

ANGLO-AUSTRALIAN RACIAL SCIENCE, TRANS-
HEMISPHERIC TRANSACTIONS, AND THE “YELLOW
PERIL” IN THE ANGLOSPHERE, 1850-1960

By

ROBERT WILLIAM BROWN

A thesis submitted to the
University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History
School of History and Cultures
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham

September 2016

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

This thesis traces the history of Anglo-Australian racial science between 1850 and 1960, and examines evolving anthropological constructions of interracial marriage, as a lens through which we can re-evaluate gold rush histories and changing attitudes to East Asian migration throughout the British World, the British Empire's geo-political relationship with China and Japan, and the transnational dissemination and contestation of the "yellow peril" trope. By decentring the histories of racial science and the British Empire from their North Atlantic moorings, and looking to anxious perceptions of East Asians emanating from antipodean Britons of the 'global south', the thesis builds a more trans-hemispheric narrative of the rise and fall of racial thinking. It does this by utilising two case studies. One examines the Sydney geographer Professor Griffith Taylor's interwar problematisation of the White Australia Policy and the 'transnational biopolitics' of Asian immigration restriction in the Anglosphere, through his positive pronouncements about Eurasian intermarriage. Secondly, analysing the latter career of outcast former Kings College London racial scientist Professor Reginald 'Ruggles' Gates, and his 'race crossing' research in 1950s Australia and Japan, the thesis complicates histories of the global decline of racial thinking and survival of marginal scientific racists after the fall of Nazism.

Acknowledgments

I owe a great debt of gratitude to both of my supervisors, Gavin Schaffer and Sadiah Qureshi. Together they have been patient and encouraging throughout my doctoral research. I'd also like to thank the staff members at the University of Birmingham for their help, particularly Elaine Fulton and Shirley Ye. I'd like to express my massive appreciation to the past and present postgraduate community at the University of Birmingham, particularly Patrick Longson who was a good friend and an early guiding influence. My thanks also go to Jamie Perry, Andrew Jones, Daisy Payling, Saima Nasar, Amy Edwards, Holly Ellis, Rebecca Crites, Helen Coy, Kelly Waterhouse, Ellis Stacey, Shahmima Akhtar, Ruth Lindley, and Laura Sefton.

The research that constitutes this project was drawn from a number of archives in both Britain and Australia. I'd like to thank the staff at the Queensland State library for being so friendly, helpful, and willing to share their inside knowledge with a dreary and disorientated Englishman. Special thanks go to John Burnett, an amateur researcher who catalogued the Griffith Taylor papers in the National Library of Australia, for talking with me and sharing his notes and advice. Thanks to Professor Marilyn Lake, my Universitas 21 supervisor at the University of Melbourne, her invaluable insights helped me broaden and decentre my research, and taught me that Britain isn't at the centre of the world. Thanks also to the postgraduates at the University of Melbourne, Andre Bret, Shane Smits and Chloe Ward.

Finally, I'd like to thank my family and friends for their support throughout the process. Simon Crane, Jonathan Garbett and Ellis Stacey in particular have been a continuous source of both patience and positivity. I owe a massive debt to my parents Caroline and Clive and my brother Jonathan who have supported me without question throughout.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	ii
List of Abbreviations and Terminology	vi
Introduction	1
Histories of the ‘yellow peril’	7
The ‘yellow peril’, the Chinese question and the White Australia Policy	10
Histories of Racial Science	16
Re-writing race science from the global south.....	20
The Career of Professor Griffith Taylor.....	26
The Career of Professor Reginald Gates in the Global South.....	29
Structure and Methodology.....	32
Chapter Structure.....	36
Chapter 1: The Victoria Gold Rush (1851), Asian Exclusion and “yellow peril” Narratives in the British World	42
Gold Rushes	62
The ‘long and strong’ Traditions of Euro-American Miscegenation Thinking	66
Chinese–Australians and the Immigration Restriction Acts	78
The ‘yellow peril’ Trope, Miscegenation Panics, and the Birth of ‘White Men’s Countries’	88
Conclusion.....	106
Chapter 2: Interwar miscegenation and the rise and demise of physical anthropology in Britain and Australia.	110
The Anthropological Investigation of Race Mixture in the Interwar Years: The Universities of Adelaide, Sydney and Melbourne.	123
The Harvard-Adelaide Race Crossing Study (1938-39).....	135
Sydney Scholars in the Pacific	140
Miscegenation Thinking at Melbourne	146
Fleming and Fleure’s Race Crossing Investigation in Liverpool (1924-1927).....	162
Conclusion.....	178
Chapter 3: ‘Yellow Peril’ or Golden Future? Professor Griffith Taylor and Australian Miscegenation Thinking Between the Wars	181
The Existing Literature.....	185
Early Career.....	188
From Clouds to Calipers: Taylor the Physical Anthropologist	197

