Article

European History Quarterly
43(2) 301–325

DOI: 10.1177/0265691413477069
ehq.sagepub.com
SAGE

Science, Politics, and Prejudice: The Dynamics and Significance of British Anthropology's Failure to Confront Nazi Racial Ideology

Bradley W Hart
California State University, Fresno, USA

Abstract
For two years in the turbulent mid-1930s, the Royal Anthropological Institute co-convened an expert committee tasked with scientifically evaluating Nazi claims about race. Called the Race and Culture Committee, this body was created at the behest of Charles G. Seligman and given the unofficial objective of producing a strong anti-racist statement attacking the anthropological notion of a pure Aryan race. Scientists and other scholars of Jewish descent were intentionally excluded from the Committee to pre-emptively avert attacks on the report's validity by anti-Semites. However, such a report was never produced due to the interference of members who were committed to defending Nazi Germany and the country's racial policies. Using newly uncovered sources, this article argues that the Committee was doomed to failure from the start, and that its demise prevented the collective British anthropological establishment from attacking Nazi views on race with a unified voice before the Second World War despite an emerging consensus that the German government's pronouncements were scientifically indefensible. More significantly, there is also now evidence that the obstructionist faction within the Committee was taking its ideological direction directly from German scientific practitioners with their own agendas during this period, raising questions about the relationship between science, politics, and interactions between academics and the state. It was only with the later publication of *We Europeans* that mainstream British scientists would declare their opposition to Nazi racial views, but by then the opportunity to make a more impactful stand had been lost.

Keywords
Anthropology, eugenics, Nazism, race, racial hygiene

Corresponding author:
Bradley W Hart, College of Arts and Humanities, California State University, Fresno, USA.
Email: bradley.hart@cantab.net

Between 1934 and 1936, the Royal Anthropological Institute and the Institute of Sociology jointly convened one of the most remarkable scientific committees of the turbulent interwar years. The Race and Culture Committee, as this body became known, was charged by its sponsors with the task of examining 'the significance of the racial factor in cultural development'.[1] The timing of the body's creation was far from coincidental: with the racial pronouncements emanating from Hitler's government becoming more aggressively anti-Semitic since the Nazi assumption of power and the first racial legislation starting to come into force in the country, the collective British scientific establishment was arguably left with little choice but to clarify its own views on the theories of racial identity and difference underpinning these actions. The Committee's creation was thus one of the few direct British attempts to confront Nazi racial ideology on its own terms before the Second World War's eruption, in a period when Appeasement toward Germany was still the British government's official policy. The fact that the Committee's scientific members subsequently failed in their task says much about the social and scientific climate of the 1930s and, most importantly, about the relationship between scientific practitioners, politics, and British society more widely during this turbulent period.

This article dramatically expands the present scholarly understanding of the Race and Culture Committee's dynamics and wider significance by examining the politics at the heart of its mission and results. Indeed, the Committee presents historians with an early example of scientific practitioners entering the political realm through the metaphorical back door, trying to maintain an illusion of 'objectivity' while often privately recognizing and embracing the public and political implications of their statements and actions. In this way, it serves as a supplementary and corrective study to Gary Werskey's efforts to illustrate the process of political mobilization that British science underwent in the period.[2] Further, the divisions that emerged on the Race and Culture Committee lend significant new insights into the furore over the popular scientific work *We Europeans*, an anti-racist tract published at roughly the same time with zoologist and science popularizer Julian Huxley, esteemed anthropologist Alfred C. Haddon, and demographer Alexander Carr-Saunders listed as authors.[3] This study thus presents important new evidence as to how science, politics, and society interacted in the later interwar period, and how this dynamic set the stage for post-war developments: a topic considered at some length by Dan Stone, among other scholars.[4]

The significance of the Race and Culture Committee therefore goes beyond the history of science itself, and marks an important chapter in the interwar development of discourses on race, and the relationship between science and society itself. As will be shown, efforts by some members of the Committee to defend particular racial notions were conceived within the broader context of international politics rather than simply the internal strife of scientific circles. The question of how science and society interact has long been a preoccupation of historians, and despite the recent work of Gavin Schaffer and others there remains room for a good deal of further scholarship on the subject.[5]

While past scholars including Schaffer and Elazar Barkan have correctly surmised that the Committee's ultimately ineffectual outcome was as much derived from socio-political pressures as science itself, the actual details and goals of these dynamics have only recently come to light through the discovery of new archival materials.[6] Though they disagree in some details, for both Barkan and Schaffer the Race and Culture Committee provides an important example of racial concepts remaining a contested terrain in 1930s Britain, setting the stage for the controversy surrounding *We Europeans*. Indeed, Barkan's 1992 study tracing the 'retreat of scientific racism' dedicated a section to the Committee's work, concluding that it had been convened at the behest of 'left-wingers and liberals' seeking a strong response to the increasing anti-Semitism emanating from Germany.[7] The body's eventual failure to produce a strong and unified statement doing just this, Barkan claims, 'showed that a clear authoritative statement in the name of the profession [anthropology] was impossible' due to 'professional politics'.[8]

In addition, scholars have recently begun to turn their attentions toward British notions of race in the interwar period more generally. Stone's work on the British far right has argued that there was an undercurrent of British (or indeed English) racial nationalism during the interwar period that was based in the ideas of eugenics and the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, among other influences.[9] Similarly, Tony Kushner has claimed that traditional 'liberal' arguments surrounding the widespread rejection of anti-Semitism in Britain are an oversimplification of a more complicated dynamic in which *We Europeans* and other works played an important but gradual role in defining how and why British scientists and laymen alike reassessed their own views of race.[10] As Kushner notes, within the anthropological world there was 'fluidity, confusion and shared racial discourse' between factions with ultimately differing views, leading to a confused academic understanding of race that was carried into the public discourse more generally.[11] The Race and Culture Committee was largely intended to clarify these confusions, both within the academic world and beyond.

By examining the dynamics of why the Race and Culture Committee failed, this article provides important new insights into how scientific discourses can be, and often are, appropriated in the socio-political sphere, and, furthermore, how these same non-scientific discourses can find their way into, and influence, scientific inquiry itself. The Race and Culture Committee's foundation marked a moment when the technocracy of scientific inquiry might well have influenced the political sphere, but in its outcome it achieved exactly the opposite result. Science, in this case, was directly manipulated by politically-minded figures to achieve specific and well-defined social and political aims. The fact that these aims included protecting Nazi racial ideology from criticism is a testimony to the turbulence of the interwar years, both within scientific circles and more widely.

To shed new light on how and why the Race and Culture Committee became an important early battleground in the conflict between racist and anti-racist scientific practitioners, this study is divided into three sections. The first will explore the formation and composition of the Committee, lending critical new insights into

how and why the body was created. As will be shown, the goals of the Committee's founders were hardly limited to the scientific and professional sphere and were directly oriented toward producing a specifically anti-Nazi consensus statement from the beginning.

The second section will describe why this consensus was ultimately impossible to achieve, specifically by examining the small bloc of dissenters who prevented an agreement from being reached, using newly uncovered correspondence and draft documents from the Committee's proceedings. These important sources were unavailable to previous scholars, leading them to underestimate the goals and ultimate influence of these individuals. The final section will briefly discuss the impact of the Committee's fissures within the broader context of British science during the period using these same resources, particularly in regard to *We Europeans* and post-war efforts to distance British anthropology in particular, and science more widely, from Nazism retrospectively.

