

Articoli/Articles

AGAINST UNESCO: GEDDA, GINI AND AMERICAN  
SCIENTIFIC RACISM

FRANCESCO CASSATA  
Dipartimento di Economia “S.Cognetti de Martiis”,  
Università di Torino, I

SUMMARY

*The aim of this article is to shed light on the ideological, institutional and intellectual connections between Italian eugenics and American scientific racism, from 1953 to 1967. The paper pays special attention to the scientific links between fascist demographer Corrado Gini (the first president of the Italian Central Statistical Institute - Istat), and geneticist Luigi Gedda (the president of the Gregor Mendel Institute in Rome and head of the Catholic political association Azione Cattolica) on the one hand, and on the other, the members of the IAAEE (International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics) and their journal, “The Mankind Quarterly”. Corrado Gini and Luigi Gedda were both members of the honorary advisory board of “The Mankind Quarterly”, and Gini was also assistant editor in 1962. Despite the theoretical differences between the “neo-Lamarckians” Gini and Gedda, and the “Mendelians” Robert Gayre and Reginald Ruggles Gates – editor and associate editor of “The Mankind Quarterly” – the relationship grew stronger because of a sort of strategic alliance in the ideological fight against UNESCO’s Statements on Race. The main source of the paper is Corrado Gini’s personal archive, deposited in Rome at the National State Archive (ACS).*

1. *The IAAEE and “The Mankind Quarterly”*

The fight against racism has been, since the beginning, one of the constituent aspects of UNESCO’s actions. In 1946, while defining the philosophical guidelines of the young UN affiliated organization,

*Key words:* Corrado Gini - Scientific racism - Eugenics - Heredity

British naturalist Julian Huxley, UNESCO's first director general, set as an objective the conciliation of the ethical and political principle of equality with the biological fact of diversity. In the following years, UNESCO's headquarters in Paris found themselves involved in an attempt to defeat racial prejudice by demonstrating the lack of scientific base for the very concept of race. This proved an arduous task that would ultimately bring forth a struggle within the international scientific community and that would culminate in the publication of two *Statements on Race* in a short period of time, in 1950 and in 1951<sup>1</sup>. Historiographic debate has highlighted the substantial lack of consideration of UNESCO's two *Statements on Race* in Italy, which went practically unnoticed in a scientific context that was still permeated by the legacy of fascism<sup>2</sup>. Deeper researches, however, add to the perception of the silence of the Italian scientific community the presence of an outright adversity towards UNESCO's policy. If, for instance, on one hand, the *Statements* never raised the attention of either the "Archivio per l'Antropologia e l'Etnologia" or the "Rivista di Antropologia" – organs of the Florentine and Roman schools, respectively<sup>3</sup> – on the other hand some relevant Italian circles of medical genetics and social sciences objectively ended up converging on the positions of Anglo-American scientific racism. By selecting scientific arguments as the core of its anti-racist campaign, UNESCO had for all intents and purposes suggested to American and European racist movements the possibility of a new camouflage strategy: racism, as well as anti-racism, had to base the legitimacy of its pursuit to defend "white supremacy" in the world on scientific evidence, threatened as it was by the civil rights campaigns in the USA and – in Africa and Asia – by the steady advancement of the decolonisation process. The main expression of such scientific racism was represented by the establishment of the *International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics* (IAAEE)<sup>4</sup> and of "The Mankind Quarterly".

*Heredity and Scientific Racism*

The IAAEE was founded on April 24, 1959 in Baltimore. Its chairman was Robert E. Kuttner, the secretary was Anthony James Gregor, and the treasurer was Donald A. Swan. The executive committee comprised Robert Gayre, Reginald Ruggles Gates, Henry E. Garrett, Charles C. Tansill, Heinrich Quiring and the Italian demographer and statistician Corrado Gini. The first issue of “The Mankind Quarterly”, organ of the IAAEE based in Edinburgh, was published in June 1960: with Robert Gayre as editor, and Garrett and Ruggles Gates as associate editors.

The “segregationist” scientists gathered in the IAAEE showed some common traits. First of all they held, in many cases, important academic positions. For example, Henry E. Garrett had been chairman of the American Psychological Association in 1946, was a member of the National Research Council and for sixteen years was dean of the Psychology Department at Columbia University<sup>5</sup>. Reginald Ruggles Gates, botanist, geneticist and anthropologist, professor at King’s College London and at Harvard University, had been an outspoken advocate of morphological, biological and psychological differences between human races since the 1930s<sup>6</sup>. Secondly, they all had relationships with the neo-nazi and neo-fascist extreme right wing in the USA and Europe. Kuttner and Garrett, for example, contributed to the publications of Liberty Lobby, the far-right organization founded by Willis Carto in 1955<sup>7</sup>. Robert Gayre of Gayre and Nigg was a Scottish anthropologist, an expert in heraldry and a supporter of “northernism”, close to the racist and anti-Semitic organizations of A. K. Chesterton. An Italian-American by origin (his original name was Anthony Gimigliano), Anthony James Gregor gained a PhD at Columbia University with a thesis on the scientific and philosophical ideas of Giovanni Gentile. Between 1952 and 1956 he wrote for Oswald Mosley’s “The European”<sup>8</sup>, then during the Sixties intensified his relationship with Italian neo-fascism and popularized the works of historians such as Nolte and De Felice within the USA<sup>9</sup>. As for

Tansill, an historian at Georgetown University, he was a member of the Nazi “Viereck Circle”, which during World War II had suggested an alliance between the USA and Hitler’s Germany<sup>10</sup>. Moreover, dating from the famous 1954 Supreme Court sentence *Brown vs. Board of Education*<sup>11</sup>, the IAAEE group was constantly busy fighting against the desegregation process in the USA: all these scientists, as a matter of fact, benefited from the donations of textile tycoon Wickliffe Draper’s *Pioneer Fund*, an organization that from 1937 until today has made ample contributions to economically sustain the main adversaries of the American integrationist system<sup>12</sup>.

As for the above-mentioned Italians, from the first issue of “The Mankind Quarterly”, four of them became members of the advisory board: Luigi Gedda, Corrado Gini, Gaetano De Martino and Sergio Sergi. The following paragraphs will look further into the role of the first two, who were the most involved in Italian eugenics and in the *liaisons dangereuses* with the IAAEE.

## 2. “*Meticcio di guerra*”: Luigi Gedda and Reginald Ruggles Gates

The link between the physician Luigi Gedda, director of Rome’s Istituto Gregorio Mendel, and “The Mankind Quarterly” was through the mediation of Reginald Ruggles Gates and developed essentially around a work titled *Il meticcio di guerra e altri casi* and published in 1960 by the Edizioni dell’Istituto Gregorio Mendel, in which an explicit stance in favour of the scientific legitimacy of “racial genetics” is presented.

