scientist at Surabaia before the last world war. He was a negro from the West Indies; who received the visit of an American professor on a world cruise. They discussed a number of problems of hygiene and of general pathology in a most friendly and objective way, and finally came upon the subject of races. The visitor held himself aloof from the problem, but could not deny that race and especially colour was a social problem in his country. Where upon the negro scientist asked if his bacteriological work was hindered by his pigment, which determined his objective value to society?[91]

[89] NA, KIT: 4518, 'Report UNESCO inquiry', 2.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid, 5.

The invitation

The national committees that UNESCO had set up in its member states were important for gaining useful insights in the cultural background of certain countries and the distribution of their ideas. Thus, the inquiry was followed with great interest by Métraux. Not only was the report of this inquiry discussed at the second conference on race issues, Bergman was even invited to attend this conference in 1951.

Correspondence at the Royal Tropical Institute show that Bergman's invitation to the UNESCO expert meeting was very last-minute: van Bork-Feltkamp received a telegram from Métraux on 1st June 1950, while the expert meeting was scheduled to start just three days later. The telegram invited the reader to attend the second UNESCO meeting on race. However, even though this telegram is kept in the Royal Tropical Institute's archives, it was sent to the corresponding address of the 'Nederlands Genootschap voor Antropologie', the Netherlands Anthropological Society, which housed at the Apollolaan in Amsterdam.[92]

Several factors of this invitation strongly suggest that the invitation was the result of the inquiry. The first thing to mention is that the invitation was last-minute. UNESCO had invited the majority of its scholars already in March or April. If Métraux wanted to invite Bergman for his work as a scholar, he could have invited him months earlier. Perhaps, this late invitation came, because the report of the inquiry was only published 15th May 1951. Finally, by sending an invitation to Bergman's ancillary position at Netherlands Anthropological Society, rather than to the Royal Tropical Institute, it seems obvious that Métraux wanted to use the results of Bergman's inquiry in the conference.

Rudolf Bergman

Because professor Bergman was not a well known professor, I will give a little background of this Dutch anthropologist that I believe is vital to understand his role at the second UNESCO conference. Rudolf Bergman (1899-1967) was a Dutch anthropologist and herpetologist. Soon

[92] Leiden University, Special collections, Archives Nederlands Bureau voor Anthropologie, KITLV inventory 147, 1456, number 43: Minutes of Netherlands Anthropological Society; NA, KIT: 4518: 'Telegram Métraux to van Bork-Feltkamp'.

after finishing his medical study in Amsterdam, Bergman moved to the Dutch East-Indies to become a teacher at the 'Nederlandsch-Indische Artsen School (NIAS), the Dutch Indies Doctors College in Surabaya. After a few years, he became a teacher at the Medical Faculty at in Batavia (current Jakarta). After the Second World War, he was promoted to professor in microscopic anatomy at the recently established National University of Indonesia, where he extended his interest in snakes. However, with the independence of Indonesia, it developed a strong preference for Indonesian over Dutch or Japanese scholars. As a result, Bergman was forced to move back to the Netherlands in 1949, where he became a physical anthropologist at the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam. On behalf of the Institute, Bergman was also appointed as professor at the University of Amsterdam in tropical anthropology. At the Royal Tropical Institute, Bergman succeeded the renowned professor J.P. Kleiweg de Zwaan, who had held the seat between 1915 and 1948.[93]

When Bergman was appointed at the semi-autonomous department of Physical and Cultural Anthropology, he was welcomed in a very neat and successful department. His predecessor professor Kleiweg de Zwaan had established a link with the University of Amsterdam, founded several journals and hosted the international congress of the *Institut International d'Anthropologie* at the Institute in Amsterdam. These accomplishments and several splendid publications, made Kleiweg de Zwaan a renowned scholar with an impressive network of influential colleagues. But apart from Kleiweg de Zwaan's legacy, Bergman owed a lot to his direct colleague, dr. A.J. van Bork-Feltkamp, with whom he had finished the inquiry.

About mrs. van Bork-Feltkamp (1893-1970) little is known. She was trained in biology, but worked as a research fellow at the Institute for Brain Research at the University of Amsterdam, where she received her doctorate in 1930. In relationship to the Royal Tropical Institute, she is often described as the secretary of the department, scholar at the University of Amsterdam and autonomous scientist. The historian David van Duuren describes that she 'fulfilled an indispensable role as a jack-of-all-trades'.[94]

It is easy to imagine, that for Bergman the invitation to join the UNESCO conference on Race Issues was meaningful. He now had the opportunity to debate with the best known anthropologists in the world. Therefore, immediately upon receiving the invitation, the

[93] van Duuren, *Physical Anthropology reconsidered*, 24-27.
[94] Ibid., 26.

director of his department sent a letter to the board of the Royal Tropical Institute, asking for financial support for Bergman's trip to Paris.[95] In this letter, the desirability of Bergman's attendance to a meeting of international allure is addressed. With this invitation, Bergman now had the opportunity to witness to the worldwide discussion concerning race first hand.[96] At that moment, Bertling and Bergman could not foresee that the latter would later be asked to participate in the discussion as well. Participation had two advantages: First, Bergman's expenses would be covered by UNESCO, but more importantly for the Royal Tropical Institute, the Netherlands Anthropological Society and for Bergman himself was that he had the opportunity to participate in a discussion with the world's most renowned scholars in the field.[97]

However, it is no surprise that Bergman attended the conference, instead of van Bork-Feltkamp, to whom the invitation was sent, as both had worked on the inquiry and both were board members of the Netherlands Anthropological Society. Van Bork-Feltkamp was the usual contact for most foreign correspondence regarding the Society and the Institute, thus finding her name on the invitation was no surprise.[98]

Perfect example

With the above, I hope to have shown how professor Bergman was the perfect example of how UNESCO tried to build a community of scientists for their Statement on Race. For UNESCO, wide support was at least of equal importance as the scientific theories that were presented in the statement. In consulting scholars from various disciplines from various countries, UNESCO hoped to gain worldwide support for their statement. Because the discussion that had started in the Netherlands, the relatively unknown anthropologist Rudolf

[95] NA, KIT: 4518, 'Letter Bertling to Offerhaus'.
[96] Van Duuren, *Physical Anthropology reconsidered*, 35.
[97] NA, KIT: 4518, 'Travelogue Bergman Paris 1951', 1.
[98] Another interesting detail can be found on the final statement itself. The names of all scholars consulted are documented here, including the institute they were currently enrolled to. Except for Bergman, who was listed at both the Royal Tropical Institute and his ancillary position at the Netherlands Institute for Anthropology.

Bergman suddenly became a perfect candidate for UNESCO's second conference in Race Issues.

3. Race from a scientific perspective

The controversy around the UNESCO Statement on Race shows that the scientific world was far from unanimous about the existence and applicability of the term 'race'. The discussion that was started by British anthropologists and later also reached the Netherlands showed that within the scientific community 'race' was heavily discussed. Several disciplines discussed the reality of 'race' from their own perspective. Sociologists, biologists, geneticists, psychologists and anthropologists all discussed the idea of race and how that affected their field of study. Therefore, this chapter devotes attention to the various perspectives concerning the term 'race'.

In this chapter, I will investigate why scholars had such disparate views on the issue of race, especially in anthropology. I have focussed primarily on this discipline because this is the most interesting in relation to the UNESCO Statement. Not entirely coincidently, the discipline of anthropology gathered the authority on the ontological status of race after the Second World War. Anthropologists believed that – more than any other scientific discipline – they could decide to what extent 'race' was a biological category or a social construct.[99]

In the last part of this chapter, I will research how UNESCO dealt with the various academic disciplines that discussed 'race'. I will analyse how it brought together a balanced group of scientists that included scholars from all disciplines working on this subject.

Origins of 'race'

But first, it is good to take a look at the history of the term race and how this has evolved over the years. According to the sociologist Charles Hirschman, racism – defined as the belief that social, ethnic and cultural differences between groups are inherited and immutable, is an ancient idea, but only developed rapidly in the nineteenth and twentieth century. He points out three key events that strengthened the the idea that different races exist: 'The worldwide slave trade that deported millions of Africans to the New World, the colonization of many

[99] Leonard Lieberman and Larry T. Reynolds, 'Race: The Deconstruction of a Scientific Concept', in: Ibid., *Race and Other Misadventure*s, 142-143.

countries in Asia and Africa and finally the development of Social Darwinism, the pseudo-scientific theory of European or white superiority.'[100]

Studies into 'race' have largely started in the nineteenth century, when academic disciplines were not as visible as they are today. The physical study of the human body, its origin, its working (physiology) and its structures (anatomy) have changed radically after Charles Darwin published his ideas of evolution in the late nineteenth century. The current fields of physical anthropology, genetics and biology have largely originated from here. As the human sciences evolved, the idea that physical characteristics were an effective way of classifying the human species grew larger. Race was genuinely seen as a biological category, that was not affected by social factors. Differentiating on racial basis was common practise in Europe. Or as the historian of science Barkan acknowledges, at the end of the nineteenth century: 'the inferiority of certain races was no more to be contested than the law of gravity to be regarded as immoral.'[101]

But in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, more and more research was conducted into the mysteries of the human body. From the physical study, two main branches have originated: (physical) anthropology and biology. The main difference between the two was that biology was predominantly occupied with defining the human race, whereas anthropologists classified them.[102] At that time, these disciplines often had the same outlook on their objects of study, as both biologists and anthropologists had a medical background, still their method and their outlook differed.[103] A clear distinction between physical and cultural anthropology did not yet exist; anthropologists in the early twentieth century used both (remains of) the human body and cultural representations to define various groups.

Anthropology

Anthropologists studied the human species. It is therefore no surprise that Darwin's theory of evolution played a large role in the development of this field. Anthropologists wanted to

[100] Hirschman, 'The Origins and Demise of the Concept of Race', 392.
[101] Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, 2-3.
[102] Ibid., 137.
[103] Van Duuren, *Physical Anthropology Reconsidered*, 27.

classify the human races and define characteristics of all current and past groups. Over the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century, American and European museums therefore collected large amounts of contemporary and archaeological remains to study the origins and characterizations of different groups. They collected and measured skulls and bones from all over the world, claiming that to measure is to know. Their ultimate aim was to create a world map with human races and historical racial mixture.[104]

Anthropologists in the early twentieth century were thus 'racialists', scholars who believed that the human species is naturally divided into races. This is not to be confused with scientific or ideological racists – people who discriminate or hold prejudices based on these races. However, this confusion was not problematic, because in the early twentieth century, racial inequality was common practice. Racism was not specifically seen as something bad or something that needed to end.[105]

However, anthropology studied the emergence of the human race. When the scientific discipline emerged, it was mainly conducted by colonial doctors who worked at medical schools in Asia or Africa. Because anthropology was not yet recognised as a discipline of its own, it was most commonly practiced by doctors and other medical staff, who tried to collect as many statistics regarding bones, length or size of the skulls (often expressed in the so-called cephalic index, which indicates the relation between length and width of the skull). Additionally, cultural representations were added to understand the true nature of various groups, but the human body was initially its primary source.