At the most basic level, there was little consensus that the Race and Culture Committee's proceedings actually revealed and, if anything, its results reflected the deep divisions present within British scientific circles on racial matters more generally. The only major publication stemming from its deliberations and the mountain of papers it produced was a short 'interim report' pamphlet carrying the body's name as the title and offering two entirely conflicting 'suggested definitions' of race.[12] The first of these definitions argued that races were highly complicated entities that could not be easily defined using even the most advanced scientific techniques: 'A Race is composed of one or more interbreeding groups of individuals and their descendants, possessing in common a number of innate characteristics which distinguish them from other groups', it began.[13]

The statement continued by casting doubt on the notion that scientists had properly identified what these traits actually were, stating that 'in defining races, both descriptive and measurable characters can be used. Caution is necessary in the use of statistical averages, which may obscure the fact that several diverse strains persist side by side within an interbreeding population'. This definition, it concluded, would 'in some cases apply to the whole population of a particular area if it breeds freely; it may also apply to an interbreeding portion of a group within a particular area provided that this portion carries a number of common innate characteristics distinguishing it from other groups'.[14]

The Committee's second proposed definition was far simpler:

> by Race is meant a biological group or stock possessing in common an undetermined number of associated genetical characteristics by which it can be distinguished from other groups, and by which its descendants will be distinguished under conditions of continuous isolation (*i.e.* so long as the stock is preserved against internal dilution).[15]

Simply put, under this definition 'race' was simply shorthand for a series of traits that would continue to be passed through a given population in the absence of

miscegenation with other groups. A race, therefore, was to be defined by the shared, empirically-quantifiable genetic characteristics of a given community.

The meaningful fault line between these definitions can be difficult to immediately discern. In essence, the first proposal relied heavily on the notion of shared geography and physical origins: a race, it stated, was simply a group that had developed over the centuries in the same physical area, and consequently possessed similar 'innate' and transmittable characteristics produced by the evolutionary process. Indeed, the fact that the term 'interbreeding' was prominently used could even be construed to suggest that there was really only one race of humans, given the physical ability of any healthy human couple to produce children. Determining the common physical characteristics that could be used to define subdivisions of these large interbreeding groups was thus the task of anthropologists and other scientific practitioners.

The second definition was significantly more conservative in its scope and theoretical underpinnings. Races, it argued, were not defined by physical origins or location, but by shared innate characteristics themselves. Members of the 'Aryan' race, for instance, would remain Aryan as long as they remained free from miscegenation with other races, and even if they relocated themselves to live among other racial communities. Social integration and interbreeding with another population would thus only produce dilution of the existing race and its eventual destruction. As one contributor summarized it, 'all such differentiated types [races], however large or small the differences, must be the result of isolation of the descendants of certain groups'. In the modern world, the author went on, this process of isolation was now being reversed, and 'intermixture has largely taken the place of isolation as an evolutionary factor'.[16] Thus, the term 'race' referred to a crude but useful way of classifying the descendants of previously purer groups that were now endangered by the vagaries and physical mobility of modern life.

Given this bold division of opinion on what was construed as a straightforward scientific question, it is little surprise that the Committee reached even less concrete results in its efforts to define the term 'culture'. Effectively pushing the definitional aspect of its purview to the side, the Committee's report simply concluded that the three 'conditioning factors' of culture were 'innate endowment of individuals', 'transmitted experience', and 'physical environment': three extremely broad threads of anthropological thought that, taken to their respective extremes, were fundamentally incompatible with one another.[17]

Sensing these obvious ambiguities and conflicts, the report's editors spent its remaining pages printing statements authored by various Committee members endorsing and attacking aspects of these proposals. There was little, if any, consensus to be found and clearly little appetite to directly attack Nazi racial ideology in any systematic way. To step into the political climate of the time, the Committee's first definition of race could be viewed as a veiled attack on Nazism, largely due to its reliance on 'interbreeding' potential, while the second definition was much more essentialist and could be read as endorsing the view that innate racial characteristics were worth protecting from destructive miscegenation.

Likewise, the unchangeable nature of racial inheritance it proposed could be interpreted as directly supporting anti-Semitic views about the racial status of Jews. As will be shown, these political implications were not an afterthought, but at the forefront of the Committee's internal discussions and outcome.

Forming the Race and Culture Committee

The force behind the Race and Culture Committee's creation was Charles G. Seligman, one of the leading lights of early twentieth-century British anthropology. Seligman's first major claim to academic fame had been as part of the Torres Strait expedition in the 1890s, and upon his return he became a professor at the London School of Economics (LSE), where he remained until retiring in 1934. In this capacity he served as a mentor to many of the leading lights of anthropology for the rest of the century, including Edward Evan Evans-Pritchard and, perhaps most significantly, Bronislaw Malinowski, with whom he clashed over the fundamental nature of anthropology.[18] This academic genealogy was a critical contributor to the Committee's composition.

By the mid-1930s, Seligman was at the end of his career and contemplating retirement from the LSE. It is clear that he saw the Race and Culture Committee's work as an important attack on Nazi racial claims that was necessary for both political and scientific reasons. His initial plan to seat a committee to critique Nazi racial claims was hatched in consultation with Oxford archaeologist John Linton Myres, as was the appointment of Raymond Firth, a young but quickly advancing anthropologist, as secretary.[19] The remaining membership was more contentious, but included a number of notable figures. Sitting on the moderately anti-racist, or at least anti-Nazi, side of the Committee was an overwhelming majority of members, officially including anatomist Grafton Elliot Smith (Committee chairman), anatomist Wilfrid Edward Le Gros Clark, geographer Herbert J. Fleure, anthropologist Geoffrey Morant, Firth, Myres, and human heredity researcher J. B. S. Haldane.[20] This loose-knit faction would be opposed by two lesser-known figures: anthropologist George Pitt-Rivers and botanist Reginald Ruggles Gates, both of whom were already well-known for holding controversial views on race. The Committee's final publication also listed psychologist John Carl Flügel, anthropologist C. Daryll Forde, and archaeologist Louis S. B. Leakey as Committee members, but these figures seem to have contributed little to the discussions and did not publish individual reports.[21]

The Committee's membership, while academically impressive, was drawn up with more than scientific considerations in mind. After consulting colleagues, Seligman and Myres agreed that Jewish scholars should be excluded from the Committee's formal membership. Seligman had considered appointing LSE sociologist Morris Ginsberg to the body, but demurred when faced with direct objections to his membership on the basis of his religion.[22] Ginsberg was thus relegated to the role of 'adviser' to the body, and Seligman similarly considered appointing

Jewish biologist and historian of medicine Charles Singer to a similar position.[23] It is unclear whether Seligman, himself Jewish, sought to keep his own integral role in the Committee quiet for the same reason, as his name was excluded from the official list of participants in the Committee's final publication.[24] Regardless, it is obvious that he closely followed its proceedings, and it is interesting that Pitt-Rivers listed him among its participants in a 1935 letter describing the Committee's membership.[25] Pitt-Rivers also listed Ignaz Zollschan, a Jewish doctor from Czechoslovakia visiting Britain on an anti-Nazi education mission, as a member, though he too was excluded from the official list of contributors in the body's eventual report.[26]

The outcome of the Race and Culture Committee's deliberations was intended to be a single multi-author volume setting out a scientific critique of race. Seligman was particularly eager to avoid producing a 'symposium' publication in which 'people will to a certain extent either go further than they ought or hedge unduly'.[27] There was to be no ambiguity in the outcome of these deliberations, and no unscientific grounds from which to attack the result. For this reason, Seligman had decided to pre-emptively exclude Jews from authoring any part of its proceedings and even alluded to the creation of a 'non-Jewish travel fund' to subsidize the participation of the contributors he wanted to take part.[28] Essentially, Seligman was hoping to produce a document very much like *We Europeans*, but featuring the names of Britain's leading anthropologists, archaeologists, and heredity researchers as the authors. As Seligman told Smith, the objective of all this was political rather than exclusively scientific:

> My reason for bringing this forward now and considering it urgent is the altered state of things in Germany. Whereas before June 30th [the Night of the Long Knives] many people, myself included, thought the Hitlet [*sic*] regime likely to last for an indefinite period, there now seems to be a strong feeling that it may go to pieces during the coming autumn or winter. Although we cannot influence Germany, I think it would be well to have a statement before the public in order to take whatever chance there may be of influencing public opinion against the continuance of the more extreme results of the present Aryan fallacy when a new regime emerges.[29]