It was Ruggles Gates himself, a personal friend of Luigi Gedda<sup>13</sup>, who wrote the preface to *Meticcio di Guerra*, which he welcomed as an important contribution to the development of a “genetic of races”: “The studies on interracial breeding are presently assuming a new meaning. From the occasional or systematic studies conducted in many parts of the world, slowly but steadily is stemming the science of Racial Genetics, whose fundamental principles are already

visible”<sup>14</sup>. In the second issue of “The Mankind Quarterly”, it was again Ruggles Gates who signed the volume’s review, which he enthusiastically indicated as “a model”: “This work will serve as a model for future studies on the hybrids of war. It is of crucial interest for anyone involved with the study of races”<sup>15</sup>.

Gedda was not entirely new to the study of interracial breeding. In 1938, for instance, on the pages of the catholic journal “Vita e Pensiero”, he had welcomed the fascist laws against race crossing (*meticciato*) declaring the links between “very different races” as unfavourable:

*As a general rule, and in this case, nature loves orderly, gradual processes, “Natura non facit saltus”, and for this reason the crossbreeding among highly different races is usually unfortunate. On the other hand, the mix of kindred races, thus similar, far from hurting, can produce new, valuable matches and, in the end, improve the stock (...). It is the mix of very different, distant – or, as we say – even diverging races which will end up being very damaging for the human stock; an example can be seen in the hybrid which results from the crossing between the white and the negro races, a type of mix that, with the due means, should be strongly recommended against<sup>16</sup>.*

Perhaps remembering these sentences, in his preface to *Meticciato di Guerra*, Gedda quickly draws a distinction between racism – now condemned without hesitation – and the scientific study of human races, made more urgent and relevant by the increase in racial mixing that resulted from the rapid development of transportation and communication means. Gedda’s claim of the scientific value of “race genetics” reveals an implicit polemic purpose, which combines under the same negative title every political intervention on race matters, regardless of whether it came from Hitler’s Germany or from UNESCO’s *Statements*:

*The study of races is a consequence of our times and as such, destined to develop even if a halt in the regular process of scientific development has been determined by an ill-advised use of racial phenomena in political and social*

*activities as a criteria for discrimination, barring or war. As much as it wasn't good science, racism wasn't good politics either. Such an arbitrary transfer of scientific hypothesis and elaborations into the incubator of politics did not help the knowledge of the argument of race, and has damaged it instead by making it appear as an arbitrary hype, alien to science and detrimental to ethical, individual and social values, and also as a source of controversies and rigidities, in contrast with the custom of scientific research, which avoids any passions and requires a spirit of cooperation to assure the necessary control<sup>17</sup>.*

In this specific case, fitting into the plentiful eugenic literature of “racial hybrid” analysis – largely quoted in his pages – the analysis of Gedda (assisted by two of the Institute’s contributors, Adriana Mercuri and Angelo Serio) concerned 44 “war hybrids”, aged between 8 and 12: 34 males, in-patients at Anzio’s Istituto SS. Cuori, and 10 females, in-patients at Rome’s Istituto S. Cuore della Borgata del Trullo; children of “European Italian mothers” whose fathers were “coloured” soldiers who belonged to the occupying troops in Italy in the years 1943-1948.

The reference to genetics here is nothing but an attempt to modernize linguistically a research methodology that doesn't part from the traditional layout of physical anthropology. His included definitions of three groups of hybrids, for example, are derived from the reconstruction of the unknown “paternal race” setting off from the “exotic genotype”; in other words from the reading of the “non European racial characteristics present in the hybrid”. Also the work of classification fits into the usual anthropologic taxonomies while grafting them into the frame of a genealogy methodology: from cranium measurements to I.Q. evaluation, from clinical examinations to personal anamnesis<sup>18</sup>.

Thanks to the researches of the Istituto Mendel, Gedda drew three conclusions. First, through anthropometric surveys, a positive evaluation of racial crossbreeding emerged, which in some cases presented forms of “heterosis” or “hybrid vigour”, thus demonstrating the creative energy of racial mixing<sup>19</sup>.

Secondly, the use of mental tests seems to indicate a psychological inferiority of hybrids, due to hereditary factors as well as to environmental influences<sup>20</sup>. Third, drawing on an argument used – within the IAAEE – by A. J. Gregor and by psychologist Clairette Armstrong<sup>21</sup>, Gedda justifies the segregation of hybrids as a form of “protection” in an hostile social context. Only through isolation in the boarding schools of the *Ente per la Protezione del Fanciullo* could the hybrid be defended from the surrounding racial prejudice and be guaranteed a normal psychological development: “There’s no doubt that the contact between the hybrid and the leucodermic world is in this way not only postponed; it is also true that it will occur at an age less delicate and thus more apt to overcome and sublimate inferiority complexes”<sup>22</sup>.

The research conducted by Gedda, Serio and Mercuri soon sparked heated debate that directly involved “The Mankind Quarterly” and the IAAEE group. Not at all coincidentally, in Italy it was Corrado Gini who extensively reviewed *Meticciano di Guerra* on the pages of “Genus”, concentrating his criticisms on the problem of “heterosis”, an issue which had been very dear to the statistician ever since the 1930s<sup>23</sup>. In Gini’s opinion, there were essentially two unsolved problems that undermined Gedda’s claims. First of all, coloured soldiers in Italy did not represent the populations they belonged to, because they had been through numerous selection processes, and this made “the characters of the offspring not comparable to those of their peers from the parent races”<sup>24</sup>. Also, literature on “racial hybrids” – and Gini quotes, apart from his own works, also the data of Davenport and Steggerda on Jamaican race-crossings<sup>25</sup> – demonstrated the impossibility of conceiving “heterosis” as a common or generalisable phenomena: on the contrary, “as far as the crossbreeding between whites and negroes is concerned, various and reliable testimonies bear witness against it”<sup>26</sup>. These same arguments are found in a letter sent in January 1961 from Gini to Gayre, the editor of “The Mankind Quarterly”, to suggest the publication of an essay specifically dedi-

cated to the problem of interracial mixing. Both the Italian statistician and the Scottish editor shared a negative opinion on hybridisation between whites and negroes, and Gini didn't hesitate to take a clear stance against the process of integration that was taking place in the USA, thus revealing the political core of the issue: "Apart from the scientific matters – he wrote – I believe that this isn't the most appropriate moment to promote the hybridisation between negroes and whites"<sup>27</sup>. On scientific grounds, the reference to Gedda's researches and to the problem of heterosis is explicit:

*I don't know if you've seen the recent book of our colleague prof. Gedda on war hybrids in Italy. He comes to the conclusion that there is an [sic] heterosis in the mulattos, what is contrary to all the previous results. This conclusion can well be attributed to the selection of the fathers and probably also of the mothers, which makes their children not comparable to those of the general populations<sup>28</sup>.*

