

Pamphlet: "Racial Intermarriage in the United States."
Little Blue Book No. 1387. by George S. Schulfer.
Haldeman-Julius Publications. 1929.
(32 pages)

Interracial marriage

X
1
Schuyler, George S.

Racial interracial marriage in the United States by George S. Schuyler, 1929.

32 p.

Historical accounts of the phenomenon
of interracial marriage

K
1

Schuyler, George S.

Racial Intermarriage in the United States by George S. Schuyler, 1929.

32 p.

A historical account of the phenomenon of interracial marriage

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1387
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Racial Intermarriage in the United States

ONE OF THE MOST INTERESTING
PHENOMENA IN OUR NATIONAL
LIFE

George S. Schuyler

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1929,
Haldeman-Julius Company

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**RACIAL INTERMARRIAGE IN THE
UNITED STATES**

RACIAL INTERMARRIAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

One of the greatest current myths in the United States centers around racial intermarriage and its results. No subject is more taboo in polite society and yet when an opinion is voiced on it, either oral or written, we get something like this:

(a) There is a natural aversion between the two races, especially in the field of sex relations.

(b) No respectable white American, male or female, will marry a Negro.

(c) There are very few racial intermarriages in the United States and they are almost wholly between blacks and whites of the very lowest social stratum.

(d) Racial intermarriages invariably end tragically.

This, upon close investigation, is found to be unalloyed bunk. The fact is that there has never been made in the United States a comprehensive study of racial intermarriage. Go to the best libraries in the country and you will find that in the past half century there has been but one article published on it and that in a Negro magazine, *The Messenger*. The subject has been referred to in a score or more of

books but most of the conclusions are derived, not from investigation but from mere opinion and very prejudiced opinion at that. Even the United States Census Bureau has no facts to furnish the investigator.

Now let us see: Is there any natural sex aversion between the two races? Consider the evidence! Listen to William Benjamin Smith, a professional Southerner commenting on the subject in "The Color Line," one of the most violently prejudiced tomes ever written:

The South is entirely right in thus keeping open at all times, at all hazards, and at all sacrifices, an impassable social chasm between black and white. This she must do in behalf of her blood, her essence, of the stock of her Caucasian race.

If we sit with Negroes at our tables, if we entertain them as our guests and social equals, if we disregard the color line in all other relations, is it possible to maintain it fixedly in the sexual relation, in the marriage of our sons and daughters, in the propagation of our species? Unquestionably, No! It is certain as the rising of tomorrow's sun, that, once the middle wall of social partition is broken down, the mingling of the tides of life would begin instantly and proceed steadily. (P. 7.)

It will be noted that the erudite Mr. Smith says nothing about any natural aversion. Nay, he admits that once the color bar is let down, blacks and whites will rush together to the altar.

Nor is Mr. Smith the only person in the country who admits that "the natural aversion" talk is nonsense. The present leaders in the strug-

gle to keep the Land of Our Fathers both white and pure, tacitly admit it when they advocate the passage of anti-intermarriage laws in every state in the nation. Such men as Senator Cole Blease and Representative Allard Gasque of South Carolina who recently sought the passage of such a law for the District of Columbia; W. A. Plecker, Registrar of Vital Statistics in Virginia, who spends the money of the Old Dominion in sending out literature advocating race purity; Lothrop Stoddard, who seems to have dedicated his life and talents to the preserving of white integrity; John Powell, a suspiciously dark Southerner who has hit upon the brilliant scheme of organizing all of the Anglo-Saxons in the nation into clubs, and Major Ernest Cox, author of that masterpiece of misinformation, "White America": all of these gentlemen by their constant argument for more *social* barriers between the two so-called races are admitting that there is no inherent repugnance of white for black, or vice versa.

Dr. Plecker, Major Cox and Mr. Powell, in their zeal to get the much-advertised Racial Integrity Law passed in Virginia, made a thorough investigation into genealogies in that state, and finally announced the sad news that there were no Indians in Virginia, and few on

the Atlantic Coast, without Negro ancestry, and have not been for a century. This news considerably depressed large numbers of the First Families of Virginia who had long boasted airily of their Indian forbears and claimed descent from the immortal Pocahontas. Indeed, when the above law was proposed, the *Richmond News-Leader* created a stir by saying that among those, living and dead, who would have to be *classed* as Negroes if the bill became a law, were:

Two United States Senators, a United States Ambassador to France, five generals, two Presidents of the United States, two Secretaries of War, three of the most distinguished of Southern novelists, three Governors of Virginia, a Speaker of the House of Representatives, two bishops, three Congressmen, one Rear Admiral, two judges of the Virginia Supreme Court, and many of the foremost officers of the Confederate Army.