The Race and Culture Committee was therefore an attempt to force scientific practitioners toward direct political involvement at a time of growing crisis. As Werskey's work has made clear, this was far from the default position for scientific researchers to take in the interwar years, regardless of their political convictions.[30] Haldane, a committed Communist and a staunch critic of traditional racial prejudice, was a prominent example of a scientist who had not shied from expressing strong political views in the past, and it is telling that Seligman was particularly eager to secure his involvement with the Committee.[31] Clearly sensing the power that scientific language had given the Nazi regime both within Germany and abroad, Seligman was seeking a way to attack these notions using Britain's leading scientific figures as his allies.[32]

At the same time, however, these membership demographics prompt an important question: if the goal of the Race and Culture Committee was to produce a strong statement opposing Nazi racism, why include Pitt-Rivers and Gates at all? Both men's provocative views on race, and their stances toward Nazi Germany, were widely known by the mid-1930s, and they could hardly be expected to sign up to a statement that in any way challenged prevailing concepts of race or the political *status quo*.[33] The key to these men's inclusion lies in the hierarchical nature of British academic culture in the period. For his part, Gates was easily one of the most respected hereditary researchers of the time, being elected to the Royal Society in 1931 and holding a chair in botany at King's College London.[34] As a prominent writer on racial and eugenic issues, it would have been difficult to exclude him from the proceedings while maintaining the perception of impartiality that Seligman was seeking.[35]

Pitt-Rivers likely obtained his position through similar dynamics. Although the most forgotten of the Committee's members, Pitt-Rivers was highly regarded and well connected within the anthropological establishment at the time.[36] After the First World War he had been tutored by Malinowski and conducted fieldwork in the South Pacific that was eventually published in a *de facto* doctoral thesis entitled *The Clash of Culture and the Contact of Races* that examined processes of cultural 'collapse' and group extinction.[37] In 1922, before these findings had been published, Pitt-Rivers was elected to the Royal Anthropological Institute, extending him a large degree of professional respectability and ensuring his inclusion at major academic gatherings.[38] Malinowski later used Pitt-Rivers as the external examiner for Raymond Firth's doctoral thesis, and Firth himself described Pitt-Rivers' work in the study as 'brilliant'.[39] This level of academic respectability, coupled with his close connections to Malinowski, Gates, and the prominent anthropologist Arthur Keith, effectively guaranteed Pitt-Rivers a seat at the Race and Culture Committee's table. However, by the mid-1930s these academic activities had led to a developing affinity for Nazi racial policies and Hitler's regime itself. In one remarkable example, Pitt-Rivers wrote a 'scientific' article explicitly endorsing fascism in 1934, claiming that it represented a 'new determinism and hope', and that the 'disease' responsible for destroying past societies and cultures might be averted in Europe through its 'new Renaissance'.[40] Extraordinarily, this piece was published in a *Festschrift* honouring Seligman himself.[41]

Indeed, both explicit and implicit anti-Semitism underpinned much of both Gates' and Pitt-Rivers' academic work throughout their careers.[42] Both men were long-time and leading members of the Eugenics Society and tried to direct the organization's activities toward examining the consequences of racial miscegenation over the frequent objections of the body's leadership.[43] For his part, Pitt-Rivers had been obsessed with 'anthropologically' studying Jewish populations since before his Pacific fieldwork. In 1920, he had published a short and controversial tract accusing a worldwide Jewish conspiracy of being responsible for the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, and he continued to view Jews through a similarly conspiratorial lens for decades to come.[44] Both Pitt-Rivers and Gates were close

friends and intellectual followers of Keith, who himself spent decades trying to archaeologically and anthropologically determine the origins of various 'races', which he saw as natural divisions of mankind.[45] Keith was impressed by Pitt-Rivers' tenacity and scientific theories, agreeing to write the introduction to one of Pitt-Rivers' books and telling him that 'no one is so well fitted as you to put up the case for Eugenics'.[46] As Keith was one of Britain's most famous living anthropologists in the period, this was a significant compliment. In late 1935, Keith seconded Pitt-Rivers' nomination for membership in the prestigious Athenaeum Club, indicating the depth of their friendship.[47]

The Failure of Consensus

Even if the Race and Culture Committee's task of producing a consensus anti-Nazi statement was never explicitly expressed to most of its members, Gates and Pitt-Rivers quickly realized the political implications of its activities and took a shared defensive stand for Nazi racial views. At the same time, they carefully cloaked their own activities in the guise of the same scientific objectivity that Seligman himself was keen to cultivate. Perhaps sensing the probability of a split within its membership, and undoubtedly encouraged by Seligman, Herbert Fleure tried to bring the Committee's deliberations to a premature end following a series of meetings in early 1935. In February, he asked Firth to circulate a draft statement stating that the Committee had 'unanimously' agreed to the simple definition of a race as 'a number of persons possessing in common a number of innate physical characteristics, and, by interbreeding, normally transmitting these to their descendants'.[48]

The circulation of this 'consensus' definition set off an immediate firestorm. It quickly emerged that its phrasing was hardly acceptable to most Committee members, least of all Pitt-Rivers and Gates, and it quickly resulted in the circulation of various individual definitions that would later became the individual 'dissenting' statements included in the final publication. Gates' and Pitt-Rivers' primary concern appears to have been with the concept of interbreeding: people of differing races, after all, had long been known to successfully produce reproductively-viable offspring. If successful breeding alone were the sole marker of a 'race', every living human might conceivably be considered to be of the same race.

The second area of concern for Gates and Pitt-Rivers lay in the efforts of some (possibly most) Committee members to claim that geographical location and physical segregation was one of the defining characteristics of a race.[49] This assertion, which was most directly expressed by Haldane in his contribution to the Committee's report, troubled particularly Pitt-Rivers because it implied that one of the most important 'races' featuring in his work might not in fact exist: the Jews. On a draft of Haldane's statement emphasizing 'geographical distribution' as an important aspect of racial distinction he dismissively scrawled 'Jews presumably do not exist?'[50] He summarized his overall concerns thus: 'my objection to J.B.S. Haldane and Elliot Smith's [similar] definitions, following older definitions of race, is, as I have said before, reference to origin and geographical habitat'.[51]

Both Gates and Pitt-Rivers agreed that the Race and Culture Committee's report must not contain a consensus definition of race that included any references to geographical segregation because this would fundamentally undermine their own claims about both the Jews and, no less important, the Aryan race being touted by Nazi propaganda. Pitt-Rivers was also deeply concerned about the possible political implications of such a statement being published by an authority as venerable as the Royal Anthropological Institute. Since 1934, he had been regularly travelling to Germany to give university lectures on anthropology, eugenics, and racial issues, finding the country to be particularly welcoming to his views. In lectures at Königsberg and Berlin he began to publicize a new academic field he envisioned creating, termed 'ethnogenics', which would deal with 'the prognosis of race, population, and culture change, and the aetiology of that change in the past'.[52] The ultimate aim, he claimed, was 'preserving those types and those races which enrich our civilization'.[53]

Perhaps predictably, these assertions, and their clear political implications, were well received in the racially and eugenically-charged climate of Germany, and Pitt-Rivers enjoyed a number of prominent contacts in the country's anthropological establishment. Concerned that the Race and Culture Committee was about to disseminate an explicitly or implicitly anti-Nazi statement, in mid-1935 he reached out directly to one of these connections, Königsberg racial anthropologist Lothar Loeffler, for information he might be able to use to influence the Committee's discussions. Loeffler was a high-profile German eugenicist and anthropological researcher who had once served as legendary racial hygienist Eugen Fischer's assistant.[54] In 1932 Loeffler joined the Nazi Party and soon became the head of the Königsberg University Racial Biology Institute.[55] Pitt-Rivers met him in this capacity during a 1934 lecture tour at Fischer's personal urging.[56]