The Public Backlash: ‘Taylor Made’ Gets Stitched Up	209
<i>Environment and Race</i> (1927).....	216
From Adelaide to Auschwitz: Racial Thinking in the North Atlantic	225
The Transnational Treatment: Cedric Dover and the Eurasians of the British Empire	230
Conclusion.....	234
Chapter 4: The research of Professor Reginald ‘Ruggles’ Gates in the global south in the 1950s.....	238
Early career	240
Anthropometric Studies in Cuba, 1952	252
Lectures with the Emperor: Travels, Studies and Scientific Networks in Japan, 1954	253
Calipers and contacts: race crossing research in Australia, 1958	262
Conclusion.....	289
Thesis conclusion.....	292
APPENDIX.....	300
BIBLIOGRAPHY	302

List of Abbreviations and Terminology

The use of terminology has proven to be highly problematic when writing about 'race'. I have therefore aimed to use inverted commas when referencing such terms, in order to avoid any implicit endorsement of nineteenth and twentieth century biological determinism. What follows is a brief description of a number of terms and constructs addressed in the thesis.

Miscegenation: the interbreeding of people considered to be of different racial types¹

Monogenesis: The theory that humans are all descended from a single pair of ancestors

Polygenesis: The hypothetical origination of a race or species from a number of independent stocks

Half-Caste: A person whose parents are of different races

Quadroon: A person who is one-quarter black by descent. Early 18th century (earlier as *quarteron*): via French from Spanish *cuarterón*, from *cuarto* 'quarter', from Latin *quartus*; later assimilated to words beginning with quadri

Octaroon: A person who is one-eighth black by descent.

Anthropometry: The scientific study of the measurements and proportions of the human body.

Biometry: The application of statistical analysis to biological data.

Psychometry: The science of measuring mental capacities and processes

¹ <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/miscegenation>

Introduction

This thesis traces the history of Anglo-Australian racial science between 1850 and 1960, and examines evolving anthropological constructions of interracial marriage, as a lens through which we can re-evaluate gold rush histories and changing attitudes to East Asian migration throughout the British World, the British Empire's geo-political relationship with China and Japan, and the transnational dissemination and contestation of the 'yellow peril' trope. By decentring the histories of racial science and the British Empire from their North Atlantic moorings, and looking to anxious perceptions of East Asians emanating from antipodean Britons of the 'global south', the thesis builds a more trans-hemispheric narrative of the rise and fall of racial thinking. It does this by utilising two case studies. One examines the Sydney geographer Professor Griffith Taylor's interwar problematisation of the White Australia Policy and the 'transnational biopolitics' of Asian immigration restriction in the Anglosphere, through his positive pronouncements about Eurasian intermarriage. Secondly, analysing the latter career of outcast former Kings College London racial scientist Professor Reginald 'Ruggles' Gates, and his 'race crossing' research in 1950s Australia and Japan, the thesis complicates histories of the global decline of racial thinking and survival of marginal scientific racists after the fall of Nazism.

On the 8th July 1928, Gavin Long, a childhood friend of the University of Sydney Geographer, Professor Griffith Taylor, wrote him an impassioned letter. In it he thoroughly denounced Taylor's new book, *Environment and Race* (1927) for its theories that the Asian was biologically superior to the 'Britisher', and that the White Australia Policy, a biopolitical system enacted in 1901 to exclude Asians from migrating to settle in Australia, should be relaxed so that some Chinese and Japanese settlers could populate the tropical north of the country. He was adamant that the Australian people would never allow Asian immigration,

and that ‘internecine’ ‘race war’ would be a result, an opinion borne out by the vitriolic criticism Taylor received in the popular press throughout the decade.²