Not only is it not true that there is any aversion or repugnance between the two extreme races, but on the contrary the researches of scientists prove that there is a great degree of attraction between them. Does not Jean Finot tell us in "Race Prejudice," page 156,

Man did not wait to commingle with his species until science should tell him to do so. With him cross-breeding has been facilitated by the complete fecundity of halfbreeds and the sexual concord between representatives the furthest removed from one another. Since the first migration of peoples this phenomenon has taken place. In the blood of

modern white Europeans flows that of Negroes who lived on our continent (Europe) at the end of the Quaternary Epoch.

Which may probably account for so many white people having unmistakably Negroid features.

E. B. Reuter, the eminent sociologist, in his "The American Race Problem," page 134, reveals the fact that "Miscegenation of the Negro and white people in America dates from the first appearance of the Negroes." Referring to intermixture of whites and blacks in the colonial days, he says, "But neither the severity of law nor the intolerance of public sentiment seemed to have much effect on the miscegenation of the races. They prevented intermarriage rather than race mixture. The clandestine intermingling tended to increase and the illegitimate progeny of the white servants and Negro slaves became in many places a serious public burden."

Franz Boas confirms these views in an article on "Race Problems in America," *Science*, May, 1909:

Intermixture in early times was not by any means confined to peoples which, although diverse in language and culture, were of fairly uniform type. On the contrary the most diverse types of southern Europe, Northern Europe, Eastern Europe and Western Europe, not to mention the elements which poured into Europe from Asia and Africa, have been participants in this long continued intermixture. . . .

It is quite obvious, that, although our laws may retard the influx of white blood (into the Negro group) considerably, they cannot hinder the gradual progress of intermixture . . . that there is no racial sexual antipathy is made clear by the size of our mulatto population.

The extent to which white blood (if such an erroneous term may be permitted) has flowed into black in the United States has been revealed through the close studies of Melville Herskovits, the well-known anthropologist, who informs us in "The American Negro" that

Instead of 80 or 85 percent of the American Negroes being wholly African in descent, only a little over 20 percent are unmixed, while almost 80 percent show mixture with White or American Indian . . . between one-third and one-fourth of them (27.3 percent, to be exact) have American Indian ancestry.

Pursuing this subject of so-called "natural" racial antipathy, aversion and repugnance, one finds in "The Tales of the Midrash" (Gen. Rabba 18), a work familiar to Jewish scholars, the following excerpt attesting to the antiquity of interracial attraction.

When the Jews returned from Babylon, their wives had become brown, and almost black during the years of captivity, and a large number of men divorced their wives. The divorced women probably married black men, which would, to some extent, account for the existence of black Jews.

Sarah G. Millin, in her "The South Africans," devotes some space to this subject and we learn

from her that the most cultured and refined Englishmen in the sub-continent will have large families by Hottentot women. This would seem to substantiate the statement of Shakespeare in *Titus Andronicus*, III, 2, that "Coal-black is better than another hue." Dr. Iwan Bloch in "The Sexual Life of Our Times," page 614, likewise touches on the subject, saying:

White men from early times had a peculiar weakness for Negroes and mulatto women and girls. . . . Notwithstanding the deeply-rooted racial hatred, even in America racial fetichism gives rise to numerous connections of this kind. The colored girl exercises a powerful attractive force upon the American man; and even the proud American woman manifests, with an especial frequency in Chicago, a certain preference for the male Negro.

Two very old proverbs also throw light on this attraction: One on page 45, "Handbook of Proverbs," Henry G. Bohn, Collector, London, 1867, says "A black man's a jewel in a fair woman's eyes," and the second, to be found in the *Grand Dictionnaire Universal*, Pierre Larousse, advises men to "Take a white woman for beauty, but an Egyptian or Negro woman for pleasure." Sir Richard Burton, while translating "The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night," was so struck by the number of instances where white princesses fled to the arms of sable lovers that he appended a long footnote to page 6, Volume 1, on the reason therefor.