In April 1935, Pitt-Rivers leaked Loeffler draft documents from the Race and Culture Committee's confidential discussions, along with a pamphlet authored by Zollschan and an appendix entitled 'Scientific as Against Political Implications of the Aryan Question' that he had authored and planned to distribute to his fellow members. 'I should be very glad to know from you that I have correctly interpreted the attitude of German anthropologists', he told Loeffler.[57] If Pitt-Rivers was indeed seeking ammunition to use against his fellow Committee members, Loeffler was happy to provide it. Through a mutual acquaintance, Loeffler provided Pitt-Rivers with a scathing rebuke of the Committee's work. Remarkably, however, Loeffler also explicitly admitted to Pitt-Rivers that the German government's own assertions about the Aryan race were themselves *not* scientifically valid, but had to be maintained for political purposes. Pitt-Rivers summarized the situation to his fellow Committee members in a memorandum:

> The German Government privately agree that the public use by them of the word *Aryan* is unscientific, but it has now acquired a new meaning as a result of their use of it, and to change the word would be interpreted as dropping the *Aryan* clause [of the Nuremberg Laws and other legislation] – or weakening it. German University

> anthropologists [Loeffler] interpret their duty as to back up their Government politically but to secure their scientific position in a way that does not interfere with that. The original *Aryan* clause was issued in a hurry without consulting the scientists.[58]

This memorandum was effectively a warning against including provocative anti-Nazi statements in the Committee's final report. To denounce Nazi racial views, Pitt-Rivers was effectively arguing, would take the Committee into the realm of politics rather than science.

At the same time, however, this scientific *tu quoque* also opened the door to the possibility of a strange scientific détente between Germany and Britain, under which the scientific practitioners of these countries would admit privately that the wider public and political understanding of race was effectively incorrect, but should not be attacked openly for fear of antagonizing wider international issues. With German anthropologists effectively conceding that their own definitions did not stand up to scientific scrutiny, Pitt-Rivers was implying, the British scientific establishment had no right to attack Nazi racial theory without entering the non-scientific domain and potentially heightening international tensions. To increase the perceived gravity of the situation, Pitt-Rivers referred to Loeffler as merely 'an academic source' in his memorandum, and explicitly stated that his assertions were 'communicated privately' to the Committee.[59]

The second half of Pitt-Rivers' memorandum, also derived directly from Loeffler's letter, accused the British of equally misappropriating racial science to attack Germany:

> The attitude of German Anthropologists has recently stiffened by finding, since the International Anthropological Congress in London, that the sentence the German delegation objected to in the Chairman's address by Grafton Elliot Smith was not eliminated from the published report recently received. They claim that its withdrawal was promised . . . and that the English Chairman's reference to the *Aryan* question represented a straying from the scientific to the political field . . . so that in both counties there is an equal misuse of the word outside the scientific world, while within that world there should be perfect identity of view.[60]

Thus, Pitt-Rivers was effectively claiming, statements attacking Nazism would endanger scientific collaboration and wider relations between the countries during a particularly delicate period.

Tellingly, Pitt-Rivers also evoked the spectre of a recent public dispute to reinforce his point. German anthropologists, he wrote, had been deeply offended by the recent 'unscientific and political' use of the term 'Aryan' by government minister Sir John Simon (later Viscount Simon), who was then serving as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.[61] In mid-1934, Simon had become the victim of an anti-Semitic whispering campaign designed to undermine his Cabinet authority by suggesting that he was secretly Jewish and was therefore incapable of conducting a fair and

impartial policy toward Germany.[62] Perturbed by these rumours, Simon wrote a letter to *The Times* strongly denying that he had any Jewish ancestry and identifying himself as 'an ordinary Briton of Aryan stock without any Jewish admixture whatever . . . nobody who knew my relations and forebears would imagine that they were Jewish'.[63]

Simon's letter seems to have ended the rumours about his own ancestry, but at the same time sparked a more unexpected public controversy. This new debate surrounded Simon's use of the term 'Aryan' to describe his ancestry, and largely presaged the eventual split within the Race and Culture committee itself. Three days after Simon's letter appeared in *The Times*, a letter signed by Haddon, Haldane, and Nobel Prize winning biochemist Frederick Gowland Hopkins directly condemned Simon's use of the term. 'The use of the word Aryan in a letter by Sir John Simon . . . might have been passed over in silence had it been written by any other than a Minister of the Crown', they wrote. The authors went on:

> Anthropologists have long recognized that although there are Aryan languages there is no legitimate use of the word as applied to race or stock in Western Europe . . . We do not question the appropriateness of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs correcting an erroneous impression as to his ancestry. It is, however, unfortunate that he should misuse a scientific term in a sense that politically has done so much damage in Germany.[64]

These provocative assertions did not go unanswered. Arthur Keith was the first critic to respond, a day later, claiming that Simon had been correct in his use of the term and rhetorically asking 'what other term could he have used to cover the meaning he wished to express?'[65] Grafton Elliot Smith responded by turning the tables and asking Keith, 'what is wrong with the term ''English'', which would have covered the meaning he wished to express?'[66] Other contributors, including Haldane and Seligman, likewise weighed in reiterate the claim that 'the philological term ''Aryan''' had no relationship to any currently existing racial group, as no single race or group could be proven to be 'the original Aryan-speaking stock which passed to others its Aryan tongue'.[67]

This contentious back-and-forth continued for days, with the correspondence section of *The Times* suddenly becoming the venue for a discussion that included Britain's leading anthropological practitioners and the public alike. The question of what defined a 'race' itself was at the core of this debate, and predictably, anti-Semitism quickly became the real focus of discussion. Keith was the first to bring this point directly to the fore. 'Sir Grafton asks, ''What is wrong with the term 'English'?''', he wrote. He continued:

> What is wrong is this – Sir John can certainly claim to be 'English.' So, too, can Sir Herbert Samuel, Lord Reading, and scores of men who have rendered great and abiding service to England, and yet, although they are 'English', rightly claim descent from a racial stock which was and is native to the East [the Jews].[68]

Gates and Pitt-Rivers themselves soon joined the discussion, publishing statements that corresponded almost exactly with the position they would later take in the Race and Culture Committee's final report.

The editors of *The Times* soon shut down this public forum with an editorial expressing surprise about the ferocity of the debate. 'Not long ago "Aryan man" was one of those popularized scientific phrases of which the layman was quite sure he knew the general meaning', the paper's editorialist wrote. 'Then, because the term, further confused with the pseudo-connotation of Nordic and associated with fair hair, was adopted as a justification for political intolerance, it was recently discredited as having no useful meaning in common speech. Now, after all, there are found authorities to defend it.'[69] The evocation of this episode in Pitt-Rivers' memorandum was clearly intended to further convince Committee members that the term 'Aryan', scientifically valid or not, had effectively become a political pawn in both Nazi Germany and elsewhere. Indeed, the Race and Culture Committee's discussions themselves were effectively the private continuation of this same debate, featuring many of the same participants.

Rather than simply preventing his anti-Nazi colleagues from presenting their own definitions of race, Pitt-Rivers now took control of the situation and insisted on the inclusion of a definition that would be far more amenable to German views. It is clear that Pitt-Rivers himself authored this statement, as it is nearly identical to his writings elsewhere, and he bragged in private correspondence with Gates that this definition 'appeared to get general endorsement' from German academics during his lectures in the country.[70] This statement became the shorter 'second definition' of race that was included in the final Race and Culture Committee report.