By the time Gavin Long wrote to Taylor in 1928, the term, ‘yellow peril’ had for several decades been part of the British Empire’s common vernacular. Broadly, the ‘yellow peril’ of the late nineteenth century encompassed anxiety that the ailing Chinese Qing Empire, and perhaps the whole of the fluid and oft unstable ‘Orient’, would awaken, that the ‘Chinese dragon’ would rouse its vast populations to invade and overwhelm the West in revenge for humiliation at the hands of European treaty port imperialism.³ While Kaiser Wilhelm II is thought to have coined the term as part of the German popular press reaction to Japanese expansionism in their war with China in 1894-5, as Bulfin and Yeats both argue the imaginative construct ‘certainly predated this’.⁴ Bulfin argues that in the British Imperial context, we can ironically find that the ‘genesis’ of the ‘yellow peril’ was touched off not by expansionist Chinese aggression, but as a result of British military, missionary, and commercial penetration of China, and the ‘scramble for concessions’ proceeding from British

² Griffith Taylor papers, National Library of Australia, 9/956: Gavin Long. 8th July 1928, to Taylor, Brighton, Victoria. “Boyhood friend, son of Bishop Long.” His disagreement with some conclusions of *Environment and Race*. Problems of Asian immigration in view of racial prejudice. For the full letter, see Appendix I.

³ Gina Marchetti defines the “yellow peril” as a sweeping ‘Oriental’ phantasm that was, ‘rooted in medieval fears of Genghis Khan and Mongolian invasions of Europe’, encompassing, ‘racist terror of alien cultures, sexual anxieties, and the belief that the West will be overpowered and enveloped by the irresistible, dark, occult force of the East’. See, Gina Marchetti, *Romance and the Yellow Peril*, (University of California Press, 1993), p.2, quoted in Kenneth Chan, *Remade in Hollywood: The Global Chinese Presence in Transnational Cinemas*, (Hong Kong University Press, 2009), p.22. Richard Austin Thompson also identified in his landmark doctoral thesis of 1957, the “yellow peril” represents a number of permutations across a number of interlocking discourses and conversations, from fears of East Asian military aggression, growing economic and geopolitical power of Japan and China in the early twentieth century, and the moral or biological threat posed by non-white immigration into Europe and the United States. See, Richard Austin Thompson, *The Yellow Peril, 1890–1924*, University of Wisconsin, PhD thesis, 1957

⁴ Dylan Yeats and John Kuo Wei Tchen suggest the “yellow peril” was a, ‘practice rooted within a European Enlightenment’ evolving into an important part of the ‘European colonialist worldview’, although Yeats traces the western antipathy to the spectre of Asia back to 18th century renderings of the battle of Thermopylae between the Greeks and Persians. See, John Kuo Wei Tchen and Dylan Yeats, *Yellow Peril, an Archive of Anti-Asian Fear*, (Verso, 2014), p.163. See also, Kaiser Wilhelm II designed the iconic picture drawn by Hermann Knackfuss in 1895 of the Archangel Michael under the Christian cross facing a grave threat from the East, represented by Buddha riding a Chinese dragon, *Völker Europas, Wahrt eure Heiligsten Güter* (Peoples of Europe, Guard Your Dearest Goods), later entitled the “yellow peril” and engraved in *Harper’s Weekly* in 1898. For a copy of the images, see, *Harper’s Weekly*, 1898, in Michael Kevvak, *Becoming Yellow: A Short History of Racial Thinking*, (Princeton University Press, 2011), p.125

victory in the two Opium Wars (1839-41, 1857-60).⁵ Increased labour demands for Britain's burgeoning Pacific empire drove the 'coolie trade' of migrating Chinese labourers throughout the colonies employed to facilitate this expansion.