And even men of God have not escaped the lure of the black wench, if we are to believe Frank Harris, who, referring to the number of mulattoes encountered on a journey across Africa covering the route taken by the sainted Livingstone, says (My Life, Vol. III, Chap. XVIa), "It grew to be a joke with us that we were following in the missionary's footsteps."

* * *

So much for the myth of natural aversion between the races. Lately I set out to ascertain how many mixed couples there were in the United States and what, in general, was their character and deportment in their respective localities. I ransacked the public libraries in vain and was unable to get any authentic facts and figures from any source, federal, state or municipal. Consequently it was necessary for me to gather my own statistics by personally visiting a number of communities and by sending questionnaires to dependable individuals in various parts of the country. My informants included editors, physicians, social workers, students and labor leaders in about 100 communities, all of whom have resided for many years in their respective cities and towns. It seems that there are black-and-tan couples in every important town in the "free" territory,

i. e., where it is not a prison offense for such couples to reside. Some idea of how they are distributed can be gained from the following list: Salt Lake City, Utah, 35; Seattle, Wash., 25; Cincinnati, Ohio, 100; Kansas City, Kans., 10; Chicago, Ill., 1,000; New York, N. Y., 500; Pittsburgh, Pa., 120; Boston, Mass., 50; Cleveland, Ohio, 1,100; Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., 100; Tacoma, Wash., 15; Columbus, Ohio, 12; Los Angeles, Calif., 20; Duluth, Minn., 10; Springfield, Ohio, 6; San Francisco and Oakland, Calif., 10; Denver, Colo., 6; Oklahoma City, Okla., 2; Yonkers, N. Y., 4; Harrisburg, Pa., 6.

Since it is always claimed that these people are invariably the dregs of civilization, I took great pains to ascertain their general character and reputation. Here are some typical reports:

Cincinnati, Ohio. "They attract but little attention owing to the fact that they are reputable, quiet people."

Kansas City, Kansas. "In three cases they stand well socially. The others are not so well known. In the western sections of this state we find lots of intermarriage among the farm group. I know of several cases where white girls from rich families have married colored farmers and vice versa."

Cleveland, Ohio. "Good. About the average."

New York, New York. "Good. Many are persons of exceptional education. One couple is engaged in high school teaching."

Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn. "About the av-

erage of the other unmixed group and much more inconspicuous."

Salt Lake City, Utah. "Very good. Stay to themselves."

San Francisco and Oakland, California. "Very good in the majority of cases. Principally white husbands and black wives."

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. "The mixed couples are among our best citizens."

Boston, Massachusetts. "Good. It seems that here in Boston it is mostly the Irish women that marry Negro men. . . . Two of the women are Jewesses. Three of the cases are of Negro women married to white men. . . . Among Negro men of the better class married to white women here, there is an attorney and a physician, both of national repute."

While most of these couples are of the white woman-black man type, probably one-fifth are of the white man-black woman variety. Cleveland reports at least 60 percent of its 1,100 couples to be of the latter kind.

Of course this seems like a mighty small number of mixed couples for a country in which there are over ninety million so-called whites and about twelve million alleged Negroes. Yet, in order to thoroughly appreciate the feat that the black-and-tan couple accomplishes in merely getting married, without taking into account the difficulty of staying together, let us consider the obstacles. Your average couple goes to the altar over a carpet of roses, with the blessings of society ringing in their ears, but the mixed team finds the path to the parson strewn

with boulders, and bricks falling thickly about them. Only Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Wyoming, New Mexico, Washington, and the District of Columbia permit them to wed. The other states forbid them and establish penalties ranging all the way from a fine of \$2,000 and imprisonment for ten years in North Dakota, to a mere voiding of the marriage in the commonwealths of Arizona, Arkansas, Missouri, Nebraska, California, North Carolina and Utah. Some of these couples do reside in Missouri, Nebraska, California, Utah and Colorado, but they were married elsewhere, and their marriage is not legal in those states, no matter how wealthy, cultured or law-abiding they may be.