In light of these developments, by late 1935 Firth had resigned himself to the view that the Committee would never be able to produce the single, authoritative statement that Seligman had been seeking. The publication would be divided into the two definitions that had been agreed to after much discussion, followed by individual dissenting statements. In an effort to achieve at least some agreement, Firth asked the Committee members to suggest changes for each set of individual remarks, some of which were subsequently agreed to and others rejected by the original author. Even after this process had been seemingly completed, however, Pitt-Rivers tried to derail the Committee's work at the last moment. Sending a telegram to Firth in November 1935, he accused fellow Committee members of 'mutilating' his personal contribution and demanded that Firth allow him to modify it, on the threat that he would otherwise refuse to be included in the publication.[71]

Incensed, Firth reluctantly agreed, and it was in these 'corrections' that Pitt-Rivers introduced a citation to the 'consensus section' of the report that attacked anthropologist Franz Boas, along with an important caveat into his own section: 'the term *Aryan* has been used in Germany to focus political attention on the Jewish question', he wrote. '*Aryan race* no less than *English race* should not be interpreted in either country as the adoption of a scientific terminology.'[72]

By introducing these changes at the last minute, Pitt-Rivers was ensuring that they would almost certainly be accepted by the Committee with little or no further scrutiny, and, indeed, these modifications appeared nearly verbatim in the Committee's final report.[73]

With these amendments, any remaining sense of consensus had effectively been destroyed, with almost absurd results. Why bother to cite Boas at all, when the citation included a caveat stating that his work was essentially not worth consulting? This confusion, of course, was exactly the goal that Gates and Pitt-Rivers had successfully pursued. Rather than gain a new and more sophisticated understanding of why Nazi racial ideas were scientifically invalid, readers of the Race and Culture pamphlet would be left with the impression that scientists themselves were divided on the matter. Partly by sheer persistence and partly through a last-minute gambit, Pitt-Rivers and Gates had together ensured that British anthropology would miss its best opportunity to confront Nazi racial theory scientifically before the Second World War.

These efforts were made with a clear foreign policy objective in mind as well. Sending a copy of the Committee's published pamphlet to a contact in the German scientific establishment, Pitt-Rivers noted that 'you will see that at least two members of that Committee, Professor Ruggles Gates and myself, are working for a better understanding with German men of science'.[74] Détente with Nazi Germany and synchronicity with its approved scientific views was the ultimate goal, not merely derailing the efforts of other anthropologists who hoped to call these same views into question. Just as Seligman had explicitly created the Committee to achieve a political goal, Pitt-Rivers and Gates had managed to take control of its proceedings to achieve their own political aims, in large part by simply obstructing its activities.

From the Race and Culture Committee to *We Europeans*

Indeed, the fallout from the Race and Culture Committee's failure to reach a consensus view was wide-ranging. Pitt-Rivers was pleased by the outcome, suggesting to Firth that the pamphlet could be followed by 'a fuller and better publication with international commentaries' and offering suggestions on how its technical terminology might be accurately translated into German and French.[75] As it turned out, however, this moment of triumph was short-lived. At nearly the same time as the publication of the Committee's report, the appearance of the strongly anti-racist tract *We Europeans* strongly challenged the views that Pitt-Rivers and Gates sought to defend. Bearing the names of Julian Huxley, Alfred Haddon, and Alexander Carr-Saunders, both Pitt-Rivers and Gates conspiratorially suspected the involvement of other, possibly Jewish, figures in its authorship. In fact they were at least somewhat correct in this suspicion: Charles Singer, the historian of science who had been retained by Seligman as an 'adviser' to the Race and Culture Committee though his name never appeared in its official documents, played a leading role in writing *We Europeans* and later penned an anti-Nazi tract

entitled *The Argument of Blood* that carried Huxley's name.[76] As Schaffer has noted, due to these circumstances and the on-going efforts of Seligman, Haddon, and others to avoid the libellous criticism of 'Jewish control', it is likely that the actual authorship of *We Europeans* will remain shrouded in mystery.[77]

In essence, *We Europeans* presented the view that the concept of race itself was scientifically meaningless. The idea that modern-day 'races' were descended from racially pure and isolated groups in past times was a 'fallacy', the authors wrote.[78] The notion that language families themselves could be used to define these racial groups, as Pitt-Rivers and others, including Keith, had directly argued in respect to Aryans, was equally incorrect. 'There are a great many examples in history of a conquering people forcing its language on the conquered; and also a great many examples of the converse process, of the conquering invaders adopting the language of the country they have invaded' the authors stated. 'It is thus quite improper to speak of a ''Celtic race'' ... Similarly there is not and cannot be such a thing as an Aryan race, since the term Aryan refers to language.'[79]

Even more aggressively, *We Europeans*' authors sought to directly attack the very notion of a Jewish race at its core. There was in reality no 'Jewish race' at all, they wrote, in the same way there was no definable German race or English race. Jews currently living in Europe were of 'mixed descent' and simply shared 'religious and social traditions' but had little or no hereditary relation to one another.[80] In contrast to the claims of anti-Semites, 'Jews do not constitute a race, but a society forming a pseudo-national group with a strong religious basis and with peculiar historic traditions. Biologically it is almost as illegitimate to speak of a ''Jewish race'' as of an ''Aryan race'''.[81] The notion of an Aryan or Nordic race itself, they continued, was based upon the 'myth' of the 'hypothetical' existence of a past group that could not be scientifically supported.[82] The idea that this race was hereditarily superior to others was 'based on nothing more serious than self-interest and wish-fulfilment ... The Nordic type may be held up as an ideal, but this ideal is genetically unattainable, and will not affect the biological realities of the situation'.[83] In the final reckoning, the authors concluded, racism was simply 'a symptom of Europe's exaggerated nationalism' rather than any kind of scientific inquiry. Scientists themselves should combat it, they wrote, 'by pointing out the biological realities of the ethnic situation, and by refusing to lend her [science's] sanction to the absurdities and the horrors perpetuated in her name. Racialism is a myth, and a dangerous myth at that ... And it is not scientifically-grounded. The essence of science is the appeal to fact'.[84]

Pitt-Rivers and Gates were greatly displeased by these assertions. Indeed, *We Europeans* was a crushing public defeat on the heels of their relative success in obfuscating the Race and Culture Committee's report. The fact that A. C. Haddon's name was on the title page had given the book significant scientific credibility and served to make the blow even more bitter for Pitt-Rivers. He characteristically blamed the Jews for its publication, claiming that Huxley had effectively taken advantage of Haddon, a widely respected and now elderly Cambridge anthropologist, for political purposes:

> I very much resented his [Huxley's] little book 'We Europeans' a copy of which he sent me. It is pure Jew propaganda and A. C. Haddon was dragged in to give it a spurious appearance of being a scientific and anthropological book. I do not believe that A. C. Haddon wrote a word of it. It was due largely to Carr-Saunders who has been very active in Pan-Judaistic propaganda lately, collecting funds etc., for the so called Academic Assistance Council, i.e. the committee established for the purpose of controlling all our universities by emigre Jews.[85]

Huxley refused to take this type of criticism sitting down, and aggressively attacked the Race and Culture Committee's report in public as well. By chance, Gates was actually present for a public diatribe in which Huxley singled out his individual contribution to the Committee report for a biting critique. 'I thought he made a very weak case', Gates told Pitt-Rivers. 'I did not realise that his thinking on the subject was so muddled by his socialism'.[86] Muddled or otherwise, Huxley's thoughts soon led to an acrimonious series of personal correspondence between him and Gates, in which the latter accused the former of being a propagandist. 'Yes, of course *We Europeans* was written as a retort to Nazi pseudo-science', Huxley replied. 'But it was written as a scientific and not as a propagandist book, because we considered this by far the most effective retort. If you like to say that it is still propaganda, that is merely an unusual use of words. What I reject is your assertion that it is unscientific and tendentious'.[87]

At their core, both *We Europeans* and the Race and Culture Committee report were indeed 'propaganda' in the broad sense that they sought to advance particular views and arguments to the public in a clear and simplified manner. It is clear that Seligman had initially hoped to make the Committee's report a smaller, more accessible, and authoritative statement similar in content to *We Europeans*. His correspondence with Firth indicate that he hoped a strong statement denouncing Nazi racial claims from the British anthropological establishment would have far-reaching effects both inside and outside Germany. He intentionally excluded Jewish scholars from the body's official membership to pre-empt the anti-Semitic accusation that its results were influenced by political rather than scientific motives, and it is possible, if not likely, that Gates and Pitt-Rivers were included to provide dissenting voices for this same reason.