As for the biological negativity of race crossings between "whites" and "negroes", there was substantial agreement from Gayre:

*I think that Professor Ruggles Gates will be of your opinion as he tends on the whole, I think I am right in saying, to deprecate the tendency to look for heterosis in human beings. In my own case, I have thought that some of the energy generated by the Americans is due to heterosis, not of course heterosis due to crossings of specific types, but within the various races of the one stock. Concerning Professor Gedda's theory, I think that you are probably quite right, and that there may well be a selection taking place when this kind of hybridisation occurs. The American negro soldiers that were sent to Italy, if I remember rightly, were specially selected. I was there at the time. On the whole also, they were definitely themselves to be classified more as mulattos than Negroes in a vast number of cases. In fact, the pure negro among the American negro troops, seems to be a rarity. Therefore, I am entirely in agreement with you that the results that Professor Gedda is getting are not necessarily due to heterosis at all<sup>29</sup>.*



However, despite this theoretical convergence, the inappropriateness of opening a critical debate within the IAAEE, which would have opposed Gini and Gedda on the issue of crossbreeding, drew a curtain over the idea of publishing the essay. This seemed even wiser as *Meticciano di Guerra* at that time was at the centre of heated polemics also within the Anglo-American scientific community. Indeed, in 1962 it was Leslie C. Dunn - a geneticist, editor of the first *Statement* of UNESCO, and among those who wrote the second<sup>30</sup> - who strongly attacked Gates and Gedda in the “Eugenics Review”, openly accusing them of racism:

*There are still reminders of the uncritical use of what look like genetical methods applied to racial anthropology. What shall one say, for example, when three authors, after anthropometric examination of forty-four Italian war orphans of whom the fathers were unknown but assumed to be “coloured” draw sweeping conclusions concerning heterosis (“established with certainty”), inheritance of erythrocyte diameter (“very convincing”) and other statements not supported by evidence. Yet these are statements made in 1960 by Luigi Gedda and his co-workers Serio and Mercuri in their recent book *Meticciano di guerra*. R. R. Gates, who writes an introduction in English to this elaborate book, refers to it as an important contribution to what he calls “racial genetics”. Others will have greater difficulty in detecting any contribution to genetics, but may see in it, as I do, a reflection in 1960 of the uncritical naïveté of that early period of human genetics which delayed its progress. (...) Truly the past is not yet buried, and human genetics, in spite of its recent evidences of new life, is still exposed to old dangers<sup>31</sup>.*

Gedda didn't directly respond to the criticism, but instead it was Gayre himself, the editor of “The Mankind Quarterly” who intervened in his defence, thus reasserting once more the deep ties between the catholic twinologist and the IAAEE's eugenicists. According to Gayre, Dunn's opinion is factious, outrageous, lacks scientific objectivity and is purely ideological:

*The hall-mark of the witch-hunter is the use of such terms as racist and racialism – used here in connection with Professor Gedda and Doctors Serio and Mercuri, as well as Professor Ruggles Gates; The Mankind Quarterly and its editors and contributors are, therefore, in good company. But the people who use these terms abusively are activated by an almost hysterical hatred of anyone who recognises, or anything which establishes, the existence of different and great racial groups, with all their differences in heredity (whether biological or sociological)<sup>32</sup>.*

Unlike Dunn's statement, Gayre argued, there was no contradiction whatsoever between genetics and racial anthropology. On the contrary, the former had come to justify the latter:

*But frequency genetics has not in any way altered basic biological facts. Frequency studies can add very little when we consider those fundamental characters which anthroposcopically distinguish the major human stocks. (...) We might well go over a lengthy list of human characters which in the past have been used for racial classification, and find that they are equally valid<sup>33</sup>.*

Here Gayre supports an *evolutionist* interpretation of the history of genetics which blends the acquisitions of modern science with all of the previous ideas on inheritance, from Aristotle onwards, against the *revolutionary* hypothesis of Dunn, according to whom true genetics only started with Mendel. Therefore, neither Gedda nor "The Mankind Quarterly" have a past they should be ashamed of:

*Because of Gedda, Serio, Mercuri, Gates and The Mankind Quarterly we are told that the past is not yet buried and human genetics is still exposed to old dangers! We might ask what past is not yet buried? What are the old dangers? And to what or to whom? To the old school of cytological geneticists? Or to civilisation?<sup>34</sup>*

The debate between Gayre and Dunn, an emblematic moment of the clash between UNESCO's anti-racism and the racist eugenics of the IAAEE, marked the point of Gedda's highest visibility in "The

Mankind Quarterly”. From then on, no other essay was published regarding the Italian physician, although his name always remained highly visible on the magazine’s front page among the members of the honorary advisory board.

### 3. *Corrado Gini and the “guerrilla” against UNESCO*

Corrado Gini’s contributions to “The Mankind Quarterly” span from the magazine’s first issue until 1965, and were characterized mainly by two aspects: first, the development of a scientific and organizational exchange with the members of the IAAEE; second, the embracing of a personal strategy in conducting the battle against the anti-racism of UNESCO.

First of all, Gini coopted the IAAEE’s most prominent members for the International Institute of Sociology (IIS), which he chaired as of 1950, and made the pages of its journal, “Genus”, available for them. In particular, it was the relationship with A. J. Gregor that grew the most intense. It was Gregor who opened the IAAEE’s doors to Gini<sup>35</sup> and it was again Gregor who translated his essays into English. In the USA, Gregor was a fervent advocate of Gini’s organicism, to which he devoted a number of essays (also in a joint effort with the sociologist Michele Marotta)<sup>36</sup> and a seminar at the John Hopkins University<sup>37</sup>. The bond with Gini allowed him to become a member of the International Institute of Sociology and to attend its 19<sup>th</sup> (Mexico City, 1960)<sup>38</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> (Cordoba, 1963)<sup>39</sup> conventions. For his part, Gini asked Gregor if the leaders of “The Mankind Quarterly” would be willing to become members of the IIS: “Do you think – he wrote in a letter – that any of Mankind’s managers would like to be elected members of the Institute?<sup>40</sup>” In 1963 Gregor became chairman of the *Research Committee on Intergroup Relations* created within the IIS<sup>41</sup>. The following year, thanks to Gregor’s mediation, the IAAEE became a sponsor of Gini’s new edition of the *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, the printing costs of which would be covered half