Likewise, its deterministic approach of measuring skulls and limbs was a method that contributed to the assumed inequality between object and subject: The Western researcher and the researched, who functioned in a colonial climate and was subjected to the researcher's discourse of attempting to classify according to an implicit hierarchy. This typology contributed to a negative image of the 'other' as lower or inferior.[106] In other words, anthropology in itself was subjected to colonialism.

---

[104] Van Duuren, *Physical Anthropology Reconsidered,* 15-16, 24-35.

[105] Machteld Roede, 'Rassen, Waan of Werkelijkheid? Met aandacht voor het verzetswerk van Arie de Froe', in: Hans Ulrich Jessurun d'Oliveira, *Ontjoodst door de Wetenschap. De wetenschappelijke en menselijke integriteit van Arie de Froe onder de bezetting* (Amsterdam, 2015), 108-109, 123-124.

[106] Van Duuren, *Physical Anthropology Reconsidered*, 16.

Liberal orthodoxy

Above, I explained how anthropologists before the Second World War believed in the innocence of 'race'. However, it is unclear if the Second World War played a large role in the scientific dismissal of the term 'race'. Some scholars argue that after the war, a group of anthropologists discarded their racialist approach, when they felt that the contrast between racialism and racism had become too vague. To them, the atrocities of the Holocaust had shown its full potential, discouraging physical anthropology as a whole.[107] However, other scholars argue that already before the war racism waned. These scholars show that before and after the war the idea of 'race' hardly changed within the scientific community. Still, the Holocaust did not discard the concept of 'race' completely as the term was still used in plentiful studies.[108] The typology of 'race' did not change immediately after the Second World War. Yet, the Nazi administration had shown the disastrous consequences of racial thought and problematized the term 'race'.[109]

The Second World War thus heavily influenced the scientific outlook on the term race. However, already before 1933, scientific racism was on its return. Centred around the famous anthropologist Franz Boas, a scientific and political movement against prejudice slowly emerged. Franz Boas (1858-1942) was a Jewish German who had moved to the United States in 1887 where he became the godfather of modern American anthropology. He is well known for his idea that biological material should be separated from cultural remnants. His anthropology distinguished biology from culture and argued that culture should be seen as something independent; independent from biological factors, but also freed from a Eurocentric standard. Thus, he was not only the predecessor of cultural relativism, but also questioned the validity of the term 'race'.[110] For this discovery, he is often seen as one of the founders of cultural anthropology.

With this ground-breaking theory, Boas slowly tried to change the world around him. As a political activist, his scientific work became the basis of his political life. He joined anti-fascist movements, produced movies to combat anti-Semitism and as a Jewish German

[107] Stuurman, *De uitvinding van de mensheid,* 440.
[108] Lipphardt, 'Isolates and Crosses in Human Population Genetics', 70-72.
[109] Stuurman, *De uitvinding van de mensheid,* 440.
[110] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 131.

himself, he was engaged in helping refugees flee Nazi Germany. Boas, in short, believed that his scientific convictions had to be accompanied by actions.[111] His anthropological method became popular: when he died in 1944, a large group of his students were already continuing his work.

In the wake of Boas', a new group of anti-racist anthropologists in America had started to make a career from the 1930s, building upon the anthropologist's legacy. As racism became more unpopular, the scientific community approached a more open outlook towards the concept of race, while still disregarding the idea that races exist. This ideological framework is often portrayed as liberal orthodoxy. Ruth Benedict, for instance, made a clear distinction between racialism and racism, but still acknowledged that races existed. Most scholars, among who Leslie Clarence Dunn and Theodosius Dobzhansky – who were asked for UNESCO second conference on race issues – acknowledged that there existed certain differences among people. However, for them, this identification did not entail any classification or ranking of any kind in superiority or inferiority. This liberal orthodoxy believed that 'race without racism' was possible.[112]

Another student of Boas was Ashley Montagu. As I mentioned in the first chapter, with the publication of *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* the author had extended the work of Boas by trying to influence the current debate on race. In this work, Montagu argues against the myth that race was linked with mental or social capacities. He describes race merely in physical terms and argues that the term 'race' should be abandoned in favour of the more neutral term 'ethnic group'. The author also asserts that race mixture is harmless, because 'pure races' have never existed.[113]

Thus, a vivid discussion concerning the nature of race had started in the 1940s within the discipline of anthropology. This discussion questioned the existence of race, as studies had argued that 'race' was nothing more than physical characteristics. For Montagu and several others, this meant that – because of the dangers of ideological racism – race was nothing more than a myth and should be abolished. Other scholars, such as Dunn or Dobzhansky had more modest beliefs; they argued that despite the fact that racism was a problem, race was a biological category and was therefore 'real'.

---

[111] Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, 283-285.
[112] Hirschman, 'The Origins and Demise of the Concept of Race', 410.
[113] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 170-171.

Still, these scholars agreed that 'race' should be defined genetically, that a population differed primarily in terms of the relative frequency of its genes. Dunn and Dobzhansky also agreed with Montagu that cultural factors shape racial differences more than biological factors. However, these two scholars did not repudiate the possibility that mental differences between different races could be hereditary, as Montagu did.[114]

At the same time, British anthropologists argued with Americans about the question whose anthropology was the best. The British branch was largely influenced by Bronsislaw Malinowski, who coincidentally also educated Ashley Montagu. Malinowski believed that human behaviour was largely based on social structures. In his thoughtful fieldwork, his descriptions of human institutions resulting from social organization, was genuinely regarded as an attack on the American biological anthropologists, who disregarded social structures.[115] Broadly speaking, the American anthropologists focussed more on the biological aspects of human beings, whereas the British anthropologists were more concerned with social aspects such as human interaction. And even though both schools condemned the racial practises of Nazi Germany, the British anthropologists strongly disagreed with the American outlook on anthropology, especially Boas'.[116] British anthropologists engaged in ontological discussions about race, which made them susceptible to Malinowski's social approach. On smaller and larger issues, this caused friction.[117] To some extent, this explains why the British responded fiercely to the Statement on Race, because UNESCO had only invited American anthropologists for their statement.

UNESCO

In relation to the statement, UNESCO underestimated the different scientific theories concerning race in anthropology. It chose Ashley Montagu as *rapporteur* because of his prominence in the field, even though had had enemies in both schools: both American and British scholars did not agree with his provocative work. To a large extent, the UNESCO

[114] Ibid., 172-173.
[115] Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, 124-127.
[116] Ibid., 66.
[117] Ibid., 64-64, 126-127.

Statement on Race resembles the activist statements of *Man's Most Dangerous Myth.* In an attempt to abandon the term race, the statement defined race only in physical and physiological terms, just like Montagu's publication.[118] Hence, it is no surprise that physical anthropologists opposed this statement: they believed in the existence of biological existence of races and in the differences among them. They also did not agree with the suggestion that human beings have an innate drive to work together, as the statement claimed.

Still, it is too easy to claim that UNESCO should have known better when it asked Montagu for the job. The argument that this statement would eventually be criticized is too easy in hindsight and does not add any knowledge. From a scientific perspective, it was almost impossible to give a summary on such a controversial issue without ending in a scientific debate. Considering that I have only discussed anthropology so far, UNESCO had to include other disciplines such as sociology, genetics and biology too. This made the production of a statement with which everyone could agree a complicated endeavour, one that UNESCO could not succeed in.

The criticism on the Statement on Race is often explained in terms of a contradiction between physical anthropologists and cultural anthropologists, but I explained that this is too simplistic.[119] According to some historians, a group of physical anthropologists claimed that they had not been consulted,[120] but this is not entirely true. Montagu was of course a physical anthropologist himself as were Comas and Beaglehole, and Dobzhansky and Dunn had been asked to review the statement before it was published. The claim of these British anthropologists was only partly true: they had not been consulted, but their discipline had not been eschewed.

Still, the confusion is understandable, as the statement was published in an era that saw the decline of the old form of physical anthropology – the pre-Boasian anthropology. The statement is often associated with this 'paradigm shift' in anthropology.[121] However, the field of anthropology was heavily fragmented geographically. Even though this distinction was more fluid than it seems the idea that the human species could be studied by looking at physiological characteristics slowly waned.

---

[118] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 198.
[119] Stuurman, *De Ontdekking van de mensheid*, 467; Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science*, 172.
[120] Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index', 174.
[121] Van Duuren, *Physical Anthropology Reconsidered*, 35.

The discussion between the British school of (social) anthropology and the American school shaped the overall reception of UNESCO's Statement on Race. Within the American school, there were some activist successors of Boas, such as Montagu and the more modest scholars like Dunn and Dobzhansky. This complicated range shows that it was difficult to find consensus on this topic. But it also shows that the scientific discussion was very complicated. UNESCO aimed to bring these scholars together to jointly publish one straightforward statement that was easily understandable for a great audience.

4. The statement and its international geopolitical sphere

So far, I explained how UNESCO built a large network of scientists to end racism around the world. I have looked at the statement and how UNESCO believed in the universal objectivity of science. In using the authority of scientists, UNESCO not only wanted to use 'the scientific method' to gain true knowledge on the issue of race, but in the previous chapters I tried to explain that it was actively creating its own 'truth'. In this chapter, I will place UNESCO's scientific endeavours in a geopolitical context. So far, I have neglected the international and political context to this statement even though I have already touched upon it.

This chapter will evaluate to what extent the UNESCO Race Statements were politically influenced. I will focus on the origins of the statement and approach the early years of UNESCO from an international perspective. This perspective roughly entails the post-war era in which supra-national organizations and international cooperation collided with the Cold War tensions and decolonization in large parts of the world. The Universal Declarations of Human Rights also played an important role in the publication of these statements, for they had served as an important benchmark in the history of equality and international cooperation. I will also devote attention to the larger question of how science can be brought in the diplomatic world.