Nor are such laws exclusively aimed against marriage between blacks and white. Caucasians and Mongolians are also forbidden to enter connubial bliss in Arizona, California, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oregon and Utah; Amerindians and Caucasians cannot intermarry in Nevada or North and South Carolina, while Oklahoma and North Carolina forbid the noble redskin and the Descendants of Ham the privilege of cementing their affections

in the legal manner. Curiously enough, Texas, while forbidding marriages "between persons of European blood and their descendants with persons of African blood and their descendants," making such marriages null and void, and establishing a *maximum* penalty of five years' imprisonment in such cases, does, nevertheless, make reservation in the case of a person knowingly marrying another of opposite race. In Oklahoma, where marriage is forbidden between any person of African descent with any person not of African descent, the law is said to have been passed to keep Negroes from intermarrying with the aboriginal Americans, a great many of whom are wealthy in oil lands. If there was any wealth to be gained by racial intermarriage, the otherwise vociferous advocates of racial purity wanted it to be "For whites only." However, a large number of these Oklahoma "Indians," being really mulattoes—that is to say, the offspring of red and black parentage—there are probably many Caucasians in that state and Texas who would not boast so loudly of their "Indian blood" if they knew its source.

Not satisfied with the vast extent of territory in which people who love each other but happen to be unfortunate enough to belong to

the two opposite races cannot marry, strenuous efforts have been, and are being, made to enlarge it. Senator Cole Blease and Representative Allard H. Gasque of South Carolina, also Senator Caraway of Arkansas, have endeavored, as yet unsuccessfully, to get an anti-intermarriage law passed for the District of Columbia, within the past two years. During 1927, an apparently concerted effort was made by the Ku Klux Klan and its sympathizers to extend the forbidden territory over Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey and Rhode Island, but the bills introduced all died in committee after loud and fervent protests from the militantly liberal crowd.

* * *

A legally married, law-abiding mixed couple hooked by the zealous minions of the law in any of the twenty-nine states mentioned can be jailed and heavily fined for living in concubinage, even where there is no penalty imposed for racial intermarriage. Think, for instance what the Virginia Racial Integrity Law means to such a pair! The *Raleigh News and Observer*, in its issue of May 4, 1928, carried a lengthy news item from Amherst, Va., telling how

Mrs. Mary Hall Wood, 22, white woman, who, with her husband, Max Hamilton Wood, has been languishing in Amherst County Jail here for al-

most a year, and who was convicted Tuesday in the circuit court here upon the charge of having married a Negro, announced today in her cell that she would appeal the case to a higher court.

Mrs. Wood, who is described as "a brunette with fair complexion and regarded as pretty," had received a sentence of two years in the penitentiary for the crime of marrying the man she loved. Her husband had been successfully "passing" for white for some time before it was discovered that some of his ancestors hailed from Africa instead of Austria. The news item concludes with the following contribution to the history of Christian civilization:

A daughter, said to be two years old, is reported to have disappeared since the couple was incarcerated, and the mother said today that she did not know where the child is.

Even where both parties are legally Negroes, they are not safe from molestation in the No-Man's-Land of racial intermarriage. For instance, the New York *Amsterdam News*, January 27, 1926, told the world how Judge Samuel A. Dew of Kansas City, Mo., assumed the added role of anthropologist, when he fined Edward Hayter and his wife Fay Hayter \$500 each on the ground that the wife was too white. The eminent jurist ignored both the testimony of Mrs. Hayter and the admission of the prose-

cuting attorney that she was legally a Negro: *i. e.*, of African ancestry, although as white as Calvin Coolidge. "Take off your hat," the dispenser of justice commanded, and when he saw the white Negro lady's crowning glory, the couple was \$1,000 out. It seemed that the lady was born in Louisiana and that her father was a white man, evidently possessing strong views on the subject of miscegenation. The pair had been married for six years. Referring to similar incidents in Cincinnati, Ohio, W. P. Dabney, editor of *The Union*, writes, "It was a frequent occurrence for the police to arrest light mulatto colored girls out with Negro men, thinking said girls were white." Such happenings are not uncommon elsewhere in the Land of the Free.

If couples, legally Negroes, are so greeted by the bench, what is the judicial attitude where one of the parties is legally white? In the *Chicago Whip*, issue of April 14, 1928, there appeared a long news story headed "Youthful Mixed Couple Lose in Second Court Tilt." The item told of the arrest last February of Lester Arnold, an 18-year-old Negro, "for larceny of stamps valued at \$1.95 from the National Training School" and his sentence to 60 days in jail by one Judge Lyle. The story continues:

When his young wife walked into court, and it was found that she was a Caucasian, the judge changed his decision, and sentenced the boy to a year in the house of correction . . . (saying) "I hope during that time she will have a chance to forget this man and become acquainted with some decent fellows of her own race."