by the University of Rome and half by the American organization<sup>42</sup>. Like Gregor, Gayre too was nominated as a member of the International Institute of Sociology and accepted Gini's proposal to enter, thanks to his findings on "northern racial origins", the constitutive committee to verify the validity of De Tourville's theories on the influence of the northern stock on modern society<sup>43</sup>. In particular, it was the idea of the Celtic-Irish origin of pre-Colombian America that represented a point of agreement between Gini and Gayre<sup>44</sup>. Finally Gregor, as well as other contributors of "The Mankind Quarterly" such as Kuttner and Swan, published their essays, which shared a strong racist slant, on the pages of "Genus"<sup>45</sup>. Therefore, if the main contributors to "The Mankind Quarterly" often appeared in "Genus", and in the International Institute of Sociology, equally Corrado Gini – a member of the honorary advisory board since 1960 and an assistant editor since 1962 – published two essays in the British magazine. One was in 1960 (*The Testing of Negro Intelligence*)<sup>46</sup> and one in 1961 (*Psychic and Cultural Traits and the Classification of Human Races*)<sup>47</sup>, both of which were English translations of essays that first appeared in "Genus", respectively in 1960<sup>48</sup> and in 1955<sup>49</sup>. The first essay was a review of *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, a racist manifesto by Audrey M. Shuey, a teacher of psychology at the Randolph-Macon Women's College (in Lynchburg, Virginia) and a member of the honorary advisory board of "The Mankind Quarterly". The book had been financed by the Pioneer Fund, prefaced by Garrett and aimed to demonstrate – through the use of IQ tests – the mental inferiority of Negroes<sup>50</sup>. According to Gini, Shuey's work was the ultimate demonstration of the existence of those innate racial differences in mental attitudes which are so strongly denied in the *Statements on Race* of UNESCO:

*In my opinion it is probable that the volume will arouse objections and discussions because the techniques and the employment of mental tests*

### *Heredity and Scientific Racism*

*involve, for the time being, very subjective elements – but in any event it is possible to say that, because of the abundance of the material collected and objectively reported, the volume constitutes a milestone in this area. After its publication the burden of proof rests upon those who maintain the non-existence of the stated differences<sup>51</sup>.*

In the wake of the American manifesto, Gini suggests a theorem which sums up racist differentialism:

*If, in a stable environment, two groups of individuals differentiate themselves by virtue of a character which, at least in part, is hereditary and which, at least in one of the two groups, is subject to natural selection, the differences observed between the two groups are, at least in part, innate<sup>52</sup>.*

In other words, if two human groups live in different environments and, in at least one of them, the characteristic taken into consideration allows for natural selection, this will eliminate certain modalities of that characteristic and will favour others in different ways in the two groups; and, if such modalities are in part hereditary, the two groups will display innate differences. As a consequence – Gini concluded – it is possible to reckon that “under the influence of natural selection, innate mental attitudes differ among various population groups”<sup>53</sup>. Behind the differentialist discourse of Gini’s racism it is easy to recognize the traditional hierarchic and inferiority logic: in particular the idea that in the case of “negro races compared to the white ones” natural selection has favoured physical characteristics over mental ones: thus the physical superiority of “Negroes”, but also their innate intellectual inferiority<sup>54</sup>.

On the other side of the Atlantic, Gini’s review attracted the barbs of “Man”, the authoritative organ of the British Royal Anthropological Institute. If the “theorem” presented by Gini meant anything – wrote G. Ainsworth Harrison – it signified that “there is a necessary relation between the way one difference is determined in one population and

the way it is determined among two populations”. But, he went on to say, this “is not a theorem”: a relation, indeed, often exists in reference to characters which present a certain environmental weakness, but such a relation “is certainly not necessary, as clearly indicated by experimental evidences”<sup>55</sup>. In private, Gini’s essay also provoked the disapproval of the illustrious geneticist Walter Landauer (University of Connecticut, Department of Animal Genetics), who reprimanded Gini for the “innatism” (and implicitly, the racism) of his theorem on the differences among mental characters of populations:

*It seems to me further that your “theorem” constitutes a rather astonishing tautology. I should think that in this statement the words “hereditary” and “innate” are to all intents synonymous.*

*I have the impression that the “Mankind Quarterly” is an attempt to forget Mendelian genetics and to return to the nineteenth century and Galton. I hope, of course, to be wrong and may judge hastily after seeing only one issue<sup>56</sup>.*

And Gini replies, substantially confirming his anti-UNESCO racist differentialism:

*My point is that, if a characteristic is not only hereditary but also subject to natural selection (as it is usually the case) then two groups, living in different conditions, become innately differentiated relatively to such a characteristic.*

*Then we may conclude that the differences between human groups may be, and practically are, in part innate and not only cultural as the Unesco Statement declared. Let me think that it is a conclusion of some bearing especially in the present epoch<sup>57</sup>.*

The second essay – published in “Genus” in 1955 and in the “The Mankind Quarterly” in 1961 – epitomizes Gini’s main objections to the Statements on Race<sup>58</sup>. Setting off from a neo-Lamarckian theoretic base, Gini supports, in a dispute with UNESCO’s anti-

racism, the existence of a parallelism between environmental and racial differences. Each environment, in substance, would have its matching race:

*It is to be observed, however, with respect to this proposition, that, even assuming that the diverse populations were originally identical with respect to innate mental characteristics, differences of environment (at first natural, then also social) in which their life developed, would have inevitably impelled selection (natural, nuptial, reproductive) in a different direction for each race, in each favouring individuals possessed of traits better adapted to environmental conditions. And, since the individual differences with respect to the characteristics in question might be at times acquired but at other times innate, selection led, consequently, to the differentiation, in the adaptation to the environment, of the hereditary patrimony of the individual races<sup>59</sup>.*

Beyond permanent physical differences, one must also then consider psychic and cultural differences. Contrary to what is claimed in the *Statements*, every race – purported Gini – is characterized by an innate disposition to work and saving, which marks the demarcation line between “primitive” and “civilized”:

*While, therefore, there do not seem to be reasons as a consequence of which psychic and cultural characteristics should be excluded from the classification of races, a strong reason can be adduced which would counsel the adoption of the first even in preference to the second; it is the decisive importance that psychic traits exercise in determining the differences of human societies. This is to be said particularly with respect to the propensity (...) to labour and accumulation. For in this trait is found the fundamental difference between primitive populations, which, refusing to work beyond that strictly necessary to satisfy the most basic needs of existence, live on the margin of subsistence, and civilised populations in which individuals are disposed, even if in different measures, to make an effort which carries them beyond the subsistence level, and to conserve part of their produce with a view to future needs<sup>60</sup>.*

The translation of this second essay as it appeared in “The Mankind Quarterly” presented an interesting hidden background, which outlined with great clarity the nature of Gini’s contribution. Editor Gayre, as was his habit, intervened brutally and without prior notice on Gini’s text, erasing the following paragraph:

*To decide, in any case, whether cultural traits of a population have, at least in part, a hereditary base or whether they constitute simply acquired characteristics is in practice very difficult. But this difficulty does not arise only with respect to such characteristics. In point of fact, after the researches of Boas on the European immigrants to America, those of Dorning on the Jewish immigrants to Berlin and above all after our own researches with respect to the Albanian colonies in Calabria and the Ligurian colonies in Sardinia, it is very difficult to maintain that physical characteristics such as cephalic index, stature and also pigmentation, which constitute the basis for the classification of human races, are in fact hereditary and not, rather, acquired under the influence of the environment. Their permanent character, over a number of generations, would be, in the generality of populations, the effect of the constant conditions of the environment in which the population lives<sup>61</sup>.*