Tensions within the General Conference

When UNESCO was established in 1945, it primarily devoted itself to international cooperation in the field of education, science and culture. As I explained in the first chapter, already in its Constitution, UNESCO's first director Julian Huxley explained what kind of considerations an international organisation like UNESCO had to cope with. Huxley explained how UNESCO could never adhere to one ideology or religion, because of its disparate member states.[122] If UNESCO would defend catholic traditions, that would not be appreciated by for instance China or Saudi-Arabia. Thus, the UNESCO directorate understood that it needed to focus on global

[122] Huxley, *UNESCO: Its Purpose and its Philosophy*, 6-7.

issues that are untied to specific countries. Racism, especially after the Holocaust, was such an issue.

The funding of UNESCO's projects was decided by UNESCO's General Conference, at which delegates from its member states decided what UNESCO should do. At its first conference, it had decided on funding the Tensions Project, in which UNESCO researched international tensions that could potentially start wars around the world. The project of the Race Question was also discussed in the General Conference, which meant that UNESCO's Social Science Department had to formulate its aims in a vague and neutral way, to avoid hostile reactions from any of its member states.

It was only after the UN published its Universal Declaration of Human Rights that UNESCO became actively involved in the race question. This declaration that stated that men of differences races are equal and therefore had the rights to be treated equally, was a new development in international politics. According to the historian Mark Mazower, this was a threat to national governments that did not want to lose authority on what they believed to be internal matters. Thus, a number of influential member states made sure this UN declaration would not be binding: 'The British feared embarrassment over the colonies, the Americans over segregation and civil rights.'[123] To conceal their discomfort, they questioned the declaration: they claimed that some terms in this document (such as 'race') were too vague to be legally binding. The memorandum of Huxley, Klineberg and Myrdal of 1948 benefited from the ambiguity that arose here. Because the word 'race' was vague, UNESCO's member states were more likely to agree with the scholar's proposal of providing a scientific summary on the current status of race.

The above suggests that UNESCO's member states already politized the General Conference to maintain their national legislation. In the early years of UNESCO's foundation, geopolitical tensions were common practice in the General Conference. As the diplomatic historian Graham describes: in the late forties and early fifties, the US had set up a project behind the scenes to keep the Soviet-Union out of UNESCO. Several US cultural diplomats conducted attempts to reshape UNESCO's cultural agenda in favour of 'cultural

[123] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World. The History of an Idea* (London & New York, 2012), 318.

internationalism,'[124] which combined easily with the humanistic basis UNESCO was founded on. The USSR was not a member of UNESCO until 1954, which meant that the communist interest was only represented by a smattering of East-European countries.[125] Part of the US cold-war strategy was to keep Soviet influence in international organisations as little as possible.

Another example of the way the US tried to influence UNESCO, was the American proposal in the General Conference that suggested that UNESCO should no longer focus on racial inequality, but should devote itself to fighting communism as its number one duty.[126] Even though the US kept the Soviet-Union out for almost ten years, these resolutions were never ratified. This political caution can also be seen in relation to the Race Question. As I explained in the first chapter, the UNESCO directorate understood that could have had to remain neutral in geopolitical conflicts. In a letter to the international federation for (Christian) churches, Torres Bodet explained how UNESCO saw its role in combatting international problems.

> We oppose aggressive imperialism – political, economic or cultural – whereby a nation seeks to use other nations or peoples for its own erbs. We, therefore, protest against the exploitation of non-self-governing peoples for selfish purposes; and retarding of their progress towards self-government; and discrimination or segregation on the ground of race or colour…[127]

UNESCO therefore refrained from national issues. It tried to stay out of national politics and only tried to contribute to international cooperation when possible, especially in relation to the abandonment of racism around the world.

---

[124] Cultural Internationalism is a term invented by Akira Iriye that describes the international spirit in world politics that aims to understand foreign cultures. Rather than relying on power politics, nation states should adopt a more liberal approach when discussed other nations, he believes.

[125] Graham, 'The (Real)politiks of Culture', 231-251.

[126] 'Publicatie van het boek tegen rassisme verboden!', *De Waarheid*, 24th May 1952, 7, via: *Delpher*, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010368827:mpeg21:a0143.

[127] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter UNESCO to World Council for Churches, July 1949.

Statement on Race

In relation to the Race Question, the geopolitical context was clearly visible. As mentioned in the first chapter, the first (and second) Statement on Race explicitly drew attention to current issues that – at least in the eyes of UNESCO and its scholars – showed the problem of racism. The Nazi administration was used as a negative example, which is referred to in the statement. The statement explains how Jews should not be considered to be a race and that there is no scientific evidence that warn about the risks of race mixture.

In the statement, the Holocaust is used as an example of ideological racism. The statement clearly asserts that this has to end. This subtle reference is not surprising: The Holocaust was without doubt a game changer in the international political world and had definitely changed the outlook on racism forever. Furthermore, as Selcer remarks, focussing on Nazi Germany was an easy way because the entire world did so[128], but it is interesting to notice that the statement did not make any connections to colonial practise or segregation issues.

The signatories of the statements were experts in these areas, but these issues were somehow not discussed nor included in the final statement. Edward Franklin Frazier, for instance, had become famous for his work on status of black families in the United States and how the status of African-American people had developed since the slavery. Yet, the problems of the term 'race' in the statement were not discussed in relation to America's segregation issues. In the process of the second statement, we see the same pattern: professor Rudolf Bergman, who had years of experience in Indonesia acknowledges in his travelogue that he pointed out race relations in the former colony.[129] Despite the fact that these issues were (at least in the case of Bergman) discussed, they did not find its way into the statement.

Considering the fact that these issues were controversial for a lot of its member states, it was no surprise that the statements focussed primarily on the Holocaust. A large number of UNESCO's influential member states were countries that had a colonial history or still coped with segregation issues.[130]

---

[128] Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index', 175.
[129] NA, KIT archives, 4515, Travelogue Paris 1951, 3.
[130] In 1950, 'Western powers' such as France, the United Kingdom, and Belgium were active in UNESCO. The United States of America was its largest donator.

However, it is impossible to say whether Torres Bodet or Métraux explicitly avoided the controversial issues in the statement. As I explained in the third chapter, even though these conferences were neatly organized, it is hard to tell to what extent UNESCO censured the final wordings of the statement. For the first statement, this seems unlikely, as UNESCO's internal scholars (Klineberg, Huxley and Myrdal) clearly were unsatisfied with Montagu's words. Still, this was published unchanged. However, John P. Jackson Jr. states that 'Scientific ideas about race cannot be separated from their political, ideological, and institutional locations.[131] Thus, without UNESCO's active censuring, it is no surprise that the ideas concerning race had changed in the wake of the Second World War.

[131] John P. Jackson, Jr., 'Editor's Foreword', in: Ibid., *Race, Science and Ethnicity: Readings from Isis and Osiris* (Chicago & London, 2002), 1-4.

5. Overcoming controversy: The Race Statement 2.0

This chapter describes UNESCO's strategy to overcome the controversy that arose after the critique on the Statement on Race. I will explain how the Social Science Department and the Department of Mass Communication together tried to alter the public opinion of the statement. At a second conference, the Committee of Experts on Race Issues revised the Statement on Race, rather than writing a new one. It needs no further explanation that the the Social Science Department had a huge influence in the outcome of the statement, simply by selecting the scholars for the conference. In the next chapter, I will analyse its strategies and reconstruct a picture of how UNESCO used science and scientists in favour of its preconceived goals.

For UNESCO, the critique on their Statement on Race was unwanted and meant that something needed to be done to alter this situation. Despite the critique, UNESCO was seen as the organisation concerned with the problem of racial inequality. It had thus given itself the authority of defining what race was and how the problems of racial inequality had to be solved. Partly for the latter, criticism appeared in October of that year. Vallois' response had to wait until the next edition of *Man* was published, in January 1951.

In these months, UNESCO could still play down the criticism: in an elaborate publication, UNESCO explained the process of composing this statement. It emphasized that the scientists in *Man* did not reject the general spirit but only suggested some alterations.[132] At the end however, UNESCO understood that this response was insufficient. On 25th January, Métraux started to organize another conference on race problems.

Hence, it was Métraux who initiated and organized the second Conference on Race Issues. In the historiography, the second meeting – and the statement that was written there – are often portrayed as a means to repudiate the first statement. However, as mentioned above, UNESCO believed that only small parts of the statement were criticized, hence, there was no need to draft a new statement. This picture also arises from the correspondence between Métraux and some of the experts invited: UNESCO planned to organize just a small conference at which an addendum to the statement would be written. Métraux believed the original text of the Statement on Race could be maintained, for this was 'a courageous

[132] Ibid., 7-8.

document and was well received all over the world.'[133] At the same time, Métraux and his department strongly disliked the critique. Not only because of the bad publicity, but even more because this criticism had started a large discussion in the Netherlands and South Africa.

The idea that the second conference should be seen independently from the first conference can also be deduced from the list of invitees to the second conference: the scholars invited were not as diverse as the first committee: rather than Mexicans, Indians and New Zealanders, this committee consisted solely of Western-European and North-American scientists. UNESCO clearly aimed to compose an appendix so that the critical British anthropologists would agree on the statement.

Experts

For the second conference, UNESCO invited a larger British delegation. It believed that allowing the British anthropologists to have their say would prevent them from criticizing once again. As I explained in the third chapter, the Social Science Department understood that to a large extent the discussion took place between two branches of anthropology: The British and the American school. In selecting scholars for this conference, Métraux thus kept a close eye on the country the experts were from. He even kept a list of representatives, ordered by country, rather than by discipline.

To select these experts, Métraux consulted various scholars and asked them for suitable candidates. Among them were the British important advisor Julian Huxley, the biologist Cedric Dover, the the American anthropologist Harry Shapiro, one of America's most famous anthropologists and also a reviewer of the first statement Theodosius Dobzhansky and last but not least the honorary secretary of the Royal Anthropological Society, William Fagg. It was peculiar that Fagg was asked for advice. As the secretary, he knew nearly all British anthropologists, but the Society was the publisher of the journal *Man* and Fagg had criticized the UNESCO statement over and over in this journal.

These scholars provided plentiful suggestions for suitable candidates. Dover suggested the British military doctor Robert Beresford Seymour Sewell, Huxley suggested to invite

[133] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Métraux to Montagu, 2nd March 1951.

professor Zuckerman, not for his criticism in *Man*, but for his taxonomical work, with regard to fossils and apes. [134] Dobzhansky suggested J.B.S. Haldane and the German Hans Nachtscheim. But if Métraux would have followed Fagg's suggestions, nearly all of the *Man* responders would be invited to UNESCO. Out of the nine critical anthropologists, Fagg suggested five of them to be suitable for the UNESCO conference: prof. Le Gros Clark, dr. Keith, dr. Morant, dr. Trevor and professor Zuckerman.[135] Out of these scholars, Métraux selected three British representatives: Zuckerman, Trevor and Morant received an invitation to the UNESCO headquarters in Paris. For unknown reasons, Le Gros Clark was unable to attend. Zuckerman only attended the last two days of the conference.