The wife is described as "a pretty blonde" and the couple had been married six months. Evidently the young woman was only following parental example, since the story concludes with the statement that "Her mother also married a colored man in a later marriage."

* * *

Nor is getting married a simple matter in the few states where there are no laws against racial intermarriage. In early November, 1925, a group of white men in Montclair, N. J., burned a cross on the lawn of a prosperous Negro contractor, a graduate of Columbia and Lincoln Universities, because he had applied for a license for marriage in New York City the day previous in company with a 20-year-old blonde telephone operator, the daughter of an insurance company official. This "Negro" is light enough to get Pullman accommodations in Mississippi.

In the latter part of April, 1926, a young white man, resident of Mahopac, N. Y., decided to take unto himself a wife in the person of a

comely 17-year-old mulatto girl. Accordingly they journeyed to Peekskill, N. Y., to get the license. As they emerged from the matrimonial bureau with their ticket to matrimonial bliss, they were surrounded by a valiant troop of Ku Klux Klansmen who warned them not to marry. This gesture availing them naught, the Klan wrote to the young man's uncle advising him that whenever they came after the benedict they were to be admitted to his apartments without question. Hearing that the husband had armed himself with a Winchester, however, the doughty Hood and Sheet Men failed to put in an appearance.

The following July in Camden, N. J., a white girl and a black man applied for a marriage license. They got it. The girl was of age and evidently knew what she wanted. Her grandmother, however, thought differently, and requested that the young woman be examined to determine her sanity, if any. Quite naturally, the two white physicians delegated to conduct the examination, found her "mentally incompetent," whereupon she was immediately committed to the home for the feeble-minded at Vineland. She may still be there.

In the little town of Rockville, Conn., early in 1928, gossips got a juicy morsel of scandal

when Beatrice Fuller, Mayflower descendant and granddaughter of a Confederate general, applied for a marriage license accompanied by Clarence Kellem, a Negro workingman who had fought to preserve democracy in the late war. The expected threats came from the Ku Klux Klan and leading citizens of the burg rolled their eyes in horror. Undisturbed, the couple prepared to enter the state of holy wedlock. The girl's mother expressed no desire to halt the proceedings, nor did Kellem's Negro father and white stepmother (his mother was also white) sound any note of disapproval. It remained for the Christian clergy of the bailiwick to froth at the mouth and deplore the fact that there was no law in the Nutmeg State to prevent such matches. Every one of them refused to marry the couple. However, the pair had a civil marriage, and according to last reports, the state of Connecticut survives, and even prospers. Commenting on this marriage, Arthur Brisbane, Hearst's intellectual heavy-weight, hastened to tell his twenty million readers that,

Intelligent men, white and black, will agree that that is decidedly against the interest of both the man and the woman, and all of both races. . . . Heine thought there could be no real freedom in America if such marriages were opposed. He was mistaken.

Late in the spring of 1928, two teachers in the New York City public schools, one a black man and the other a white woman, married in Philadelphia, Pa. Immediately a hue and cry went up. Through trickery and third degree methods each one, separately, was induced to sign a resignation. This zealous effort of a minor official was finally agreed to be much too raw, and the high school authorities, agreeing that no crime had been committed, reinstated them.

* * *

All of the troubles of the mixed couples are by no means ended when a marriage certificate has been obtained and the solemn abracadabra finished. Indeed, many of their problems have just begun. They are welcomed neither in Caucasian or Afro-American society. They will often have among the whites some good friends who will assist and visit them occasionally, but social life, so far as the superior race is concerned, is out of the question, except in isolated communities or in the extreme East. In many of our free Christian towns they often find just as much difficulty in renting or buying a residence as a Negro couple, regardless of the excellence of their character, the plentitude of their money or the breadth of their culture.

Here and there, of course, someone will relent, or a place will be obtained by the white party. The latter subterfuge, however, sometimes results in a none-too-polite request to move. There was once a couple residing in New York City, a Jewish man and a brown woman, both people of refinement and intelligence, who were only able to retain their apartment facing Central Park because she posed as his housekeeper!