Facing Gini’s rather annoyed reaction, Gayre answered, specifying the reasons for the cut:

*The paragraph which I suggested should come out is one which is largely irrelevant to the whole of your main argument, and I thought would have the effect of marring your very excellent article by causing a certain amount of controversy to develop around your statement concerning Boas. As you perhaps know, Boas was very severely treated by Karl Pearson, Keith and others when he enunciated his doctrine. It is certainly one which most of us do not share, and I have written at some length, in a work I am now publishing, against it. Therefore I felt that it was better to avoid at this stage bringing in a controversial side-issue. If you wish to expound some new version of Boas in a complete article, that would be quite another matter, and it could be dealt with objectively as the principle matter under discussion<sup>62</sup>.*



It appears evident that the controversy revolved around the interpretation of the researches conducted by Franz Boas, Columbia University's father of American cultural anthropology,<sup>63</sup> thus revealing how, apart from the editorial dispute, Gini and Gayre were engaged in a more general confrontation between the American hereditarianist eugenics and the Italian environmentalist approach. In 1911, following a suggestion of the U.S. Immigration Commission, Boas, with the help of thirteen assistants, had measured the height and the cephalic index of more or less eighteen thousand immigrants or children of immigrants in New York, coming to the conclusion that the various European types were not at all stable, as maintained by hereditarianist racism, but – rather the opposite - had a tendency to uniformity, due to environmental influences, towards an average “American” type<sup>64</sup>. Boas' studies soon became a reference point in Italy for eugenists, who used his results as a means to counter both the accusations of their American colleagues and their pervasive exposure to the risks of biological degeneration derived from the tide of Italian immigrants arriving on Ellis Island. Gini himself had followed Boas' line, directing, as of 1938, the researches of the Italian Committee for the Study of Population Problems (in Italian: Comitato italiano per lo studio dei problemi della popolazione, or CISP) on the Albanian community in Calabria and on the Ligurian-Piedmontese community in Sardinia. In summing up the results at the beginning of the 1950s, Gini believed he had demonstrated, in the long run, the physical assimilation of immigrants to the local environment:

*From all the above mentioned researches, one concludes that emigrated populations, even without crossbreeding, gradually lose their physical characteristics and acquire those of the autochthonous population. The peoples appear as the children of their land and it is indeed to be noted that, contrary to what is currently believed, assimilation, at least in some cases, happens more rapidly in relation to physical characters than to cultural ones (...) Hence if we accept Boas' theory that there is, in the differential*

*characters of a race, a hereditary nucleus and a fringe which varies with the environment, we must admit that the latter is such that, at least in Caucasian races, the hereditary nucleus will come down to not much at all*<sup>65</sup>.

Yet if for Gini, and more generally for Italian eugenics, Boas represented the confirmation of the environment's role in the variation of racial characters, for the segregationist scientists of the IAAEE, all strong advocates of hereditarianist eugenics, the "school of Boas" – which included, among others, M.F. Ashley Montagu<sup>66</sup>, the father of the first *Statement on Race* – embodied instead, the ghost of that "Jewish-communist" conspiracy which had led the United States to abandon Jim Crow's laws. As a consequence, around the "Boas case" two opposite theoretical stances confronted one another, although sharing a common enemy, namely the *Statements on Race* of UNESCO: on one side, there was the "Mendelian" racism, biological and hereditarianist, of Gayre; on the other, the "neo-Lamarckian" one, psychological and environmentalist, of Gini.

To demonstrate how these two trends, as different as they were on epistemological grounds, were in fact objectively converging, it is worth quoting the words with which Gini, while rejecting Gayre's objections, gives his ultimatum regarding the editorial line of "The Mankind Quarterly":

*You insist upon the elimination of one paragraph of my article because it is controversial with the view of getting the unanimous support of everyone of your way of thinking.*

*Now I think that the facts mentioned in the paragraph in question cannot be denied, while their interpretation is controversial. But this is, for me, not a reason for eliminating it but on the contrary a reason for insisting - as I insist - for its publication*<sup>67</sup>.

Not "regimentation", then, but scientific "guerrillas" against UNESCO: this is Gini's justification for his own role within the IAAEE and for

his contribution to “The Mankind Quarterly”. In the end, Gayre was forced to give in, even though he didn’t miss his chance for one last, ironic jab: “Of course, I am quite willing to publish the article as it stands, although I still am of the opinion that a slight modification of unnecessary material is always an advantage”<sup>68</sup>.

Carried out between January and March 1961, the diatribe between Gayre and Gini appeared, finally, to reach a clarification and a relative differentiation of stances. From this moment on, indeed, other occasions affirmed Gini’s heterodox line within the common, and agreed, scientific “guerrilla” against UNESCO; for example, in the case of the suggestion – formulated by Garrett and Gayre – to write a collective preface to Carleton Putnam’s book, *Race and Reason: a Yankee View*<sup>69</sup>. Sustained by a massive advertising campaign, and financed by the Pioneer Fund, Putnam’s volume was none other than a racist pamphlet which revolved around two arguments repeated obsessively: the mental inferiority of the negroes, as demonstrated by the scientific results of IQ tests, and an interpretation of the anti-racist battle as the umpteenth expression of the Jewish-communist conspiracy<sup>70</sup>. The anti-UNESCO intent of the preface promoted by the IAAEE had already been openly declared by Gayre to Gini himself:

*I have read it through, and while it is of course on a political-social problem, it is basically relevant to anthropology. I am sending you herewith a copy of the foreword which Professor Henry E. Garrett has proposed, and where I have marked “A”, I propose that the piece I have written should go in. If you agree with these two drafts, would you please be good enough to indicate that you are, and then we will add your name to the signatories. Professor Garrett is most anxious that as many scientists as possible, in the short time available, should sign this foreword. It is felt that the time has come when people who are more soundly grounded in science than some of the people who signed the UNESCO document should make their views known<sup>71</sup>.*

However, in the same letter in which he harshly rejects Gayre's interventions on his essay, Gini also rejects the idea of joining the initiative. A similar, collective declaration against UNESCO, he objects, would end up mirroring the vagueness and the approximation of the *Statements*:

*I am also reluctant to sign joint declarations. In order to reach a text which satisfies all the signatories, every one must renounce a part of his own thought, and the Minimum Common Denominator that is attained cannot be but vague and colourless. (By the way I think that if the signatories of the Unesco Statement – among whom there were also very distinguished scholars – would have been invited to give their individual advices, we would have had a much more valuable document)<sup>72</sup>.*