This does by no means entail that the invitation of the three had something to do with their critical response to the Statement on Race. There are no sources that suggest that their criticism was related to their invitation to UNESCO. Indeed, as these scholars were nominated by multiple colleagues for their expertise in the field, there is no direct link with their criticism. However, because of a group of agitated British anthropologists, UNESCO had to reconsider its statement. Without their criticism, a second conference would possibly not have been organized.

But there were more difficult decisions Métraux had to make: how to handle Ashley Montagu, for instance. When the Statement on Race was under review, three of UNESCO's foremost internal scholars, Klineberg, Huxley and Angell insisted on toning down the exact wording of the statement Montagu drafted. As I explained in the first chapter, Montagu believed a strong language was needed, whereas UNESCO wanted a more modest statement, with which a larger group could agree, as it wanted a universal statement. This resulted in an argument about who had the authority on the statements: UNESCO or the scholars.

For this reason, Métraux certainly did not want to invite Montagu at the second conference. In a letter to his close friend Margaret Mead, he describes Montagu as a 'maverick who has made himself tremendously unpopular.' He felt that a 'great many trouble and money might have been saved' if Montagu would 'have listened to the sound and reasonable recommendations of the very prominent men'.[136] But by not inviting Montagu, Métraux

[134] Ibid.: Letter Huxley to Métraux, 30th January 1951.
[135] Ibid.: Letter Fagg to Métraux, 8th March 1951.
[136] Métraux, retrieved from: Hazard Jr., 'A Racialized Deconstruction?', 182.

feared that the American scholar might criticize the new statement. Hence, ignoring Montagu was not an option too.

Alfred Métraux thus understood the only way to handle with Montagu was to invite him. Despite his personal feud, Métraux knew that Montagu was a respected scholar. In preparing the second conference, he had received a letter from professor Beaglehole asking it Métraux could 'assure' him that Montagu would be invited to the second conference.[137] Thus, the Swiss anthropologist understood he had to invite Montagu, but made sure that he would not be assigned a prominent position, such as *rapporteur* or chairman. Learning from the previous conference, he feared that the activist would bend the overall message of the statement to his will. Métraux understood he needed include Montagu in the process, but by not giving him a large role, he could keep him silent.

This is why Métraux suggested to appoint Leslie Clarence Dunn as the *rapporteur* of this session. Dunn was no stranger to UNESCO, as he and Dobzhansky had already reviewed the first statement. Dunn was an important scholar and was seen as one of the leading authorities on the issues of race. He was an outspoken scholar, known for his critique to the eugenics movement and for his ideas about nature and nurture [138] As *rapporteur* Dunn was asked to study the working paper and write the first draft of the second statement. Later, Dunn was asked to contribute to the UNESCO booklet series *The Race Question in Modern Science*, for which he authored *Race and Biology*.

Together with Dunn, Montagu and Harry Shapiro were invited as American representatives. Dobzhansky was also invited, but declined, due to a study trip in Egypt. From France, the renowned professor Henri Vallois attended the conference. He was an expert in the fields of anthropology and palaeontology and the director of the *Musée de l'Homme*, a museum dedicated to the evolution of men. In this role, Vallois was a very suitable candidate for this committee. Other scholars at the meeting were Gunnar Dahlberg, who was also invited for the first conference, but declined for health issues, the French anthropologist Eugène Schreider and the German professor of genealogy, Hans Nachtscheim. But to me the most peculiar invitation to the UNESCO second conference on race is that of Rudolf Bergman.

---

[137] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Beaglehole to Torres Bodet, 13th March 1951.
[138] 'L.C. Dunn', *American Philosophical Society*, accessed 9th May 2017, http://www.amphilsoc.org/collections/view?docId=ead/Mss.B.D917-ead.xml;query=;brand=default#bioghist.

Because he was no obvious choice and he has been overlooked by other scholars, I will devote special attention to him and his invitation in the third chapter.

Apart from the scholars, UNESCO also invited a number of neutral observers for this meeting who were assigned to monitor the conference. The UN sent a representative to observe, but UNESCO also invited William Fagg.[139] Fagg was an interesting choice, for he had criticized the Statement on Race several times in *Man*. He even called the statement the 'Ashley Montagu Statement, published by UNESCO.' Fagg believed that Montagu's activism hindered his objective scientific outlook.[140] In a letter to Fagg, Métraux excused himself for inviting Montagu: 'in a spirit of fairness and at the request of many scientists, I felt that Mr. Ashley Montagu should also attend the meeting, and represent the old committee.'[141]

The second conference

Roughly one and a half year after UNESCO's Conference on Race Issues, a second group of experts gathered at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris in June 1951. Apart from Ashley Montagu, all the experts had been replaced since the previous conference. Even though detailed minutes of the 1951 conference are deficient, the anecdotes of some scholars provide a clear picture of the discussions held at the Avenue Kléber. These descriptions are retrieved from the travelogue professor Bergman wrote for the Royal Tropical Institute and will be supported by the official report of the conference, drafted by Leslie Clarence Dunn.

In his travelogue, Bergman clearly describes how the conference started by a word of welcome by the director of UNESCO, Torres Bodet. He opened the conference by stressing the importance of this meeting and assigning a chairman and a rapporteur. Other sources show that UNESCO had already planned and discussed these roles months earlier. UNESCO's plan to appoint dr. Vallois as chairman of the meeting and make dr. Dunn rapporteur, seems to have worked as Bergman describes a surprise by Montagu. When the notorious troublemaker was asked months before to compose an agenda and write a working paper for the

[139] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Métraux to Fagg, 3rd April 1951.
[140] William Fagg, 'U.N.E.S.C.O.'s New Statement on Race', *Man* 51 (1951), 9.
[141] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Métraux to Fagg, 20th April 1951.

conference, Montagu had expected a leading role in the process.[142] It seems as if Métraux had succeeded in preventing Montagu from bending the conference to his will.

When the conference started, it is clear that UNESCO, in the person of Métraux, had planned this meeting more thoroughly that it had done one and a half years ago: in the opening words, Torres Bodet clearly expressed his hopes for this meeting. He explained how the 1950 Statement on Race had polarized the overall discussion on race. He increased his expectations for this attempt and hoped that this may be an effort to unite the scientists working on race.[143] In an attempt to be more uniting, Alfred Métraux also participated in the discussions.

In his opening speech, Torres Bodet explained that the statement should be seen in light of the San Francisco Charter[144] and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He stressed the importance of finding consensus, as he believed that the entire world agreed racism had to end. He believed that this statement needed to be educational as well as an inspiration for all men and women around the world.[145]

At the start of the conference, the reason for convening a second meeting was first discussed. Dunn stressed the importance of defining 'race'. He wrote that the first statement had a good effect, but it did not carry the authority of physical anthropologists and geneticists, groups that were generally seen as the most authoritarian on this issue. Therefore, special attention has now been devoted to these scholars. Dunn then explained that the chief conclusions of the first statement have been sustained, but that differences in emphasis and some deletions have strengthened the statement in its general message: 'that there were no scientific grounds whatever for the racialist position regarding purity of race and the hierarchy of inferior and superior races to which this leads.'[146]

---

[142] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Métraux to Montagu, 22nd March 1951.
[143] Nationaal Archief, The Hague, (NA), KIT archives, inventory number: 4518, 'Travelogue Paris 1951, 1.
[144] The San Francisco Charter was the constitution of the United Nations, drafted at a conference in San Francisco in 1945.
[145] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: 'Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'Education, la Science et la Culture: Discours du Directeur Generale A La Reunion d'Experts en Anthropologie Physique et Genetique Concernant le Concept de Race', 3.
[146] Ibid.: Report on Meeting of Physical Anthropologists and Geneticists for a Definition of the Concept of Race, by L.C. Dunn, 1.

Furthermore, Bergman describes a discussion that unfolded at the conference. At the beginning of the conference, Montagu suggested to discuss the statement per paragraph. After some discussion, the committee agreed, even though Bergman remarked that a 'vitium originis', a defect from the start, would be maintained. Such a defect occurred as Bergman described a discussion between anthropologists and geneticists on the scope of race: for anthropologists every slight difference could be seen as a different race, whereas geneticists only distinguished three main races.[147] The scope of what a race was could finally not be agreed upon. The final words of the second statement therefore stress that:

> Broadly speaking, individuals belonging to different major groups of mankind are distinguishable by virtue of their physical characters, but individual members, or small groups belonging to different races within the same major group are usually not so distinguishable. Even the major groups grade into each other, and the physical traits by which they and the races within them are characterized overlap considerably. With respect to most, if not all, measurable characters, the differences among individuals belonging to the same race are greater than the differences that occur between the observed averages for two or more races within the same major group.[148]

The anthropologists and geneticists agreed upon a considerable amount of points. The conference had a common discomfort with the term 'ethnic group' and felt that this should not be used in the new statement even though the entire committee felt that the world 'race' had awfully been misused. It not only agreed that there was no biological problem with racial mixing, it even stressed that pure races have never existed, so there would have been no 'pure races' to be lost from mixed breeding.[149] On the points of evolution, the committee also agreed. All of its members believe that all races are a result of evolutionary factors.

Even more interesting in his report is the overall tendency to unite. Dunn's report shows a true eagerness to avoid dogmatic definitions, look for overlap and a desire to debunk the misconceived notions of race. Every point of discussion Dunn described was followed by a relief that this has been resolved during the conference. It seems as if Torres Bodet's words

[147] NA, KIT archives,4518, 'Travelogue Paris 1951, 2.
[148] UNESCO, *Statement on the nature of race and race differences* (Paris, 1951).
[149] NA, KIT archives, 4515, Travelogue Paris 1951, 2.

have inspired the committee, because Dunn emphasises the importance of presenting a clear definition of 'race' to the public.[150]

The second statement

But was this tendency visible in the statement itself? To what extent was the second statement more modest than the activist first one? It is immediately noticeable that the second statement is accompanied by an introduction and a disclaimer. The disclaimer is interesting, because it states that: 'the views expressed in the essays are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of UNESCO.' This is somewhat surprising, because it suggests that UNESCO tried to distance itself from the Statement on Race, which is quite paradoxical if you keep in mind that UNESCO directed the conferences. The introduction, which was also written by Dunn, explains again why the second statement was needed and stressed the limitations of their current knowledge.