In the larger cities, these couples will usually be found residing in the sections largely inhabited by Negroes where it is possible for them to rent a room or a house with much less difficulty and embarrassment than elsewhere. As a consequence, Negroes know more about them than do white citizens. The Negroes can readily tell you where such couples live, what they look like, how many children they have, if any, and what is their general conduct. Very few white people possess such information. I have heard many white people state with an air of finality that no such couples existed in these United States. Many of the Nordics, even when they see a mixed couple walking down the street, love to believe that the white party is an Octoroon rather than a Caucasian. While the Negroes, except in a few instances, do not

cultivate these couples socially, they at least do not disturb them. On the other hand, when Nordics (or Jews) learn of the coming of such a couple to the neighborhood, there are always a militant few to suggest that "something ought to be done about it." Here and there, perhaps, such a couple will encounter a black (or mulatto) fanatic who has swallowed some of the Garvey bilge, but such antagonism stops with vocal disapproval.

Negro men seem to be more tolerant of these couples than Negro women, particularly where the female is a Caucasian. Likewise, white women are generally less vehement against such marriages than white men. The attitude of many Negro women is well expressed by a correspondent writing from Montreal, Canada, where there are many mixed couples, almost all of them being of black husbands and white wives. She tearfully asks, "If all the colored men decided to marry white women, and no white men married colored women, what would become of us?" Another Negro woman, Palestine Wells, a columnist for the Baltimore *Afro-American*, in commenting on the recent interracial marriage in Connecticut, said:

You know I have a sneaking suspicion that national intermarriage will make it harder to get husbands. A girl has a hard time enough getting

a husband, but methinks 'twill be worse. Think how awful it would be if all the ofay girls with a secret hankering for brown skin men, could openly compete with us.

But if most of these mixed couples are not socially acceptable in Negro society, not so with their offspring. A young college man writing from Boston, Mass., says:

Here is another odd thing. The mulatto offspring of such marriages, provided that they are nice looking, are admitted to the best Boston Negro society without questioning, simply because their mothers were white, I take it. I can cite cases of young men and women high up in the Boston social world (Negro) that are looked upon as persons of high class and that have married into the so-called best Negro families; yet, their mothers are in some cases Irish cooks and scrub-women!

Their social acceptance is more likely due to their paleness of complexion and straightness of hair. This hold true to a large extent throughout Negro society, even where such offspring are known to be illegitimate, which is not true in the above case. Color—or absence of it—is as much a social asset, especially for a woman in Afro-America, as a foreign title in white America; and with more reason, since the United States has impressed upon its Negro citizens in industry, commerce, politics and social life that the real mark of full citizenship is absence of skin pigment.

* * *

What causes these couples to stay together

year in and year out when all about them are orthodox marriages going on the rocks, is a fit subject for conjecture. Certainly their lot is much harder than that of the average folk, for added to the family perils and exigencies of holy matrimony, are the ostracism of black and white society, the odium attached to such unions, the annoyance and even frequent danger of appearing together in public because of the belligerence of uniformed custodians of Caucasian race integrity. In wide stretches of the country they cannot travel together to visit friends or to go on a vacation, because of the danger of arrest or mob violence, even if the white party is "passing" for colored, which is not infrequently done. In the "free" territory, despite the fact that their union is legal, the mixed couple finds traveling together an annoyance unless they are opulent enough to afford a drawing room; while arrangements are often made to stop with friends to avoid the unpleasantness to be met with in hotels.

And yet, the percentage of marital shipwrecks seems to be less among mixed couples than the unmixed. While the United States Census Bureau Statistics show 15 divorces in 1926 for every 100 marriages, with an increase of 3.1 percent in the former and only 1.2 per-

cent in the latter, irrespective of the 3,825 annulments during that year, a perusal of newspaper files for the past fifteen years does not reveal a half dozen instances where one or both of the parties to a mixed marriage have applied for divorce or annulment. And the number of such black-and-tan couples is estimated to be close to ten thousand. Considering the fact that such an application for divorce would be eagerly seized upon and published as proof that these marriages are disastrous, it can be safely assumed that there have been no more such applications than the newspaper have reported. Investigation in the communities where numbers of these couples reside also reveals the fact that rarely do they break up their life partnerships by the generally prevalent procedure of agreeing to live apart. Thus one is led to the conclusion that separations, legal and otherwise, among these couples do not exceed one-half of one percent.