In Australia, despite the decline of the Qing Empire, Chinese 'coolie' migrants were seen as dangerous aliens bringing crime, disease and sexual depravity, the advance guard of invading hordes. Since the Victorian gold rush of 1851, the 'yellow peril' became part of the 'conventional wisdom' of the Australian colonies, but especially after the Boxer rebellion of 1900 and hysterical images of violence in the imperial press, it gained a more 'wide currency' in the metropole.⁶ The Russo-Japanese war (1904-5) further exacerbated Anglo-Australian fears that although Japan had become an ally in 1902, the ambitious young empire was sizing up Australia for invasion and colonisation.⁷

Australian popular culture in the decades of white nationalist fervour before federation in 1901 was awash with Anti-Chinese vitriol, and the pulp writers and popular press organs such as the Sydney *Bulletin* from the 1880s onwards, pumped out pieces decrying many threats, from the Chinese depressing wages to interracial sex.⁸ Bulfin has focused on the mobility of the 'yellow peril' on the wider Anglo-Australian circuit through her case study of the writer Guy Boothby.⁹ This builds on the work of Ross Forman who has

⁵ For more detail on this, see Robert Bickers, *The Scramble for China: Foreign Devils in the Qing Empire 1832-1914*, (London: Penguin, 2012)

⁶ The Boxer war climaxed in 1900 with the Chinese revolt against treaty port imperialism, besieging the diplomatic legations of the colonial powers in Peking. This was a crisis for the British Empire, and the imperial press circulated vitriolic descriptions of Chinese invasion and sexual violence during the siege.⁶ As Ben Mountford agrees, the Boxer War came to be a node for 'yellow peril' thinking in the British World, linking Britain, Australia and the Qing Empire. See, Ben Mountford, "'The Interests of Our Colonies Seems to Have Been Largely Overlooked": Colonial Australia and Anglo-Chinese Relations', in R. Bickers and J. Howlett (eds.) *Britain and China, 1840-1970: Empire, Finance and War*, (Routledge, 2015)

⁷ Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese war (1904-5), also elicited a flurry of hysterical images from European cartoonists. MIT images website, see, http://ocw.mit.edu/ans7870/21f/21f.027/yellow_promise_yellow_peril/yp_essay04.html

⁸ Ailise Bulfin, Guy Boothby and the "Yellow Peril": Representations of Chinese Immigrants in British Imperial Spaces in the Late-Nineteenth Century, *Australasian Journal of Victorian Studies* 20.1 (2015), p.24-25.

⁹ See, Ailise Bulfin, Guy Boothby and the "Yellow Peril": Representations of Chinese Immigrants in British Imperial Spaces in the Late-Nineteenth Century, *Australasian Journal of Victorian Studies* 20.1 (2015), p.24-25.

seen the British World and China as ‘empire’s entwined’, like Ben Mountford, complicating the ‘colony-metropole’ paradigm.¹⁰

Fears of interracial marriage and miscegenation were inextricably bound up with the ‘yellow peril’. As Henry Reynolds identifies, there was in the early twentieth century a ‘continuing assault from both popular and the most expert opinion on the figure of the mulatto...and racial ideology passed rapidly across national borders.’¹¹ This was echoed by the Anglo-Indian Cedric Dover in his book *‘Half-Caste’* (1938), as he looked back on a ‘prodigal literature’ from all corners of western discourse that had stereotyped the mixed-race Eurasian as an unwelcome by-product of imperialism and the colonial encounter, ‘an undersized, scheming and entirely degenerate bastard. His father is a blackguard, his mother a whore...he is a potential menace to Western Civilisation, to everything that is White and Sacred’.¹²

But the ‘entwined’ relationship between the ‘yellow peril’ cultural narrative and the evolution of racial thinking and scientific racism that accompanied the growth of the British Empire, the debates over slavery and labour, and the colonial encounter has been much less explored. Anne Mellor has offered us a bridge between fictional narratives and racial

¹⁰ Ross G. Forman, *China and the Victorian Imagination: Empires Entwined*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013), p.5-10 See also, for Anglo-Australian theatrical circuits and the staging of plays with ‘oriental’ aesthetics and ‘yellow peril’ themes throughout the empire, Brian Singleton in *Oscar Asche, Orientalism, and British Musical Comedy* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004). He has shown that British World stage networks between Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Britain saw travelling impresarios stage oriental themed plays throughout circuits that were more orientated around the British settler World, and Robert Bickers has noted similar performances and performers in Treaty Port society. Veronica Kelly has explored the vibrancy of Anglo-Australian theatrical networks, and the speed with which orientalist productions such as *The Mikado*, *The Geisha* and *Madame Butterfly* were performed at venues such as the Theatre Royal in Melbourne so soon after they had premiered in London.¹⁰ The ‘oriental’ trope, whether ‘‘yellow peril’’ invasion horror, or titillating visions of exoticism was a popular element of transaction on the Anglo-Australian circuit. See, Veronica Kelly, *The Empire Actors: Stars of Australasian Costume Drama 1890s-1920s*, (Currency House, 2010)