The statement itself is slightly shorter than the original statement. The original statement consisted of fifteen paragraphs, the new statement only counted nine. In these nine paragraphs, roughly the same point is made. The experts explain that race is merely 'a classificatory device providing a zoological framework within which the various groups of mankind may be arranged and by means of which studies of evolutionary processes can be facilitated.'[151] Just as with the original statement, the 1951 statement explains that national, religious, geographical and cultural groups can not be seen as racial groups; thus that Americans, Frenchmen and Jews are not races. It also states that mental characteristics cannot be included in the classification of human races. And in line with the first statement, the illusion that race mixing is harmful is refuted by stressing out that pure races have never existed.[152]

A slight difference between the two statements is that the second statement was a little more reticent than the original text. Trying to present a straightforward and universal picture, the original statement tried to end hesitation on the concept of race by presenting a

[150] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Report on Meeting.
[151] UNESCO, *Statement on the nature of Race and Race Differences* (Paris, 1951), 3.
[152] Ibid., 3-7.

clear definition of race. In the second statement however, the experts admit that many populations are unclassifiable. Thus, a conclusive definition of the term 'race' is difficult. The second statement therefore stresses the disparate outlooks on the concept of 'race' from various disciplines. The controversial suggestion to replace 'race' with 'ethnic group' is deleted in the second statement.[153]

The intention of this new statement is in line with the previous race statement. However, it is the tone that differs from the original one. This is no surprise, as the original statement was criticized for its fierce words and its resolute suggestion. In the second statement, it is clearly visible that UNESCO and the committee used softer words. Sentences like: 'these are the scientific facts'[154] have now been replaced by: 'the scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups.'[155] In general, a more 'scientific' tone is used to describe 'race' and doubt or discussions are clearly portrayed. The idea that science translators should use a simple and straightforward story is replaced by a more precise summary of the scientific material available.

It is interesting to see however, that a new statement was produced. In the invitation, UNESCO proposed to only write an appendix especially for physical anthropologists and genealogists. But instead, UNESCO published a new universal statement with a committee that was a lot less diverse than the original committee. Instead, a new statement was drafted with utmost precision, avoiding controversial issues.

Review

To make sure scholars would not criticize the second statement, Dunn's draft was send to a over fifty scholars in the field.[156] Especially Julian Huxley and professor J.B.S Haldane suggested meaningful revisions. But the reviewing phase was made even larger when Métraux

[153] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 199.
[154] *Statement on Race*, 2.
[155] *Statement on the nature of Race*, 6.
[156] UNESCO, *The Race Question: Results of an Inquiry*, 17.

sent the first draft to dr. William Fagg, the secretary of *Man*. He had asked Fagg if the preliminary version of the statement could be published, so that scholars could comment on this draft, before it was finalized. All scientists now had the opportunity to comment on the statement. By allowing scholars to send feedback before the statement was published, Métraux also deprived the opportunity to criticize the statement, once it was published. Considering Métraux's aim, this was a very clever way to withhold criticism on the final statement. [157]

The second statement followed the steps of the original statement, even though the process of the second statement reserved more space for feedback. Métraux knew that to prevent another disaster, he had reserved time and space for outspoken scholars to comment on the new statement. The attempt to write a statement that could count on more support is visible in invitations, the modest tone and the reviewing phase that was also coordinated with the journal *Man*.

Looking back at these evens, it is safe to conclude that UNESCO had learned from the controversy that arose after its Statement on Race in 1950. After Métraux was appointed to coordinate the project concerning the Race Statement, UNESCO carefully dealt with the scientific and geopolitical backgrounds to the statements. Métraux's considerate approach resulted in a more modest and more uniting statement that was open for review.

Science for the second statement

As I explained in the previous chapters, UNESCO knew that only a new statement could preserve their credibility. Thus, because the criticism had started with a group of British physical anthropologists and this group was predominantly concerned with the ontological question of race, they were invited for the revision conference. And because of the difference schools in the United States and Britain, UNESCO understood that representatives from both

[157] Alfred Métraux, 'U.N.E.S.C.O.'s New Statement on Race: The Provisional Text', *Man* 52 (1952), 90-91.

these regions needed to be included.[158] Therefore, I argue that the question regarding the existence of race had primarily became a discussion for anthropologists of different regions.[159]

In the third chapter, I tried to explain how several scientific theories had a different outlook on race. After the Second World War, some scholars were racialists who believed that the notion of race could exist without having (racist) prejudices. In this chapter, I explained that the second statement was a more modest statement that avoided controversy. Rather than focussing on the differences, this statement aimed to be uniting. Thus, as this was probably the only thing truly shared by all these various branches, the rejection of Nazi Germany remained a strong point in the statement, as was the overall dismissal of racism. Montagu's controversial points, such as his denial of the existence of race, did not make it into the second statement. Finally, a statement was produced with which all anthropologists could agree. The Statement had changed from an interesting and somewhat provocative experiment, into a diplomatic tool used to steer the world away for racial beliefs. As it was revised and polished so heavily, the statement was no longer a scientific summary on the concept of race, but it became a scientific endorsement of human unity, that all men are equal.[160]

Looking back at the scientific context of the statements, it is not surprising that UNESCO's attempt was criticized. Race was a very political and very contested subject, that concerned a lot of scholars from various disciplines. And taking into account that UNESCO wanted a straightforward summary that was easily translatable to the layman, the request was hard to fulfil. With the second statement, UNESCO learned from its mistakes and was able to publish a more general statement, that remained free from criticism. Métraux's strategies of inviting scholars and allowing them to criticize before publication had clearly worked.

[158] UNESCO, 323.12.A.102: Letter Métraux to Dale Stewart, 9th February 1951.
[159] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 199.
[160] Ibid, 201.

The Statements' legacy

The publication of the second statement was a smaller event than its predecessor. Its reception around the world was only marginal. Maybe it was because UNESCO saw the second statement as a setback, or maybe the modest tone of the statement was not newsworthy. Either way, the second statement did not make it to the newspapers that had devoted attention to the Statement on Race. Still, after the second statement the criticism slowly waned.

After the Second World War, large parts of the world decolonized. According to Mark Mazower, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had an important role in these early years, as it was used to show how people in (former) colonies had equal basic rights to be treated equally. This meant that no one could be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman degrading treatment, that everyone is equal before the law and has basic rights to education. These rights were used to act against colonial practises and in favour of decolonization.[161]

As decolonization continued throughout the fifties, more and more (new) countries joined UNESCO. According to Selcer, towards the end of the fifties, in the international community, the outlook on the Declaration and the Race Statements gradually changed. This had everything to do with a shift away 'from the human rights of individuals to the collective rights of minorities – from a focus on weakening primordial affiliations to the empowerment of oppressed groups.'[162] This development gave decolonization another boost and helped colonized groups to join together in their movement. A large number of new nations with a shared colonial past joined in solidarity: in 1960, 17 new African countries joined the UN and UNESCO. This was nearly 20% of the votes in UNESCO's General Conference.[163]

These developments were welcomed by UNESCO. As an organization that had devoted itself to international cooperation, it wanted to transform from a mainly Western organization to being a global institution. Thus, UNESCO understood that to reach its goals, it could help developing countries at the African continent. Especially in the field of education, UNESCO became an important organization for developing educational programmes in multiple African countries.

---

[161] Mazower, *Governing the World*, 318.
[162] Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic index', 179.
[163] Ibid.

But these developments had its consequences for the Race Statement as well: as the General Conference became more global, and new scientific theories changed the consensus on race, the statement had to be updated. Following the work of Carleton Coon's *The Origin of Races* (New York, 1962), UNESCO revised its statement in the 1960s. Even though this American physical anthropologist still resisted to eliminating the idea of race and thus refuting Montagu's ideas, Coon believed that in discussions concerning race the biological and sociological dimensions should be separated.[164]

As a result, Métraux's successor, Francisco Benet organized a third and fourth session to discuss race. At the third session in 1964, the biological aspects of race were discussed, whereas the social perspective, such as ethical and psychological aspects were debated in a fourth session in 1966. These two conferences updated UNESCO's Race Statement, and even though the statements were not very different from the 1951 statement, a clear distinction between science and ethics was proposed, just like Bergman had suggested in his report.

I believe this example is interesting because its shows how political and scientific ideas that circulated can influence statements like these. Even though this is an example of some ten years after the publication of the race statements, it shows how geopolitical and scientific aspects have a huge influence on international treaties like these. The political implications were thus more important than the scientific ideas behind the statement.[165] In 1978, UNESCO revised its Race Statement again. Until now, this has never been rephrased.

[164] Jackson and Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science*, 214; Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index', 180.
[165] Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic index', 178.

Conclusion

With this thesis, I tried to explain how and why UNESCO organized a campaign around racial inequality in which it used scientific evidence to strengthen its point. The atrocities of the Second World War, that had shown the disastrous consequences of racism, had inspired the UNESCO directorate to fight racism around the world. It believed that racism could be abandoned if only every citizen in the world would understand that race was a fallacy. As a result, its Social Science Department set up a conference at which a group of scholars discussed the scientific status of the term 'race'. This resulted in the publication of the Statement on Race in 1950. This statement suggested to replace the controversial term 'race' with the more neutral term 'ethic group'. This statement was criticized by a group of British anthropologists, who believed this 'scientific summary' was unscientific. In reaction, UNESCO published a second statement, eschewing the controversial issues, so that virtually all scholars could now agree.

In this thesis, I discovered that UNESCO aimed for a simple and straightforward story. UNESCO was not as scientific as its name suggested. Its purpose was to eliminate racial thought; thus its scientific convictions were largely preconceived. For UNESCO science was used as a universal and truthful authority, that would strengthen its beliefs. The activist scientist Ashley Montagu was an obvious choice to write this statement, as was the decision to study race relations in a country that was seen as a success story of how people of different races could live together harmoniously. It is therefore that I argue that UNESCO actively created the universality it strived for. Its scientism led it believe that science could be the universal language capable of bridging the gap between different cultures in the world. UNESCO's Social Science Department used the credibility of renowned scholars to proclaim the end of racial theories. In doing so, it did not only use the perceived universality of science, it was also active creating one.