These plans were effectively thwarted by the tenacity of Gates and Pitt-Rivers, who proved adept at manipulating circumstances to their benefit. By exploiting the epistemic shortcomings of human anthropology, they were able to ensure that the Committee could not in good conscience produce a unified report but was instead forced to put forward a document riddled with ambiguities and specialist language. The confusion inherent in the Committee's report was obvious to any reader, and it would do little to convince non-specialists that Nazi racial claims were scientifically unsupportable, given that both Gates and Pitt-Rivers were arguing that they were fundamentally valid. Derailing the unified message of the Committee's deliberations was thus the goal, and one that proved relatively easy to achieve.

At the heart of the Pitt-Rivers/Gates argument was the claim that by examining the notion of race, anthropologists were making an unscientific leap into the socio-political sphere. Pitt-Rivers' main memorandum effectively proposed a truce between Britain and Germany on these types of 'political' questions: if British anthropologists would avoid criticizing the 'unscientific' idea of an Aryan race, the Germans would avoid criticizing the British for their own abuse of the term, as supposedly demonstrated by the public controversy over Sir John Simon's ancestry. The notion of an Aryan or Nordic race, this argument assumed, was important enough that it should be protected by the scientific establishments of both countries. Further, Pitt-Rivers argued, to attack German anthropology even after one of its leading practitioners had privately admitted that there was no Aryan race in the way Nazi ideology claimed would be a political rather than scientific move, and would endanger relations between the two countries generally. Implicit in this was the claim that some elements in British science, namely Jews and socialists, were pushing for this outcome, and that these efforts to drive Britain and Germany apart should be resisted.

Further, it is significant and telling that a leading German anthropologist such as Loeffler would be willing to admit his own cynicism in supporting Nazi racial policies that were already widely known to be 'unscientific'. If German anthropologists were privately acknowledging that their own government's assertions were indefensible but had to be maintained for wider political purposes, this would suggest that some were actually in a form of agreement with the British figures who refused to confront these same Nazi claims out of their own political considerations. On both sides of the divide considered here, scientific practitioners were knowingly entering the political realm by either calling for decisive and authoritative action, as in Seligman's case, or insisting on silence in the face of the actual scientific evidence, as in the case of Pitt-Rivers, Gates, and Loeffler. Faced with these clear choices, the voices calling for caution to avoid upsetting a delicate *status quo* temporarily prevailed until the anti-racist faction headed by Huxley could fully mobilize its resources outside the traditional academic establishment.

These troubling debates over the concept of race were eventually silenced by the onset of the Second World War, and only then because the conflict had changed the acceptable bounds of discussion. Gates remained deeply racist for the rest of his lengthy career, claiming that Jews were conspiring against him and openly pursuing racial research in the post-war world that was no longer publically acceptable.[88] Pitt-Rivers, on the other hand, suffered a more ignominious fate. As the Second World War approached his affinity with Hitler became more pronounced, and in 1938 he published a book 'anthropologically' examining the demographics of the disputed Sudetenland. Perhaps predictably, his study concluded that Hitler's claims to the territory were morally justified by the alleged maltreatment of the German population by the ruling Czechs.[89] At the same time, he once again blamed the Jews for trying to lure Britain into a Second World War.

These actions had consequences, and in 1940 Pitt-Rivers was arrested on the orders of the Home Secretary and taken to a detention facility for suspected

Nazi sympathizers. He remained in custody for more than a year before being released for health reasons. One of the few scientific figures who stood by him throughout this period was Keith, who offered to help secure his release to continue his scientific work. 'If ever you need reference as to the value of your scientific work . . . call me as a witness', Keith told him in 1942.[90] Science and anthropology were in many ways the last-resort defence for Pitt-Rivers, both intellectually and legally. Under interrogation, he denied harbouring any particular sympathies for Nazism, and claimed that his contacts in Germany and visits there had been obtained through normal scientific channels. In this way, Pitt-Rivers never backed away from the 'science' that he had worked hard to defend on the Race and Culture Committee, even when his fellow scientific practitioners attempted to force their own more moderate views ahead of his.[91]

Pitt-Rivers never published another anthropological work after the Second World War, marking an almost stunning reversal of fortune for a researcher who had been widely respected and published in the discipline's leading journals only a decade before.[92] In many ways, forcing his own definition of race into the Race and Culture Committee's report was the high-water mark of his career. However, even after the Second World War, Pitt-Rivers remained convinced that Jews posed a scientifically-demonstrable threat to the state and that only Hitler had properly appreciated the urgency of this danger. 'The problems of Jewry and of anti-Semitism reside in Jewish policy of miscegenation, their melting-pot philosophy, which is a policy of race-extinction and fundamentally opposed to the process of race-formation and race segregation which is fundamental to tribal peoples', Pitt-Rivers scrawled in his copy of Keith's 1948 *A New Theory of Human Evolution*. 'The recent war essentially expressed this conflict between the tribal or endemic race-consciousness of the Germanic peoples and the epidemic . . . of the Jewish and melting pot philosophy.'[93] For Pitt-Rivers, eugenics and anthropology had demonstrated the objective importance of Aryan racial consciousness, and he never appears to have retreated from his views on the subject. Keith continued his own work into old age, publishing a tract linking evolutionary processes to anti-Semitism and, ultimately, the events of the Second World War shortly after the conflict's conclusion.[94] In his 1950 autobiography he described Pitt-Rivers as having 'only clear-cut opinions' and bemoaned his Second World War internment.[95] Gates, for his part, continued publishing studies largely following the model of his earlier work until his death in the 1960s, causing a good deal of controversy in the process.[96]

Pitt-Rivers' main contact in the German racial hygiene establishment suffered a similar fate. Throughout the Third Reich's existence, Lothar Loeffler used his long-standing position in the Nazi Party to oppose what he perceived as unscientific racial theories being advanced by the SS and the regime's ideologues. He soon became embroiled in a conflict with Nazi demagogue, *Der Stürmer* publisher, and *Gauleiter* Julius Streicher over the science of paternity testing, with which Streicher's own racial inheritance theories clashed.[97] However, this opposition to 'unscientific' racial concepts by Loeffler was matched by an obsession with

determining new 'scientific' methods of racial classification. During the Second World War, Loeffler became involved in wartime research efforts to develop a 'racial diagnosis' blood test, indicating his deep interest in the 'science' of racial classification.[98]

Given all this, what can be learned from the Race and Culture Committee's failure to denounce Nazi racial views in the years before the Second World War? For one, the new source material considered here conclusively shows that the Race and Culture Committee was home to two main factions: the anti-racists who were seeking to use it as a venue to attack Nazi racial ideology, and a smaller rump faction of racist anthropologists, Gates and Pitt-Rivers, who were determined that this should not happen for both scientific and political reasons. While in retrospect it would have likely been advantageous to have simply excluded these men from the Committee, the formal nature of British scientific culture and the extensive network that both men enjoyed made their absence untenable.

However, if Seligman or his colleagues believed that Gates and Pitt-Rivers could be controlled or silenced, they were badly mistaken. Both men quickly ascertained that the goal of the Committee's work was to directly confront Nazi racism and, as a result, they effectively held its work hostage until their dissenting remarks were fully included in its results. Their goal was not merely to protect Nazi science and ideology from criticism abroad, but also to ensure that their own efforts to build closer relations between British and German scientific practitioners would not be endangered by outside considerations. Pitt-Rivers in particular can thus be seen as an unofficial ambassador for the German scientific establishment in Britain during the mid-1930s, as his numerous lectures in the country and activities in Britain upon returning make clear. If we are to take his assertions at face value, his goal was building a sort of international racial consciousness that would presumably prevent the outbreak of war between two 'Aryan' powers. The Race and Culture Committee threatened this comity, and therefore its activities had to be mitigated, in his reasoning.