As a consequence, the first edition was published with a preface signed by Gates, Garrett, Gayre, and, in Gini's place, Wesley Critz George, a professor of Anatomy at the University of North Carolina and a fan of racial segregation even before the Brown ruling<sup>73</sup>. Shortly thereafter, in light of the 200,000 copies sold and of the twelve reprints in eighteen months, it was Putnam himself who once again asked Gini for a contribution for the pocket edition:

*As you may know, a panel of four scientists headed by the late R. Ruggles Gates signed the introduction to the first edition. I would be greatly honored if I might add your name to this panel in preparing the pocketbook edition. The tide seems to be turning in the United States, and I believe we may soon have the integrationists and "scientific" propagandists on the defensive. I solicit your aid in rallying here the forces with which I believe you are in sympathy<sup>74</sup>.*

Although declaring that he shared Putnam's line of thought, Gini again refused to endorse any collective declaration. In the scientific field, he argued, it is not possible to reach an effective interpretative "common denominator" on the issue of race. On the contrary,

scientific manifestos always end up obscuring the value of those who sign them. Authorities such as Haldane, Dahlberg or Dunn – all of whom Gini personally knew and appreciated – had sacrificed the complexity of their researches on the altar of the *Statement on Race* of UNESCO, and Gini – from an opposite standpoint – did not want to make the same mistake:

*Naturally there are not two scholars who have exactly the same opinion on a scientific field of a certain extent while a common declaration must constitute a minimum common denominator of the thought of all the signers neglecting the particular aspects which characterize the scientific personality of the various signers. I think that Haldane, Dahlberg, Dunn and the other signers of the manifest of Unesco that you and I deplore (all people in my opinion of a remarkable scientific value whom I know personally) would have written much more reasonable things should they have written their declarations freely and independently from the others<sup>75</sup>.*

Again with the purpose of differentiating the outline of the contributors to “The Mankind Quarterly”, in November 1962 – following a suggestion by Sergio Sergi, himself a member of the honorary advisory board of the journal – Gini proposed the inclusion on the front page of a declaration that would sanction the different viewpoints represented within the common conviction of physical and psychic difference between human races<sup>76</sup>. The suggested text, which was accepted by Gayre and published on the first issue of 1963, read as follows:

*The Mankind Quarterly exists to discuss the subjects which are included in its title and sub-titles. It is the view of the Editors (as would seem to them to be manifestly true and generally accepted to be true by the vast majority of observers past and present) that human races are physically and/or psychically different. The question of whether any particular race or racial group is superior to another in the totality of all its characters is not accepted by the Editor, and, as far as is known by the other associate and assistant editors.*

*The views expressed in articles which appear in The Mankind Quarterly and the associated series of Mankind Monographs are those of the authors, and the editors and the Honorary Advisory Board of The Mankind Quarterly do not necessarily accept responsibility for the views so expressed.*

*We believe, however, that it would be a disservice to science to refuse to publish an article or monograph just because the views expressed by the author were not accepted by the Editor, or one of the other editors, or of some members of the Honorary Advisory Board, and we are certain that none of these persons would wish to take the responsibility of stifling the expression of such views<sup>77</sup>.*

In the following issues, always upon Gini's insistent request, a more synthetic sentence was included: "The articles bind the authors and not the editors".

The papers which, from then on, Gini sent to Gayre must probably be interpreted in the context of the same strategy of differentiation within the IAAEE's offensive against UNESCO. For instance, Gayre favourably accepted the idea of translating and publishing Gini's contribution to the First International Congress on Human Genetics in 1956.<sup>78</sup> a speech based on the theory of sub-Lamarckism – very far, as we've seen, from the views of the editor – that culminated, nonetheless, in a racist differentialism that was perfectly compatible with the general orientation of "The Mankind Quarterly".

Actually, neither this last essay, nor two of Gini's other proposals presented between 1962 and 1965 – the publication of the essay *Alla soglia dell'umanità* (At the Threshold of Humanity)<sup>79</sup> and the translation, to be published in the *Mankind Monographs*, of his 1940s essay *Le rilevazioni statistiche fra le popolazioni primitive* (Statistical Surveys in Primitive Populations) – were realised, due to Gini's sudden death in 1965. Their findings, made possible by the retrieval of the original correspondence, contribute, however, to highlighting the complexity and the importance of the ideological and scientific relationship between Gini and the IAAEE. A relationship which was

surely marred by tensions and clashes between different stances, but was reaffirmed until the end, in the name of the struggle against the common enemy: the egalitarianism and the anti-racism upheld by UNESCO and by the *Statements on Race*.

4. *Epilogue: "Race and Modern Science"*

In 1967, Reginald Ruggles Gates' project to organize a "manifesto" against UNESCO took shape in a collection of essays titled *Race and Modern Science*. The polemic intent of the volume was comprised in its title, which echoed UNESCO's previous publication, *The Race Question in Modern Science*. The editorial enterprise was managed by Robert Kuttner and was dedicated to the memory of Ruggles Gates, "who suggested, and helped put together, this book". Anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists who belonged to the ideological reservoir of "The Mankind Quarterly" crowd these pages in the attempt to demonstrate the scientific value of the concept of race and the legitimacy of racism: Bertil Lundman, Jan Czekanowski, J.D.J. Hofmeyr, Ilse Schwidetzky, David C. Rife, C.P. Oliver, Robert Kuttner, Cyril D. Darlington, A. James Gregor, George A. Lundberg, Friedrich Keiter, Frank McGurk, R. Travis Osborne, and Stanley D. Porteus. Two Italian contributions, whose authors may be easily guessed, must also be added to this catalogue. The first is a translation of a part of Luigi Gedda's *Meticciano di Guerra*<sup>80</sup>; the second, by Corrado Gini, is a collection of passages from his sociology lessons at the University of Rome, published in 1957<sup>81</sup>.

In the same year, *Race and Modern Science*, *Challenge to the Court: Social Scientists and the Defense of Segregation, 1954-1966*<sup>82</sup>, an essay by historian I. A. Newby, was published in the United States of America: for the first time, an historiographic reconstruction pointed its finger against the IAAEE and "The Mankind Quarterly". It will not be the last<sup>83</sup>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND NOTES