¹¹ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.53, see also, Henry Reynolds, *North of Capricorn: the Untold Story of Australia's North*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 2003)

¹² Cedric Dover, *Half-Caste*, (London, Martin Secker and Warburg, Ltd, 1937), p.13. ‘*An undersized, scheming and entirely degenerate bastard. His father is a blackguard, his mother a whore ... But more than all this, he is a potential menace to Western Civilisation, to everything that is White and Sacred*’.

scientific debates in her article, 'Frankenstein, Racial Science, and the 'Yellow Peril.'”(2003), a re-evaluation of Mary Shelley’s 1818 novel that interweaves analysis of the text with the historical context of the evolution of theories of racial difference, human evolution and white superiority in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹³ Victor Frankenstein’s monster was described as having ‘Mongolian’ features, ‘yellow’ skin and dark hair, but with a ‘European’ body, and was, according to Mellor, a coded critique of miscegenation thinking and increasingly negative scientific constructions of Asians.¹⁴ The anatomist William Lawrence was an acolyte of Johann Friedrich Blumenbach and a friend of Mary Shelley, and the way that Shelley writes Frankenstein, according to Mellor, demonstrates that she was aware of the latest racial classifications of the ‘Mongolian’ type from Lawrence and Blumenbach’s work.¹⁵ The fiction and subsequent fictions harnessed up to date scientific knowledge of the ‘Mongolian’ type in physical and behavioural terms in order to construct ‘yellow peril’ fantasies, and this link between fiction and science is something the thesis will explore.

But we will also explore the mobility of the ‘yellow peril’ construct and racial ideas in culture and science, by re-assessing the growing relationship between the mapping of colonial space, meteorology, medicine, and the mushrooming scientific interest in constituting racial difference in the nineteenth century. The practice of superimposing the suitability of different racial groups for different climates and geographies in the 1800s and 1900s is described by Yeats and Chen as ‘geo-racial mapping’.¹⁶ The nineteenth century saw attempts on the part of a plethora of scholars, from travel writers to anthropologists, anatomists and

¹³ Anne Mellor, “Frankenstein, Racial Science, and the ‘Yellow Peril.’” In *Romantic Science: The Literary Forms of Natural History*. Ed. Noah Heringman. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), p. 173-196. See also on Frankenstein, monogenesis and polygenesis, David S. Hogsette, ‘Metaphysical Intersections in *Frankenstein*: Mary Shelley’s Theistic Investigation of Scientific Materialism and Transgressive Autonomy’, *Christianity and Literature* Vol. 60, No. 4 (Summer 2011)

¹⁴ Ibid, p.5. Refers to, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, *Five Races of Mankind* (1795)

¹⁵ Ibid, p.5

¹⁶ John Kuo Wei Tchen and Dylan Yeats, *Yellow peril, an Archive of Anti-Asian Fear*, (Verso, 2014), p.128

geographers, to classify human difference by stratifying peoples they encountered according to appearance and behaviour, constructing hierarchies that justified European imperialism, colonisation and non-white subordination.¹⁷ But race thinkers were also anxious actors who played their part in fleshing out ‘yellow peril’ fears. In 1877 for instance the French anthropologist, Armand de Quatrefages was already speculating on the demographic enormity of the *race jaunes* of the Far East, and Viscount Arthur de Gobineau in 1880 warned of a future war between the ‘white’ and the ‘yellow’.¹⁸ Theodore Roosevelt and Charles Henry Pearson both became obsessed by the migrations of East Asians.¹⁹ In Northern Australia, where white European colonists struggled to prosper in the face of harsh humidity and tropical disease, ‘elaborate geo-racial mapping suggested that Asians fared better in the semi-tropical climates where European colonialism was least secure.’²⁰ The ‘yellow peril’ struck at the heart of the British World project.