Barkan has described the Race and Culture Committee's inconclusive outcome as a form of 'appeasement' toward Germany. In this way, he claims, British scientific practitioners effectively mirrored their government's own policies in the international political sphere during the same period, preventing 'the shift against racial typology, and, by implication, against racism from receiving formal approval'.[99] The sources examined here tell a different story. The Race and Culture Committee's failure was brought about not by a sense of collective scientific appeasement, but by the determined efforts of two racist scientific practitioners trying to protect their ties to Germany and, ultimately, preserve relations between Britain and Germany. Indeed, the Race and Culture Committee's undertakings had been political rather than scientific from its inception, and it was ultimately because of this politicization that its deliberations ultimately came to nothing.

In this sense, the Race and Culture Committee marks an early attempt by interwar British anthropologists to directly confront the racist implications and appropriations of their field's research. Unfortunately for those eager to demonstrate the

unscientific nature of Nazi racial views and policies, there was more committed support for the Nazi *Weltanschauung* in British anthropology than they had likely predicted. It was only with the less collaborative, and ideologically better directed, publication of *We Europeans* that British scientists would take an affirmative step toward openly attacking Nazism, and this was predictably a step that Germany's supporters and sympathizers strongly opposed but could ultimately no longer prevent.

More widely, the story of the Race and Culture Committee presents important insights into the relationship between science and society in the modern age. Scientific practitioners such as Pitt-Rivers, Keith, and Gates fundamentally sought to mould human society and relations based on the model of race and race relations implied by their research, as Schaffer, Stone, and others have demonstrated was also the case in later discussions over immigration in both the interwar and the post-war period.[100] At the same time, however, it is easy in retrospect to see how these scientific premises themselves were the product of society's wider priorities and prejudices, establishing the existence of a two-way street of influence and mutual appropriation between science, society, and political discourse. Indeed, the Race and Culture Committee itself was a strange product of science and politics being combined into the same discussion, with disastrous results for British scientific figures that sought to call Nazi claims about race into question. It was only with *We Europeans* that these issues would fully be raised in the public consciousness. Further, the Race and Culture Committee lends important insights to the discussions and debates over anti-Semitism itself that were taking place in interwar Britain. As Kushner has argued, British responses to anti-Semitism were far more complicated and nuanced than traditional accounts have indicated.[101]

Thus, while Seligman's notion of confronting Nazism using the language of scientific objectivity was not intrinsically unwise, the assumption that only scientific considerations would come into these discussions was decidedly naïve. If nothing else, the Race and Culture Committee should serve as an example for scholars of how these socio-political interventions into the world of scientific discourse can have far-reaching consequences that extend beyond the rooms of the academy or, in this case, the Royal Anthropological Institute. While Nazi racial views ended up being strongly challenged in Britain by the publication of *We Europeans*, the failure of the Race and Culture Committee deprived the scientific establishment of a strongly anti-Nazi collective public statement in the years before the Second World War. In that sense, its example reiterates how science can serve as both a key contributor to social and political discourse while at the same time remaining deeply beholden to the prejudices and politics its practitioners bring to the table.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to extend a special thanks to Allen Packwood and the staff of the Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge, for their assistance with the research phase of this article. The author is also grateful to Gavin Schaffer for kindly reading an early draft of the piece and offering a number of helpful suggestions.

Notes

1. *Race and Culture* (London 1936), 2.
2. Gary Werskey, *The Visible College* (London 1978); Paul Gary Werskey, 'Nature and Politics between the Wars', *Nature*, Vol. 224, no. 5218 (1969); Paul Gary Werskey, 'British Scientists and "Outsider" Politics, 1931–1945', *Science Studies* 1, no. 1 (1971).
3. See Julian S. Huxley, A. C. Haddon, and A. M. Carr-Saunders, *We Europeans: A Survey of 'Racial' Problems* (London 1935).
4. Stone's most significant publication on this topic is Dan Stone, *Breeding Superman* (Liverpool 2002).
5. Schaffer's recent work on race and politics in Britain has been praised for shedding new light on this question, while at the same time reviewers have acknowledged the importance of expanding the discussion further. See particularly Hoi-Eun Kim, 'Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62 (Review)', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 21, no. 4 (2010).
6. See Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars* (Cambridge 1992); 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*, Vol. 38, no. 3 (2005); Gavin Schaffer, '"'Scientific' Racism Again?": Reginald Gates, the Mankind Quarterly and the Question of "Race" in Science after the Second World War', *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 41, no. 2 (2007); Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62* (Basingstoke 2008). The important new materials mentioned will be discussed in more depth shortly.
7. Barkan, op. cit., 286.
8. Ibid., 288.
9. See Stone, op. cit.
10. See Tony Kushner, *We Europeans?*: *Mass-Observation, 'Race' and British Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Aldershot, Burlington, VT 2004); Tony Kushner, 'Beyond the Pale? British Reactions to Nazi Anti-Semitism, 1933–39', *Immigrants & Minorities*, Vol. 8, no. 1–2 (2010).
11. Kushner, *We Europeans?*, 44.
12. *Race and Culture*, 3.
13. Ibid., 3.
14. Ibid., 3.
15. Ibid., 3.
16. 'The Conception of Race', statement to the Race and Culture Committee by Reginald Ruggles Gates (Papers of George Pitt-Rivers, Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge 11/4).
17. *Race and Culture*, 4.
18. F. J. West, 'Seligman, Charles Gabriel (1873–1940)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004). http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36011 (accessed 7 January 2011).
19. Letter from Seligman to Firth, 22 April 1934 (Raymond Firth Papers, London School of Economics Library Archive, 8/2/3).
20. Barkan, op. cit., 289. As Barkan observes, the distinction of 'anti-racist' is not intended to be interpreted in the contemporary sense, as these figures harboured and published views that would today be considered prejudiced (Barkan, 289–90).
21. *Race and Culture*, 2.

22. Letter from Seligman to Firth, 22 April 1934 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
23. Letter from Seligman to Firth, 26 April 1934 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
24. *Race and Culture*, 2.
25. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Lothar Loeffler, 2 April 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/3).
26. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Lothar Loeffler, 2 April 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/3).
27. Letter from Seligman to Firth, 25 May 1934 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
28. Letter from Seligman to Firth, 25 May 1934 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
29. Letter from Seligman to Elliot Smith, 24 July 1934 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
30. See Werskey, 'Nature and Politics between the Wars'; Werskey, 'British Scientists and "Outsider" Politics, 1931–1945'.
31. Letter from Seligman to Firth, 25 May 1934 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
32. Sheila Faith Weiss, among others, has examined the ways in which science was used as a 'weapon' by the Nazi regime in the foreign policy sphere: see S. F. Weiss, '"The Sword of Our Science" as a Foreign Policy Weapon: The Political Function of German Human Geneticists in the International Arena During the Third Reich', in *Ergebnisse, Vorabdrucke Aus Dem Forschungsprogramm 'Geschichte Der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft im Nationalsozialismus' Der Präsidentenkommision Der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* (Berlin 2005).
33. For Gates' views, see Schaffer, '"Scientific" Racism Again?'.
34. Alan R. Rushton, 'Gates, Reginald Ruggles (1882–1962)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004). http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33355 (accessed 7 January 2011).
35. By the mid-1930s Gates had published extensively on racial, hereditary, and anthropological issues: see, for instance, R. R. Gates, *Heredity and Eugenics* (London 1923).
36. One of the few scholars to significantly consider Pitt-Rivers' contributions to anthropology throughout this period is Stone. See Stone, op. cit.
37. See G. H. L. F. Pitt-Rivers, *The Clash of Culture and the Contact of Races* (London 1927).
38. 'List of Fellows (Supplemental), Corrected through April 1936', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* LXV (1935): 19.
39. Bronislaw Malinowski to Elsie Malinowski, 13 October 1927 (Bronislaw Malinowski Papers, London School of Economics Library, 34/26). See also Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori* (London 1929), 467n.
40. G. Pitt-Rivers, 'Anthropological Approaches to Ethnogenics,' in E. E. Evans-Pritchard et al., eds, *Essays Presented to C. G. Seligman* (London 1934), 251.
41. Evans-Pritchard et al., op. cit. Notes on the *Festschrift* can be found in Malinowski Papers 36/2.
42. Gavin Schaffer has already analysed the impact of anti-Semitic thought on Gates: see Schaffer, '"Scientific" Racism Again?.'; Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62*.
43. Gates was particularly active in this effort, as his correspondence makes clear: see Eugenics Society Papers, Wellcome Library, London EUG/D.120. Pitt-Rivers also played an important role within the Eugenics Society's international wing: see B. W. Hart, 'Watching the "Eugenic Experiment" Unfold: The Mixed Views of British Eugenicists Toward Nazi Germany in the Early 1930s', *Journal of the History of Biology*, Vol. 45, no. 1 (2012).
44. See G. Pitt-Rivers, *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution* (Oxford 1920).