1. For an in-depth reconstruction of the whole matter, see POGLIANO C., *L'ossessione della razza. Antropologia e genetica nel XX secolo*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa 2005, pp 145-210.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 191.
3. *Ibid.*
4. On the IAAEE see also: MEHLER B., *Foundations for Fascism: The New Eugenics Movement In The United States*. *Patterns of Prejudice* 1989; 23: 17-25; ID., *Institute For The Study of Academic Racism-Bibliographies*, online at [www.ferris.edu/isar/homepage.htm](http://www.ferris.edu/isar/homepage.htm); TUCKER W. H., *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana 1994; BILLIG M., *Psychology, Racism and Fascism*. Searchlight, Birmingham 1979.
5. TUCKER W. H., *The Funding of Scientific Racism. Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana-Chicago 2002, p. 79.
6. For a biographical sketch of Gates, see BARKAN E., *The Retreat of Scientific Racism. Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and in the United States between the World Wars*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992, pp. 168-76.
7. TUCKER W. H., *The Funding of Scientific Racism*. Op. cit. note 5, pp. 79-86.
8. Oswald Mosley (1896-1980) was a British politician, known principally as the founder, in 1932, of the British Union of Fascists. The monthly journal "The European" (1953-59) was edited by Mosley's wife.
9. B. Mehler's biographies of Gayre and Gregor, included in *Institute for the Study of Academic Racism-Bibliographies*, can be consulted for free online at [www.ferris.edu/isar/bibliography/homepage.html](http://www.ferris.edu/isar/bibliography/homepage.html)
10. TUCKER W. H., *The Funding of Scientific Racism*. Op. cit. note 5, pp. 87-88.
11. *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U. S. 483 (1954) was a landmark decision of the United States Supreme Court, which overturned earlier rulings going back to *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896, by declaring that state laws that established separate public schools for black and white students denied black children equal educational opportunities.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 101-30.
13. On this issue see also Gates' obituary, written by Gedda himself: GEDDA L., *Prof. R. Ruggles Gates (in memoriam)*. *Acta Geneticae Medicae et Gemellologiae* 1963; 1: 95. The article also includes a bibliography of Gates' contributions to Gedda's journal *Acta Geneticae Medicae et Gemellologiae*.
14. GEDDA L., SERIO A., MERCURI A., *Il Meticcio di Guerra e Altri Casi*. Edizioni dell'Istituto Gregorio Mendel Roma, 1960, p. VI.



*Heredity and Scientific Racism*

15. RUGGLES GATES R., *Il Meticcio di Guerra*. *The Mankind Quarterly* 1960; 2: 218.
16. GEDDA L., *A Proposito di Razza*. Vita e Pensiero, September 1938, p. 416 (my translation).
17. GEDDA L., SERIO A., MERCURI A., *Il Meticcio di Guerra e Altri Casi*. op. cit. note 14, p. 6 (my translation).
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 275-76.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 278.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 279.
21. TUCKER W. H., *The Funding of Scientific Racism*. Op. cit., p. 85.
22. GEDDA L., SERIO A., MERCURI A., *Il Meticcio di Guerra e Altri Casi*. Op. cit. note 14, p.214.
23. On the figure of Corrado Gini, until now known only for his work as a statistician and demographer during the fascist era, see CASSATA F., *Il fascismo razionale. Corrado Gini fra scienza e politica*. Carocci, Roma 2006; LANARO S., *Nazione e Lavoro. Saggio sulla Cultura Borghese in Italia 1870-1925*. Marsilio, Venezia 1979, pp. 44-51; IPSEN C., *Demografia Totalitaria. Il Problema della Popolazione nell'Italia Fascista*. Il Mulino, Bologna 1997; TREVES A., *Le Nascite e la Politica nell'Italia del Novecento*, LED, Milano 2002.
24. GINI C., *Eterosi nei Meticci di Guerra?* review of Gedda L., Serio A., Mercuri A., *Il Meticcio di Guerra e Altri Casi*. in *Genus* 1960; 1-4: 168 (my translation), Edizioni dell'Istituto Gregorio Mendel, Roma 1960,
25. See DAVENPORT C. B., - Steggerda M., *Race Crossing in Jamaica*. Carnegie Institution, Washington 1929. For a critical analysis of this research, crucial in the history of American eugenics, see Barkan E., *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*. Op. cit. note 6, pp. 162-68.
26. GINI C., *Eterosi nei Meticci di Guerra?* Op. cit. note 24, p. 168.
27. Archivio Centrale dello Stato (from now on ACS), Gini Papers (from now on, AG), b. b.6, letter from C. Gini to R. Gayre, January 30th 1961.
28. *Ibid.*
29. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from R Gayre to C. Gini, February 3rd 1961.
30. On Dunn's anti-racist commitment, see E. Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, cit., pp. 266-68.
31. DUNN L. C., *Cross Currents in the History of Human Genetics*. In *The Eugenics Review* 1962; 2: 74.
32. GAYRE R. OF GAYRE, L. C. *Dunn on Luigi Gedda, Angelo Serio, Adriana Mercuri, R. Ruggles Gates and "The Mankind Quarterly"* *The Mankind Quarterly*, 1962; 1:49-50.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
35. ACS, AG, b. b.5, letter from A. J. Gregor to C. Gini, July 3rd 1960; letter from C. Gini to A. J. Gregor, July 11th 1960.
36. GREGOR A. J., *Corrado Gini and the Theory of Race Formation*. *Sociology and Social Research* 1961; 45: 175-81; GREGOR A. J., - MAROTTA M., *Sociology in Italy*. *Sociological Quarterly* 1961; 2: 215-21; GREGOR A. J., of Gini C. (review), *Corso di Sociologia*. *Mankind Quarterly* 1961; II, I: 298-300; ID., Castellano V. (review of), *Studi in Onore di Corrado Gini*. *Sociology and Social Research* 1962; 46: 501; ID. *Corrado Gini, the Organismic Analogy and Sociological Explanation*. *Sociological Quarterly* 1967; 8:165-72.
37. ACS, AG, b. b.5, letter from A. J. Gregor to C. Gini, May 3<sup>rd</sup> 1961.
38. GREGOR A. J., *Sociology and the Anthropobiological Sciences*. In: *Mémoire du XIXe Congrès International de Sociologie - Communications*, Comité Organisateur, Mexico 1960, v. II, pp. 83-107.
39. GREGOR A. J., - MCPHERSON D. A., *Sociology and Mental Testing of Non-Industrial Peoples and id. Sociology and the Assimilation of Non-Industrial Peoples*. In: *La Sociologia y la Sociedades en Desarrollo Industrial: Communications before the XXth International Congress of Sociology*. Universidade de Cordoba (Argentina), Cordoba 1963, v.II, pp. 337-50.
40. ACS, AG, b. b.5, letter from C. Gini to A. J. Gregor, October 3rd 1960, followed by an affirmative answer on October 6th 1960. Gregor directly suggested the names of Darwin (letter to C. Gini, February 18th 1961) and Lundberg (letter to C. Gini, November 19<sup>th</sup> 1962).
41. ACS, AG, b. b.5, letter from A. J. Gregor to C. Gini, September 21st 1963.
42. ACS, AG, b. b.5, letter from C. Gini to A. J. Gregor, October 25th 1964 and letter from A. J. Gregor to C. Gini, November 5th 1964.
43. Gayre also joined the “Comitato internazionale per lo studio degli umanoidi pelosi” (International Committee for the Study of Hairy Humanoids), promoted by Gini within the Istituto Internazionale di Sociologia (International Institute of Sociology). On this, see *Comitato Internazionale per lo Studio degli Umanoidi Pelosi*. *Genus* 1962; 4: 1-4.
44. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from Gayre to Gini, December 8th 1960; letter from Gini to Gayre, December 26th 1960; letter from Gayre to Gini, January 2nd 1961; letter from Gini to Gayre, January 9th 1961.
45. GREGOR A. J., *The Logic of Race Classification*. *Genus* 1958; 1-4: 150-61; ID. *The Biosocial Nature of Prejudice*. *Genus* 1962; 1-4. KUTTNER R., *Cultural Selection of Human Psychological Types*. *Genus* 1960; 1-4: 1-4; ID.