For its second statement, UNESCO knew it had to embrace outspoken critics to prevent further negative publicity. For the second meeting on race issues, the project leader of the Race Question, Alfred Métraux therefore invited scholars from all branches of anthropology, including the ones who had criticized the statement. In order to build a large coalition of scholars and to overcome the criticism, UNESCO published a new statement with the help of the unknown Dutch anthropologist Rudolf Bergman, who had conducted an inquiry among

Dutch scholars. With this statement that condemned Nazi Germany, virtually all scientists could agree. However, the second statement did not last very long, in the sixties, UNESCO already revised this statement that explicitly distinguished between scientific and ethical aspects. This shows UNESCO true aim: that the Race Question was not a scientific endeavour, but a political one.

This feud has been the start of a new period in the the scientific discussion concerning race. And as I explained in the fourth chapter, the worldwide trend of decolonization had its impact on the outlook on race and on UNESCO's race statements, publishing revisions in the sixties. Even though these revisions never attracted the same attention as UNESCO's first statement these statements had its impacts on African students in European cities. The UNESCO statements brought them a new pride and dignity, even though political leaders in Africa still complained that they were dependant upon Europe and North America for capital resources.[166] UNESCO never succeeded in abandoning racism around the world, but the production of these statements on race are genuinely seen as a key event in the consolidation of the liberal racial orthodoxy.[167]

However, looking back at these events, John P. Jackson Jr. mentions that scholars outside the history of science have often tried to show the 'objective' truth of scientific anti-racism. They point at the 'objective truth' that races are merely a 'social construct', created by 'the agency of human beings'. But, as Jackson cleverly remarks, 'the assumption here is that "biological or natural" categories are not, themselves, creations of "the agency of human beings." Thus, he shows how biological categories themselves are human constructions, and therefore undermine the existence of the 'concept' of race. In other words: Jackson suggests that the debates over the existence of 'race' were insignificant.[168] All the experts missed the point: they discussed the fact whether 'race' was real, or whether is was regarded a social construct. But but if indeed the idea of race was not 'real' or a biological thing, we can argue that the idea of biological categories is a social construct too.

With this thesis, I hope to have contributed not only to the historiography of the UNESCO race statements, but also to questions that relate to science and politics in general. I

[166] Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, 19.
[167] Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index', 174.
[168] Ibid.

believe the UNESCO Race Statements provide a perfect example of the entanglement of science and politics. With the abandonment of 'race', it shows how scientific ideas were influenced by the Second World War, but with its aim to ban racism on scientific grounds, UNESCO showed how science was a respected entity with regard to providing answers to political questions.

This research has touched upon various questions that I have not been able to answer in this thesis. Thus, further research is needed into aspects regarding UNESCO's strategies and the relationship between science and politics in general. A new study could for instance aim at the UNESCO scholarships that were granted to study race relations in specific places where people of different skin colors lived harmoniously. By studying how these scholarships were granted, we could gain new insights into UNESCO's motives. Another question regarding the interconnection of science and politics has to do with the eugenics movement. Several scholars, especially in anthropology and biology were interested in the human enhancement movement that was seen both in favor of the anti-racist movement and was associated with Nazi Germany.[169] The role of the eugenists is interesting in relation to the (fascist) idea of racial purity, but also in relation to the anti-racist movement.

Thus, I have tried to explain how in the early fifties, UNESCO published a statement to condemn racism. By abolishing the term 'race', UNESCO's experts believed it could make institutional racism disappear. By proclaiming two statements, publishing a booklet series and conducting research into race relations, the UNESCO directorate tried to educate the layman of the terrible consequences of racism. Klineberg, Huxley and Myrdal might not have expected that their memorandum developed into something this large. They encountered that in trying to influence politics with scientific studies, science was influenced by politics too. And because the scientific world was divided on the issue of race, it proved to be impossible to solve political questions with scientific answers.

[169] Mazower, *Governing the World*, 286; Selcer, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index', 175.

Bibliography

Archives

National Archives of the Netherlands, The Hague.
Archives of the Royal Tropical Institute:
- Travelogues:
  - Correspondence concerning travel and travelogues – 1928-1962: 4480-4492.
  - Correspondence concerning travelogues of the Department of Physical and Cultural Anthropology – 1951-1989: 4505-4515.

'Unesco-centrum in de hoofdstad: studenten namen het initiatief tot de oprichting', *Haarlems Dagblad* 8th November 1949, p. 5, retrieved from: *Krantenviewer Noord-Hollands Archief*, http://nha.courant.nu/issue/HD/1949-11-08/edition/0/page/5.

Leiden University, Special collections, Archives Nederlands Bureau voor Anthropologie, KITLV inventory 147, 1456, number 43

UNESCO archives, Paris:

Race Question – organization:	3.23.12.A.01.U1A
UN – Race Question:	3.23.(68.01).A.02.UN
Race & Minorities:	3.23.1
Statement:	3.23.12.64
Meeting of 1951:	3.23.A.64.(44).'51
Meetings	
1951 – France	
Race – Social Science:	361.9.A.06.(44).'51.06'

Literature

Bangham, Jenny, 'What Is Race? UNESCO, mass communication and human genetics in the early 1950s', *History of the Human Sciences* 5 (2015), 80-107.

Barkan, Elazar, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars* (Cambridge & New York, 1992).

Bergman, Rudolf, *De Arts en de medicijnman* (Amsterdam, 1958).

Bergman, Rudolf, *Inleiding tot de physische anthropologie* (Amsterdam, 1957).

Brattain, Michelle, 'Race, Racism, and Antiracism: UNESCO and the Politics of Presenting Science to the Postwar Public', *American Historical Review* 5 (2007), 1386-1413.

Chor Maio, Marcos, 'UNESCO and the Study of Race Relation in Brazil: Regional or National Issue?', *The Latin American Research Review* 2 (2001), 118-136.

Cravins, Georges G., '"Race" as a scientific and organizational concept: a critique', *GeoJournal* 3 (1997), 233-243.

Duedahl, Poul, *A History of UNESCO* (New York, 2016).

Duedahl, Poul, 'UNESCO Man. Changing the concept of race, 1945-65' (Paper, Aalborg University, 2008).

Dunn, L.C. *Race and Biology* (Paris, 1951).

Dunn, L.C. et al., *Race Science and Society* (Paris & New York, 1956).

Duuren, David van et al., *Physical Anthropology Reconsidered. Human Remains at the Tropenmuseum* (Amsterdam, 2007).

Gil-Riaño, Sebastián, 'Historicizing Anti-Racism: UNESCO's Campaigns Against Race Prejudice in the 1950s' (PhD diss.; University of Toronto, 2014).

Graham, S.E., 'The (Real)politiks of Culture: U.S. Cultural Diplomacy in Unesco, 1946-1954', *Diplomatic History* 2 (2006), 231-251.

Haraway, Donna, *Primate Visions: Gender Race and Nature in the World of Modern Science* (New York & London, 1989).

Hazard, Anthony Q. Jr, 'A Racialized Deconstruction? Ashley Montagu and the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race', *Transforming Anthropology* 2 (2011), 174-186.

Hirschman, Charles, 'The Origins and Demise of the Concept of Race', *Population and Development Review* 3 (2004), 385-415.

Huxley, Julian, *UNESCO: Its Purpose and its Philosophy* (Washington, 1947).

Jackson, John P., Jr. (eds.), *Race, Science and Ethnicity: Readings from Isis and Osiris* (Chicago & London, 2002).

Jackson, John P., Jr. and Nadine Weidman, *Race, Racism and Science: Social Impact and Interaction* (London, 2006).

Kamminga, Harmke and Geert Somsen (eds.), *Pursuing the Unity of Science: Ideology and Scientific Practise from the Great War to the Cold War* (London & New York, 2016).

Klineberg, Otto, *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research* (Paris, 1950).

Kulnazorova, Aigul, and Christian Ydesen, *UNESCO Without Borders: Educational Campaigns for International Understanding* (London, 2016).

Lerner, Natan, 'New Concepts in the UNESCO Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice', *Human Rights Quarterly* 1 (1981), 48-61.

Lieberman, Leonard and Larry T. Reynolds, 'Race: The Deconstruction of a Scientific Concept', in: Ibid., *Race and Other Misadventures: Essays in Honor of Ashley Montagu in his Nineteenth Year* (New York, 1996).

Lipphardt, Veronika, 'Isolates and Crosses in Human Population Genetics; or, A Contextualization of German Race Science'*, Current Anthropology* 5 (2012), 69-82.

Mazower, Mark, *Governing the World. The History of an Idea* (London & New York, 2012).

Métraux, Alfred, 'U.N.E.S.C.O.'s New Statement on Race: The Provisional Text', *Man* 52 (1952), 90-91.

Métraux, Alfred, 'Unesco and Race Problems', *International Social Sciences Bulletin* 2 (1950), 384-390.

Montagu, Ashley, *Statement on Race: An Extended Discussion in Plain Language of the UNESCO Statement by experts on Race problems* (New York, 1951).

Pompei, Gian Franco, et al., *In the minds of Men: UNESCO 1946 to 1971* (Paris, 1972).

Records of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Fourth Session: Resolutions (Paris, 1949).

Ritchie, James and Jane Ritchie, 'Beaglehole, Ernest', in: *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand,* accessed 3rd May 2017, http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/5b15/beaglehole-ernest.

Schaffer, Gavin, '"Like a Baby with a box of Matches": British scientists and the concept of race in the inter-war period', *The British Journal for the History of Science* 3 (2005), 307-324.

Selcer, Perrin, 'Beyond the Cephalic Index: Negotiating Politics to produce UNESCO's Scientific Statements on Race', *Current Anthropology* 5 (2012), 173-184.

Selcer, Perrin, 'Patterns of Science: Developing Knowledge for a World Community at Unesco', (PhD. Diss.; University of Pennsylvania, 2011).

Shipman, Pat, *The Evolution of Racism: Human Differences and the Use and Abuse of Science* (Cambridge, MA; 2002).

Solovey, Mark & Hamilton Cravens, *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy and Human Nature* (New York, 2012).

Stepan, Nancy, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800-1960* (Oxford, 1982).

Stuurman, Siep, *De uitvinding van de mensheid. Korte wereldgeschiedenis van het denken over gelijkheid en cultuurverschil* (Amsterdam, 2009).

Tatterhall, Ian and Rob DeSalle, *Race? Debunking a scientific myth* (College Station, Tx; 2012).

Tead, Diana, *What is race? Evidence from Scientists* (Paris, 1951).

Toye, John and Richard Toye, 'One World, Two Cultures? Alfred Métraux and Julian Huxley and the Ideological Origins of UNESCO', *The Journal of the Historical Association* 2 (2010), 308-331.