Yeats and Tchen do, despite analysing the work of intellectuals on ‘geo-racial’ mapping, stop short of relating the ‘yellow peril’ to Foucault’s ideas of ‘biopower’ and ‘biopolitics’. In *Society Must Be Defended*, his lecture series in 1975-76, Foucault talked about the importance of ‘biopower’ as a regime constructed to maintain and police the modern state, and regulate and dictate the biological make up of populations.²¹ The ‘yellow peril’ attended the construction of biopolitical regimes of non-white immigration restriction in the Anglosphere, of which the White Australia Policy was just one manifestation, and the fin de

¹⁷ See for instance, Robert Chambers, *The Development of Color*, (1844), Samuel George Morton, *Types of Mankind*, (1854). For a broader discussion, see, Francisco Bethencourt, *Racisms: From the Crusades to the Twentieth Century*, (Princeton University Press, 2013)

¹⁸ See, Michael Keevak, *Becoming Yellow: A Short History of Racial Thinking*, (Princeton University Press, 2011), p.125, see also, Gregory Blue, Gobineau on China: Race Theory, the "Yellow Peril," and the Critique of Modernity, *Journal of World History*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Spring, 1999), pp. 93-139

¹⁹ Phoebe Chow, *Britain's Imperial Retreat from China, 1900-1931*, (Routledge, 2017), p.85

²⁰ John Kuo Wei Tchen and Dylan Yeats, *Yellow peril, an Archive of Anti-Asian Fear*, (Verso, 2014), p.128, see work such as, E.W Cole ‘Colour Map of the World’, *The White Australia Question*, (Melbourne, 1903) in, John Kuo Wei Tchen and Dylan Yeats, p.162. For discussion see, Alison Bashford, *Global Population: History, Geopolitics, and Life on Earth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014)

²¹ Michel Foucault, translated by David Macey, *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*, (Penguin, 2004)

siècle concentration on racial difference was arguably very much intertwined with the rise of biopolitical discourses of race war, social Darwinism, eugenics and scientific racism. In reviewing the historiography of the ‘yellow peril’, the thesis intends to show how we can make the histories of the ‘yellow peril’, the Chinese question, and anxieties about the rise of Japan speak to histories of racial science, biopolitics and geo-racial mapping that have increasingly come to the forefront of more recent histories of Australian, British and British World historiographies. I will take this further by making cross-disciplinary connections, complicating the relationship between the dissemination of “‘yellow peril’” narratives and the rise and fall of racial thinking and scientific racism in the twentieth century British World by tracing Anglo-Australian intellectual, political and cultural transactions.

Histories of the ‘yellow peril’

As Mellor has attempted to do, we need to link fictional and scientific constructions of race, by understanding how narratives of ‘yellow peril’ were not only grounded in entertainment, but also geo-political anxieties about power, sex, modern technology and disease. As Christopher Frayling argues in *Dr. Fu Manchu and the Rise of Chinophobia*, ‘Sinophobia’ by the Edwardian period could be traced within a plethora of overlapping conversations found in the popular press, popular stage and music hall, the pulp fiction novel, and later, with the arrival of films such as *Broken Blossoms* (1919), the cinema.²² Although tracing the exploration of anti-Chinese stereotypes back to the opium fuelled Charles Dickens *Edwin Drood*, Frayling locates the writer Arthur Sarsfield’s pulp ‘‘yellow peril’’ detective novel,

²² Christopher Frayling, *The Yellow Peril: Dr Fu Manchu and the Rise of Chinophobia*, (Thames & Hudson: London, 2014), p.9

The Mystery of Dr. Fu Manchu (1913) as a nexus for the fleshing out of negative stereotypes of East Asians as cunning, cruel and inscrutable.²³ The ‘devil doctor’ of the novel, described as ‘the ‘yellow peril’ incarnate in one man’ by Denis Nayland-Smith, one of the British detectives tasked with catching him, proved so internationally popular that it spawned a succession of books and films.²⁴ Seshagiri argues *Fu Manchu* and the “‘yellow peril’” fiction genre provided a language for Britons’ anxieties about the rise of Asia, which could be brought about by the oriental appropriation of western technology.²⁵ ‘*Fu Manchu* novels....ultimately register England’s moral, political, and physiological failures.’²⁶ It is the rendering of imagined British ‘physiological failures’ in this context that is important.