*Heredity and Scientific Racism*

- Eugenic Aspects of Preventive Therapy for Mental Retardation*. Genus 1963; 1-4: 1-9; SWAN D., *Genetics and Psychology*. Genus 1964; 1-4: 23-35.
46. GINI C., *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*. The Mankind Quarterly 1960; I, 2:120-25.
  47. ID., *Psychic and Cultural Traits and the Classification of Human Races*. The Mankind Quarterly 1961; I, 4: 236-41.
  48. Id. *Sulle differenze innate tra i caratteri mentali delle varie popolazioni*. Shuey A. M. (review of), *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*. (J. P. Bell Company, Lynchburg 1958). Genus 1960; 1-4: 161-66.
  49. ID., *Possono e devono i caratteri psichici e culturali essere tenuti presenti nella classificazione delle razze umane?* Genus 1955; 11: 71-77.
  50. TUCKER W. H., *The Funding of Scientific Racism*. Op. cit. note 5, p. 74.
  51. GINI C., *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*. Op. cit. note 46, p. 122 (in Italian, GINI C., *Sulle differenze innate tra i caratteri mentali delle varie popolazioni*. Op. cit. note 48, p. 163).
  52. *Ibid.*
  53. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
  54. *Ibid.*
  55. AINSWORTH HARRISON G., *Reviews – The Mankind Quarterly*. Man 1961; 61: 164.
  56. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from W. Landauer to C. GINI, January 31<sup>st</sup> 1961.
  57. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from C. Gini to W. Landauer, February 19<sup>th</sup> 1961.
  58. It must be remembered that Gini alone in Italy, had written a review of the first *Statement on Race* of UNESCO: see Gini C. (review of), Montagu A., *Statement on Race*. (Schuman, New York, 1951), Genus 1953-1954; 10: 192-94.
  59. GINI C., *Psychic and Cultural Traits and the Classification of Human Races*. In The Mankind Quarterly 1961; I, 4: 236-37 (in Italian: ID., *Possono e devono i caratteri psichici e culturali essere tenuti presenti nella classificazione delle razze umane?* Genus 1955; 11: 73).
  60. *Ibid.*, p. 239; (in Italian: p. 76).
  61. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
  62. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from R. Gayre to C. Gini, January 25<sup>th</sup> 1961.
  63. On Boas, see POGLIANO C., *L'Ossessione della Razza*. Op. cit. note 1, pp. 290-96.
  64. See BOAS F., *Changes in the Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants*. Senate Document 208, Washington, 1911.
  65. GINI C. (my translation), *L'assimilazione fisica degli immigrati* (lecture read on the Italian radio on December 31<sup>st</sup> 1951). Genus 1950; 1-4: 19. The re-

- searches of CISP on the physical assimilation of immigrants was the subject of Gini's speeches at various international conferences on eugenics and genetics between the end of the 1930s and the mid 1950s: specifically, at the II International Congress of the Latin eugenics societies (Bucharest, 1939, never held because of the outbreak of World War II), at the VII, the VIII and the IX International Congresses of Genetics (held respectively in Edinburgh 1939, Stockholm 1948 and Bellagio 1953), and at the I International Congress of Human Genetics (Copenhagen 1956).
66. On the multi-faceted and long-lived activities of Montagu, see LYONS A. P., *The Neotenic Career of M. F. Ashley Montagu*. In: REYNOLDS L. T. - LIEBERMAN L., *Race and Other Misadventures. Essays in Honor of Ashley Montagu in His Ninetieth Year*. General Hall, Dix Hills (N.Y.) 1996.
  67. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from C. Gini to R. Gayre, February 7<sup>th</sup> 1961.
  68. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from R. Gayre to C. Gini, March 2<sup>nd</sup> 1961.
  69. PUTNAM C., *Race and Reason: A Yankee View*. Public Affairs Press, Washington 1961. On Carleton Putnam and the publication of *Race and Reason*, see TUCKER W. H., *The Funding of Scientific Racism*. Op. cit. note 5, pp. 101-11.
  70. On this matter see the slating by B. J. Bernstein, *Race and Reason: Review*, "The Journal of Negro History" 1963; 1: 58-60.
  71. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from R. Gayre to C. Gini, January 14<sup>th</sup> 1961; the italics are mine.
  72. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from C. Gini to R. Gayre, February 7<sup>th</sup> 1961.
  73. On the figure of W. C. George, see Tucker W. H., *The Funding of Scientific Racism*. Op. cit. note, pp. 69-78; 105-09.
  74. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from C. Putnam to C. Gini, December 12<sup>th</sup> 1962.
  75. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from C. Gini to C. Putnam, December 24<sup>th</sup> 1962.
  76. ACS, AG, b. b.6, letter from C. Gini to R. Gayre, November 23<sup>rd</sup> 1962.
  77. *Ibid.*, (enclosed).
  78. GINI C., *The Physical Assimilation of the Descendants of Immigrants*. In Kemp-M T., Harvald Hauge-B., *Proceedings of the First International Congress of Human Genetics*, S. Karger, Basel-New York 1958, v. II, pp. 400-03.
  79. GINI C., *Alla soglia dell'umanità*. Rivista di Politica Economica 1964; novembre: 1475-1505.
  80. GEDDA L., *A Study of Racial and Subracial Crossing*. In Kuttner R., *Race and Modern Science*. Social Sciences Press, New York 1967, pp. 123-40.
  81. GINI C., *Race and Sociology*. In: KUTTNER R., *Race and Modern Science*. Op. cit. nota 80, pp. 261-76.

*Heredity and Scientific Racism*

82. NEWBY I. A., *Challenge to the Court: Social Scientists and the Defense of Segregation, 1954-1966*. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge 1967.
83. Recently, the controversy on scientific racism in the United States has erupted again after the publication of the volume by MURRAY C. AND HERRNSTEIN R. J., *The Bell Curve. Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. Free Press, New York 1994. The “evidence” shown by the authors to prove the mental inferiority of Negroes on genetic bases is taken, not surprisingly, from “The Mankind Quarterly”.

Correspondence should be addressed to:  
francesco.cassata@unito.it