Ulrich Jessurun d'Oliveira, Hans, *Ontjoodst door de Wetenschap. De wetenschappelijke en menselijke integriteit van Arie de Froe onder de Bezetting* (Amsterdam, 2015).

Valderrama, Fernando, *A History of UNESCO* (Paris, 1995)

Vallois, Henri, 'U.N.E.S.C.O. on race', *Man* 1 (1951), 15-16.

Wagley, Charles, 'Alfred Métraux: 1902-1963', *American Anthropologist* 66 (1964), 603-613.

'U.N.E.S.C.O. and Race', *Man*, 51 (1951), 64.

UN, *Universal Declarations of Human Rights* (Paris, 1948).

UNESCO, *Basic Texts* (Paris, 2004).

UNESCO, *Four statements on the race question* (Paris, 1969).

UNESCO, 'The Nature of Conflict', *Studies on the Sociological aspects of international tensions* (Paris, 1957).

UNESCO, *The Race Concept: Results of an Inquiry* (Paris, 1952).

UNESCO, *Statement on the nature of Race and Race Differences* (Paris, 1951).

UNESCO, *Statement on Race* (Paris, 1950).

Appendix 1: Statement on Race

Paris, July 1950

1. Scientists have reached general agreement in recognizing that mankind is one: that all men belong to the same species, homo sapiens. It is further generally agreed among scientists that all men are probably derived from the same common stock; and that such differences as exist between different groups of mankind are due to the operation of evolutionary factors of differentiation such as isolation, the drift and random fixation of the material particles which control heredity (the genes), changes in the structure of these particles, hybridization, and natural selection. In these ways groups have arisen of varying stability and degree of differentiation which have been classified in different 'ways for different purposes.

2. From the biological standpoint, the species homo sapiens is made up of a number of populations, each one of which differs from the others in the frequency of one or more genes. Such genes, responsible for the hereditary differences between men, are always few when compared to the whole genetic constitution of man and to the vast number of genes common to all human beings regardless of the population to which they belong. This means that the likenesses among men are far greater than their differences.

3. A race, from the biological standpoint, may therefore be defined as one of the group of populations constituting the species homo sapiens. These populations are capable of interbreeding with one another but, by virtue of the isolating barriers which in the past kept them more or less separated, exhibit certain physical differences as a result of their somewhat different biological histories. These represent variations, as it were, on a common theme.

4. In short, the term 'race' designates a group or population characterized by some concentrations, relative as to frequency and distribution, of hereditary particles (genes) or physical characters, which appear, fluctuate, and often disappear in the course of time by reason of geographic and/or cultural isolation. The varying manifestations of these traits in different populations are perceived in different ways by each group. What is perceived is

largely preconceived, so that each group arbitrarily tends to misinterpret the variability which occurs as a fundamental difference which separates that group from all others.

5. These are the scientific facts. Unfortunately, however, when most people use the term ‘race’ they do not do so in the sense above defined. To most people, a race is any group of people whom they choose to describe as a race. Thus, many national, religious, geographic, linguistic or cultural groups have, in such loose usage, been called ‘race’, when obviously Americans are not a race, nor are Englishmen, nor Frenchmen, nor any other national group. Catholics, Protestants, Moslems, and Jews are not races, nor are groups who speak English or any other language thereby definable as a race; people who live in Iceland or England or India are not races; nor are people who are culturally Turkish or Chinese or the like thereby describable as races,

6. National, religious, geographic, linguistic and cultural groups do not necessarily coincide with racial groups: and the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated genetic connexion with racial traits. Because serious errors of this kind are habitually committed ‘when the term ‘race’ is used in popular parlance, it would be better when speaking of human races to drop the term ‘race’ altogether and speak of ethnic groups.

7. Now what has the scientist to say about the groups of mankind which may be recognized at the present time? Human races can be and have been differently classified by different anthropologists, but at the present time most anthropologists agree on classifying the greater part of the present-day mankind into three major divisions as follows: (a) the Mongoloid division; (b) the Negroid division; and (c) the Caucasoid division. The biological processes which the classifier has here embalmed, as it were, are dynamic, not static. These divisions were not the same in the past as they are at present, and there is every reason to believe that they will change in the future.

8. Many sub-groups or ethnic groups within these divisions have been described. There is no general agreement upon their number, and in any event most ethnic groups have not yet been either studied or described by the physical anthropologists.

9. Whatever classification the anthropologist makes of man, he never includes mental characteristics as part of those classifications. It is now generally recognized that intelligence tests do not in themselves enable us to differentiate safely between what is due to innate capacity and what is the result of environmental influences, training and education. Wherever it has been possible to make allowances for differences in environmental opportunities, the tests have shown essential similarity in mental characters among all human groups. In short, given similar degrees of cultural opportunity to realize their potentialities, the average achievement of the members of each ethnic group is about the same. The scientific investigations of recent years fully support the dictum of Confucius (551-478 B.C.): I 'Men's natures are alike; it is their habits that carry them far apart.

10. The scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups. It does indicate, however, that the history of the cultural experience which each group has undergone is the major factor in explaining such differences. The one trait which above all others has been at a premium in the evolution of men's mental characters has been educability, plasticity. This is a trait which all human beings possess. It is indeed, a species character of homo sapiens.

11. So far as temperament is concerned, there is no definite evidence that there exist inborn differences between human groups. There is evidence that whatever group differences of the kind there might be are greatly overridden by the individual differences, and by the differences springing from environmental factors.

12. As for personality and character, these may be considered race less. In every human group a rich variety of personality and character types will be found, and there is no reason for believing that any human group is richer than any other in these respects.

13. With respect to race mixture, the evidence points unequivocally to the fact that this has been going on from the earliest times. Indeed, one of the chief processes of race formation and race extinction or absorption is by means of hybridization between races or ethnic groups. Furthermore, no convincing evidence has been adduced that race mixture of itself produces

biologically bad effects. Statements that human hybrids frequently show undesirable traits, both physically and mentally, physical disharmonies and mental degeneracies, are not supported by the facts. There is, therefore, no biological justification for prohibiting intermarriage between persons of different ethnic groups.

14. The biological fact of race and the myth of 'race' should be distinguished. For all practical social purposes "race' is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth. The myth of 'race' has created an enormous amount of human and social damage. In recent years it has taken a heavy toll in human lives and caused untold suffering. It still prevents the normal development of millions of human beings and deprives civilization of the effective co-operation of productive minds. The biological differences between ethnic groups should be disregarded from the standpoint of social acceptance and social action. The unity of mankind from both the biological and social viewpoints is the main thing. To recognize this and to act accordingly is the first requirement of modern man. It is but to recognize what a great biologist wrote in 1875: 'As man advances in civilization, and small tribes are united into larger communities, the simplest reason would tell each individual that he ought to extend his social instincts and sympathies to all the members of the same nation, though personally unknown to him. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to prevent his sympathies extending to the men of all nations and races.' These are the words of Charles Darwin in The Descent of Man (2nd ed., 1875, p. 187-8). And, indeed, the whole of human history shows that a co-operative spirit is not only natural to men, but more deeply rooted than any self-seeking tendencies. If this were not so we should not see the growth of integration and organization of his communities 'which the centuries and the millenniums plainly exhibit.

15. We now have to consider the bearing of these statements on the problem of human equality. It must be asserted with the utmost emphasis that equality as an ethical principle in no way depends upon the assertion that human beings are in fact equal in endowment. Obviously individuals in all ethnic groups vary greatly among themselves in endowment. Nevertheless, the characteristics in which human groups differ from one another are often exaggerated and used as a basis for questioning the validity of equality in the ethical sense.

For this purpose, we have thought it worth while to set out in a formal manner what is at present scientifically established concerning individual and group differences.

(a) In matters of race, the only characteristics which anthropologists can effectively use as a basis for classifications are physical and physiological.

(b) According to present knowledge there is no proof that the groups of mankind differ in their innate mental characteristics, whether in respect of intelligence or temperament. The scientific evidence indicates that the range of mental capacities in all ethnic groups is much the same.

(c) Historical and sociological studies support the view that genetic differences are not of importance in determining the social and cultural differences between different groups of homo sapiens, and that the social and cultural changes in different groups have, in the main, been independent of changes in inborn constitution. Vast social changes have occurred which were not in any way connected with changes in racial type.

(d) There is no evidence that race mixture as such produces bad results from the biological point of view. The social results of race mixture whether for good or ill are to be traced to social factors.

(e) All normal human beings are capable of learning to share in a common life, to understand the nature of mutual service and reciprocity, and to respect social obligations and contracts. Such biological differences as exist between members of different ethnic groups have no relevance to problems of social and political organization, moral life and communication between human beings.

Lastly, biological studies lend support to the ethic of universal brotherhood; for man is born with drives toward co-operation, and unless these drives are satisfied, men and nations alike fall ill. Man is born a social being who can reach his fullest development only through

interaction with his fellows. The denial at any point of this social bond between men and man brings with it disintegration. In this sense, every man is his brother's keeper. For every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main, because he is involved in mankind.

Original statement drafted at Unesco House, Paris, by the following experts:
Professor Ernest Beaglehole (New Zealand);
Professor Juan Comas (Mexico);
Professor L. A. Costa Pinto (Brazil);
Professor Franklin Frazier (United States of America);
Professor Morris Ginsberg (United Kingdom);
Dr. Humayun Kabir (India);
Professor Claude Levi-Strauss (France);
Professor Ashley Montagu (United States of America) (rapporteur).

Text revised by Professor Ashley Montagu, after criticism submitted by Professors Hadley Cantril, E. G. Conklin, Gunnar Dahlberg, Theodosius Dobzhansky, L. C. Dunn, Donald Hager, Julian S. Huxley, Otto Klineberg, Wilbert Moore, H. J. Mullet-, Gunnar Myrdal, Joseph Needham, Curt Stern.

Appendix 2: Statement on the Nature of Race and Race Differences

Paris, June 1951

L. C. Dunn (rapporteur)

The reasons for convening a second meeting of experts to discuss the concept of race were chiefly these:

Race is a question of interest to many different kinds of people, not only to the public at large, but to sociologists, anthropologists and biologists, especially those dealing with problems of genetics. At the first discussion on the problem of race, it was chiefly sociologists who gave their opinions and framed the 'Statement on race'. That statement had a good effect, but it did not carry the authority of just those groups within whose special province fall the biological problems of race, namely the physical anthropologists & geneticists. Secondly, the first statement did not, in all its details, carry conviction of these groups and, because of this, it was not supported by many authorities in these two fields.