45. See Jonathan Sawday, '"New Men, Strange Faces, Other Minds": Arthur Keith, Race and the Piltdown Affair (1912–53)', in Waltraud Ernst and Bernard Harris, eds, *Race, Science and Medicine, 1700–1960* (London 1999).
46. Letter from Keith to Pitt-Rivers, 16 May 1931 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 18/4). See also Arthur Keith, 'Introduction', in George Pitt-Rivers, *Weeds in the Garden of Marriage* (London 1931).
47. Letter from Gates to Pitt-Rivers, 19 October 1935 (Pitt Rivers Papers 20/2). It is likely that Gates had first proposed Pitt-Rivers for membership.
48. Letter from Fleure to Firth, 20 February 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/4).
49. Barkan discusses this aspect briefly, but does not analyse its wider significance. See Barkan, op. cit., 295.
50. Draft of 'Race' statement by J. B. S. Haldane, circulated to Pitt-Rivers as part of Race and Culture Committee discussions, 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/4).
51. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Firth, 15 December 1935 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
52. Lecture given to the *Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie, und Urgeschichte*, 16 November 1934 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/2).
53. G. Pitt-Rivers, 'Anthropological Approaches to Ethnogenics', in E. E. Evans-Pritchard et al., eds, *Essays Presented to C. G. Seligman* (London, 1934), 253.
54. Benno Müller-Hill, *Murderous Science: Elimination by Scientific Selection of Jews, Gypsies, and Others, Germany, 1933–1945* (Oxford 1988), 87.
55. Ibid., 87.
56. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to A. G. Collingridge, 19 November 1934 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 23/1). Pitt-Rivers probably met Fischer at the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations' 1929 meeting in Rome, at which he served as the Eugenics Society's temporary delegate (see related documents in Archiv der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Berlin, I Ab., Rep. 3, Num. 23).
57. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Loeffler, 2 April 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/3).
58. 'Scientific as Against Political Implications of the Aryan Question' Memorandum by Pitt-Rivers, 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/2). Italics original.
59. 'Scientific as Against Political Implications of the Aryan Question' Memorandum by Pitt-Rivers, 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/2). Underlining original.
60. 'Scientific as Against Political Implications of the Aryan Question' Memorandum by Pitt-Rivers, 1935 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/2). Italics original.
61. Reference to Simon found in Pitt-Rivers' memorandum (Pitt-Rivers Papers 11/2).
62. These types of campaigns became increasingly common in the 1930s and were often coordinated for political purposes: see Richard Cockett, *Twilight of Truth: Chamberlain, Appeasement, and the Manipulation of the Press* (London 1989).
63. Anonymous, 'Sir John Simon on His Ancestry: Denial of Rumour That He Is a Jew', *The Times*, 4 August 1934, p. 7, col. D. Simon also stated that he had not denied the rumour because he did not want to be seen as endorsing 'un-English' anti-Semitism.
64. A. C. Haddon, F. G. Hopkins, and J. B. S. Haldane, '"Aryan"', *The Times*, 7 August 1934, p. 11, col. D.
65. A. Keith, '"Aryan"', *The Times*, 8 August 1934, p. 11, col. E.
66. G. E. Smith, 'To the Editor of The Times', *The Times*, 10 August 1934, p. 11, col. E.
67. A. C. Haddon, J. B. S. Haldane, and C. G. Seligman, 'To the Editor of The Times', *The Times,* 10 August 1934, p. 11, col. E.

68. A. Keith and H. C. Corlette, 'Aryans and Semites; a Race without a Homeland', *The Times*, 13 August 1934, p. 6, col. D.
69. Anonymous, 'Aryans and Semites', *The Times*, 1 September 1934, p. 11, col. D.
70. See Pitt-Rivers, *Weeds in the Garden of Marriage*, 50. See also letter from Pitt-Rivers to Gates, 15 December 1935 (Papers of Reginald Ruggles Gates, Kings College London Archive 7/8).
71. Telegrams between Pitt-Rivers and Firth, 14–15 November 1935 and letter from Firth to Pitt-Rivers, 22 November 1935 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
72. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Firth, 15 December 1935 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
73. *Race and Culture*, 2, 4, 17. Pitt-Rivers' attack on Boas was shortened slightly to simply assert that his recent bibliography on race 'may be supplanted by others such as that of J. S. Bews' (*Race and Culture*, 2).
74. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Karl Astel, 7 March 1936 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 17/3).
75. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Firth, 9 March 1936 (Firth Papers 8/2/3).
76. Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62*, 33–34.
77. Ibid., 34.
78. Huxley, Haddon, and Carr-Saunders, 269–70.
79. Ibid., 270–1.
80. Ibid., 274.
81. Ibid., 274.
82. Ibid., 275–6.
83. Ibid., 276–7.
84. Ibid., 287.
85. Letter from Pitt-Rivers to Gates, 3 April 1936 (Gates Papers 7/9). The Academic Assistance Council assisted Jewish academics fleeing Nazi Germany by providing university placements.
86. Letter from Gates to Pitt-Rivers, 30 March 1936 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 20/2).
87. Letter from Huxley to Gates, 5 April 1937 (Gates Papers 7/10). Italics on title mine.
88. See Schaffer, '"Scientific" Racism Again?'.
89. See George Henry Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, *The Czech Conspiracy: A Phase in the World-War Plot* (London 1938).
90. Letter from Keith to Pitt-Rivers, 17 February 1942 (Pitt-Rivers Papers 13/3).
91. See files relating to Pitt-Rivers' internment (National Archives, London, Home Office Files 45/25745).
92. Pitt-Rivers' only published work in the post-war world was an attack on Christian traditional imagery: see George Pitt-Rivers, *The Riddle of the 'Labarum' and the Origin of Christian Symbols* (London 1966).
93. Note by Pitt-Rivers in the front cover of Keith's *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, published in 1948. This copy was formerly in private hands and is now in the author's personal collection.
94. Sir Arthur Keith, *A New Theory of Human Evolution* (London 1948).
95. Sir Arthur Keith, *An Autobiography* (London 1950), 552–3.
96. See Schaffer, '"Scientific" Racism Again?'.
97. Müller-Hill, op. cit., 87–9.
98. Sheila Faith Weiss, *The Nazi Symbiosis: Human Genetics and Politics in the Third Reich* (Chicago 2010), 112.
99. Barkan, 296.

100. See Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62*; Stone, op. cit.
101. See T. Kushner, 'Beyond the pale?'.

Author Biography

Bradley W Hart is currently a lecturer at California State University, Fresno. He previously completed his PhD at Churchill College, Cambridge with a thesis examining the international eugenics movement of the early twentieth century. He has published extensively on the eugenics movement and is currently working on a monograph stemming from his thesis research along with another work focusing on the British far right of the 1920s and 1930s.