Marriage to these mixed couples is not just a passing fancy, apparently, but the result of a genuinely deep affection. As one couple said, "We loved each other so well that we were willing to give up everything, if necessary, to have each other." Another pair inform me that, "We don't need much society. We get

along pretty well right here in our home enjoying each other's company. All we ask is that people leave us to ourselves and don't try to cause us any trouble." A white woman, daughter of a Canadian merchant, who is married to a Negro in a Northern city, says, "Our social life centers in our home. We are forced to really *live* here instead of using it as merely a lodging place." Realizing their status in society, cognizant of the added strain upon their relationship and aware of the greatly increased opportunities for developing flurries of temper, they seem to make unusual efforts to be as pleasant and inoffensive as possible to each other. Knowing that they are two against the world, they cling the closer together; expecting society to be always conspiring to separate them, they are prone to ignore gossip and rumors brought about each to the other. As an informant writes me from Buffalo, N. Y., "They seem always to be in perfect harmony."

* * *

Such is racial intermarriage in the United States today. Among Negroes, who know more about it than white people, there is a general belief that it is declining, but in this the wish may be father to the thought. Owing to the formidable obstacles in the path of such adven-

turous couples, the number of mixed marriages has never been large, but the bogey of interracial marriage looms very big, and probably with justice, before the eyes of the advocates of Nordic supremacy. This is doubtless due to the fact that no student of the color problem in the United States can long fail to see that it is basically sexual. Discuss it with the average man, and, after touching on the economic and sociological aspects of the problem, he will invariably inquire, "Would you want your sister (or daughter) to marry a nigger?" It is usually the custom to follow up this question with the statement that legal miscegenation would result in lowering the caliber of the human stock and thus causing civilization to go to pot.

There seems to be wide ignorance of the fact that there already exists a brilliant galaxy of individuals, the offspring of mixed matches, who have contributed a great deal to civilization. There is, for instance, General Alexander Dumas, Commander of the Army of the West under Napoleon; his son, the French novelist, and his grandson, the noted French dramatist; Pushkin, the Russian novelist and poet; Booker T. Washington, the American educator; Vicente Guerrero, the liberator of Mexico and its second president; W. E. B. Du Bois, the

Afro-American Negro leader and litterateur; Samuel Coleridge Taylor, the English composer; Felix Ferrier, the Haitian architect and engineer, who built "La Ferrière," the greatest structure erected in the New World since the time of the Aztecs; Frederick Douglas, the Abolitionist and orator; Rivadavia, the first President of the Argentine Republic; Michado de Assis, the Brazilian writer, and Sebastian Gomez, the Spanish painter.

As to the result of racial intermarriage elsewhere, Dr. Oliveira Lima, Brazilian diplomat, writing in the *"Missionary Review of the World"*, July, 1924, on "Racial Intermarriage in South America," says:

Racial intermarriage, if permitted, might put an end to the "black peril," which may become a most pressing and serious one. . . . South America is free of this menace. Social controversies may arise with the development of industries and the accumulation of wealth, but irritating racial problems do not trouble us. Intermarriage is extremely repugnant to the North American communities, but as a Brazilian white man I cannot help rejoicing that such a problem is not to be found in Hispano-America and that from such intermarriage no evil consequences have resulted. . . . Intermarriage appeals to my sociological sense and to its biology presents no objection. . . . In South America our experience of centuries has taught us that there is no real understanding except the one that comes through the fusion of races.

Whatever our view, pro or con, of racial intermarriage, we cannot, in considering its ef-

fect on the color problem in the United States, ignore the reasoning of William P. Pickett, certainly no friend to the Afro-American, who, in his book "The Negro Problem," an argument for the forced migration of dark Americans to ancestral Africa, says:

Forbidden matrimonial equality, he (the Negro) cannot attain social privileges. Denied social equality, his political status becomes that of an inferior. Refused political equality, his progress in business is hampered, his education retarded, and his industrial subordination assured. (Page 23.)

Nor will it be wise to ignore the possible effect that economic and political emancipation of women, as exemplified in the Nineteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, may have on racial intermarriage in the future. Whatever one's opinion, here surely is one of the most interesting phenomena in our national life.

FA01-13

K-13