In general, the chief conclusions of the first statement were sustained, but with differences in emphasis and with some important deletions.

There was no delay or hesitation or lack of unanimity in reaching the primary conclusion that there were no scientific grounds whatever for the racialist position regarding purity of race and the hierarchy of inferior and superior races to which this leads.

We agreed that all races were mixed and that intraracial variability in most biological characters was as great as, if not greater than, interracial variability.

We agreed that races had reached their present states by the operation of evolutionary factors by which different proportions of similar hereditary elements (genes) had become characteristic of different, partially separated groups. The source of these elements seemed to all of us to be the variability which arises by random mutation, and the isolating factors

bringing about racial differentiation by preventing intermingling of groups with different mutations, chiefly geographical for the main groups such as African, European and Asiatic.

Man, we recognised, is distinguished as much by his culture as by his biology, and it was clear to all of us that many of the factors leading to the formation of minor races of men have been cultural. Anything that tends to prevent free exchange of genes amongst groups is a potential racemaking factor and these partial barriers may be religious, social and linguistic, as well as geographical.

We were careful to avoid dogmatic definitions of race, since, as a product of evolutionary factors, it is a dynamic rather than a static concept. We were equally careful to avoid saying that, because races were all variable and many of them graded into each other, therefore races did not exist. The physical anthropologists and the man in the street both know that races exist; the former, from the scientifically recognisable and measurable congeries of traits which he uses in classifying the varieties of man; the latter from the immediate evidence of his senses when he sees an African, a European, an Asiatic and an American Indian together.

We had no difficulty in agreeing that no evidence of differences in innate mental ability between different racial groups has been adduced, but that here too intraracial variability is at least as great as interracial variability. We agreed that psychological traits could not be used in classifying races, nor could they serve as parts of racial descriptions.

We were fortunate in having as members of our conference several scientists who had made special studies of the results of intermarriage between members of different races. This meant that our conclusion that race mixture in general did not lead to disadvantageous results was based on actual experience as well as upon study of the literature. Many of our members thought it quite likely that hybridisation of different races could lead to biologically advantageous results, although there was insufficient evidence to support any conclusion.

Since race, as a word, has become coloured by its misuse in connection with national, linguistic and religious differences, and by its deliberate abuse by racialists, we tried to find a new word to express the same meaning of a biologically differentiated group. On this we did not succeed,

but agreed to reserve race as the word to be used for anthropological classification of groups showing definite combinations of physical (including physiological) traits in characteristic proportions.

We also tried hard, but again we failed, to reach some general statement about the inborn nature of man with respect to his behaviour toward his fellows. It is obvious that members of a group show co-operative or associative behaviour towards each other, while members of different groups may show aggressive behaviour towards each other and both of these attitudes may occur within the same individual. We recognised that the understanding of the psychological origin of race prejudice was an important problem which called for further study.

Nevertheless, having regard to the limitations of our present knowledge, all of us believed that the biological differences found amongst human racial groups can in no case justify the views of racial inequality which have been based on ignorance and prejudice, and that all of the differences which we know can well be disregarded for all ethical human purposes.

1.Scientists are generally agreed that all men living today belong to a single species, *Homo sapiens*, and are derived from a common stock, even though there is some dispute as to when and how different human groups diverged from this common stock.

The concept of race is unanimously regarded by anthropologists as a classificatory device providing a zoological frame within which the various groups of mankind may be arranged and by means of which studies of evolutionary processes can be facilitated. In its anthropological sense, the word 'race' should be reserved for groups of mankind possessing well-developed and primarily heritable physical differences from other groups. Many populations can be so classified but, because of the complexity of human history, there are also many populations which cannot easily be fitted into a racial classification.

2.Some of the physical differences between human groups are due to differences in hereditary constitution and some to differences in the environments in which they have been brought up. In most cases, both influences have been at work. The science of genetics suggests that

the hereditary differences among populations of a single species are the results of the action of two sets of processes. On the one hand, the genetic composition of isolated populations is constantly but gradually being altered by natural selection and by occasional changes (mutations) in the material particles (genes) which control heredity. Populations are also affected by fortuitous changes in gene frequency and by marriage customs. On the other hand, crossing is constantly breaking down the differentiations so set up. The new mixed populations, in so far as they, in turn, become isolated, are subject to the same processes, and these may lead to further changes. Existing races are merely the result, considered at a particular moment in time, of the total effect of such processes on the human species. The hereditary characters to be used in the classification of human groups, the limits of their variation within these groups, and thus the extent of the classificatory sub-divisions adopted may legitimately differ according to the scientific purpose in view.

3.National, religious, geographical, linguistic and cultural groups do not necessarily coincide with racial groups; and the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated connection with racial traits. Americans are not a race, nor are Frenchmen, nor Germans; nor *ipso facto* is any other national group. Moslems and Jews are no more races than are Roman Catholics and Protestants; nor are people who live in Iceland or Britain or India, or who speak English or any other language, or who are culturally Turkish or Chinese and the lie, thereby describable as races. The use of the term 'race' in speaking of such groups may be a serious error, but it is one which is habitually committed.

4.Human races can be, and have been, classified in different ways by different anthropologists. Most of them agree in classifying the greater part of existing mankind into at least three large units, which may be called major groups (in French *grand-races*, in German *Hauptrassen*). Such a classification does not depend on any single physical character, nor does for example, skin colour by itself necessarily distinguish one major group from another. Furthermore, so far as it has been possible to analyse them, the differences in physical structure which distinguish one major group from another give no support to popular notions of any general 'superiority' or 'inferiority' which are sometimes implied in referring to these groups.

Broadly speaking, individuals belonging to different major groups of mankind are distinguishable by virtue of their physical characters, but individual members, or small groups belonging to different races within the same major group are usually not so distinguishable. Even the major groups grade into each other, and the physical traits by which they and the races within them are characterised overlap considerably. With respect to most, if not all, measurable characters, the differences among individuals belonging to the same race are greater than the differences that occur between the observed averages for two or more races within the same major group.

5.Most anthropologists do not include mental characteristics in their classification of human races. Studies within a single race have shown that both innate capacity and environmental opportunity determine the results of tests of intelligence and temperament, though their relative importance is disputed.

When intelligence tests, even non-verbal, are made on a group of non-literate people, their scores are usually lower than those of more civilised people. It has been recorded that different groups of the same race occupying similarly high levels of civilisation may yield considerable differences in intelligence tests. When, however, the two groups have been brought up from childhood in similar environments, the differences are usually very slight. Moreover, there is good evidence that, given similar opportunities, the average performance (that is to say, the performance of the individual who is representative because he is surpassed by as many as he surpasses), and the variation round it, do not differ appreciably from one race to another.

Even those psychologists who claim to have found the greatest differences in intelligence between groups of different racial origin and have contended that they are hereditary, always report that some members of the group of inferior performance surpass not merely the lowest ranking member of the superior group but also the average of its members. In any case, it has never been possible to separate members of two groups on the basis of mental capacity, as they can often be separated on a basis of religion, skin colour, hair form or language. It is possible, though not proved, that some types of innate capacity for intellectual and emotional responses are commoner in one human group than in another, but it is certain that, within a

single group, innate capacities vary as much as, if not more than, they do between different groups.

The study of the heredity of psychological characteristics is beset with difficulties. We know that certain mental diseases and defects are transmitted from one generation to the next, but we are less familiar with the part played by heredity in the mental life of normal individuals. The normal individual, irrespective of race, is essentially educable. It follows that his intellectual and moral life is largely conditioned by his training and by his physical and social environment.

It often happens that a national group may appear to be characterised by particular psychological attributes. The superficial view would be that this is due to race. Scientifically, however, we realise that any common psychological attribute is more likely to be due to a common historical and social background, and that such attributes may obscure the fact that, within different populations consisting of many human types, one will find approximately the same range of temperament and intelligence.

6.The scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups. It does indicate, on the contrary, that a major factor in explaining such differences is the cultural experience which each group has undergone.

7.There is no evidence for the existence of so-called ‘pure’ races. Skeletal remains provide the basis of our limited knowledge about earlier races. In regard to race mixture, the evidence points to the fact that human hybridisation has been going on for an indefinite but considerable time. Indeed, one of the processes of race formation and race extinction or absorption is by means of hybridisation between races. As there is no reliable evidence that disadvantageous effects are produced thereby, no biological justification exists for prohibiting inter-marriage between persons of different races.

8.We now have to consider the bearing of these statements on the problem of human equality. We wish to emphasise that equality of opportunity and equality in law in no way depend, as ethical principles, upon the assertion that human beings are in fact equal in endowment.

9.We have thought it worth while to set out in a formal manner what is at present scientifically established concerning individual and group differences:

(a) In matters of race, the only characteristics which anthropologists have so far been able to use effectively as a basis for classification are physical (anatomical and physiological).

(b) Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development.

(c) Some biological differences between human beings within a single race may be as great as, or greater than, the same biological differences between races.

(d) Vast social changes have occurred that have not been connected in any way with changes in racial type. Historical and sociological studies thus support the view that genetic differences are of little significance in determining the social and cultural differences between different groups of men.

(e) There is no evidence that race mixture produces disadvantageous results from a biological point of view. The social results of race mixture, whether for good or ill, can generally be traced to social factors.

Text drafted at Unesco House, Paris, on 8 June 1951, by:
Professor R. A. M. Bergman, Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam;
Professor Gunnar Dahlberg, Director, State Institute for Human Genetics and Race Biology, University of Uppsala;

Professor L. C. Dunn, Department of Zoology, Columbia University, New York;

Professor J. B. S. Haldane, Head, Department of Biometry, University College, London;

Professor M. F. Ashley Montagu, Chairman, Department of Anthropology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.;

Dr A. E. Morant, Director, Blood Group Reference Laboratory, Lister Institute, London;

Professor Hans Nachtscheim, Director, Institut für Genetik, Freie Universität, Berlin;

Dr Eugène Schreider, Directeur adjoint du Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Physique de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Paris;

Professor Harry L. Shapiro, Chairman, Department of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, New York;

Dr J. C. Trevor, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge;

Dr Henri V. Vallois, Professeur au Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Directeur du Musée de l'Homme, Paris;

Professor S. Zuckerman, Head, Department of Anatomy, Medical School, University of Birmingham;

Professor Th. Dobzhansky, Department of Zoology, Columbia University, New York;

Dr Julian Huxley contributed to the final wording.