Fears of interracial intimacy in Britain’s cities, and the growing notoriety of London’s Limehouse district, stereotyped as a den of vice and seduction, became a significant node of the “‘yellow peril’” trope, played upon by writers such as Sarsfield to sell more copies of their lurid fictions. Michael Diamond in *Lesser breeds: racial attitudes in popular British fiction, 1890-1940* (2006), explored anxieties of interracial sex between white women and Chinese men in London and Liverpool, and how this was constructed as a modern ‘biohazard’ in hysterical press coverage and gruesome pulp fiction. In Sarsfield’s *The Yellow Claw* (1915), ‘Eurasian’ women indeed are depicted as attractive yet ‘wicked’ and immoral, and this reflected stereotypes that miscegenation produced a degenerate hybrid type, the ‘half-caste’.²⁷ As Gina Marchetti also investigates in *Romance and the ‘yellow peril’* (1992), interracial

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Urmila Seshagiri, *Modernity’s (Yellow) Perils: Fu-Manchu and English Race*, *Cultural Critique*, 62 (Winter 2006), p.177

²⁵ Ibid, p.173

²⁶ Ibid, p.168

²⁷ Michael Diamond in *Lesser breeds: racial attitudes in popular British fiction, 1890-1940* (Anthem Press, London, 2006), p.28-32

sexuality as a cinematic trope in the United States was a prominent fixation, implying that miscegenation made the East Asian presence in ‘white men’s countries’ permanent.²⁸

Britain signed an alliance with Japan in 1902 and 1905, with the assistance of Britain in closing the Suez Canal to Russian warships, the Japanese defeated the Russian Empire in 1905. Rotem Kowner has explored the changing image of Japan during the late nineteenth century, and notes that western descriptions of the Japanese as a racial type became more negative, unified and distinct as the nation rapidly developed itself as a regional empire capable of challenging European interests.²⁹ Initial approval for the speed of Japan’s modernisation and military buildup in the Pacific, Ross Forman argues, began to give way to an anxiety that Japan, China, or even a combination of Asian nations could end up, ‘supposedly overrunning Australia and America and South Africa...on their way to England’s shores—a hysteria that reaches its culmination in the invasion novels’.³⁰ As Ailise Bulfin adds, it was the hybrid threat, the imaginary trope of Sino-Japanese combination embodied in the half-Chinese, half-Japanese villain Yen How in M.P. Shiel’s *The Yellow Danger* (1898), that most terrified the western reader.

Yorimitsu Hashimoto even goes so far as to argue that Shiel’s *The Yellow Danger* (1898), contained sentiments such as a phobia for Chinese immigration that had been taken from American discourse, but also ‘British anti-Asian germ-phobia.’³¹ In addition he analyses of *The Stolen Bacillus* (1893), ‘as a metaphor for immigration-scares, and also relates the rise

²⁸ Gina Marchetti, *Romance and the Yellow peril*, (UCP, 1993)

²⁹ Rotem Kowner, ‘Lighter than Yellow, but not Enough’: Western Discourse on the Japanese ‘Race’, 1854-1904, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Mar., 2000), pp. 103-131

³⁰ Ross G. Forman, *Peking Plots: Fictionalising the Boxer Rebellion of 1900*, *Victorian Literature and Culture* (1999)

³¹ Hashimoto, Yorimitsu. “Germs, Body-politics and Yellow Peril: Relocation of Britishness in *The Yellow Danger*,” *Australasian Victorian Studies Journal* (Australasian Victorian Studies Association, The University of New England, Australia) 9 (2003): 52–66, see also, Hashimoto, Yorimitsu. “Victorian Biological Terror: A Study of ‘*The Stolen Bacillus*’”, *The Undying Fire: The Journal of the H.G. Wells Society, The Americas* (The H.G. Wells Society, the Americas) 2 (2003): 3–27.

of germ theory.³² By drawing on this branch of scholarship, we are able to link these tropes with the development of eugenics and race science. By doing this we will be able to develop the argument that the ‘yellow peril’ spurred the pathologisation of immigration and interracial marriage that, as we will discuss, was a cornerstone of early twentieth century anthropological discourse.

The ‘yellow peril’, the Chinese question and the White Australia Policy

David Walker in *Anxious Nation* (1999) argued that ‘Australia came to nationhood at a time when the growing power of the East was arousing growing concern...this in turn came to influence how Australians saw themselves as an outpost of Europe facing Asia’.³³ He painted the East Asian question of past and present as central to understanding Australian history. Walker’s ground breaking work charted Australia’s anxious construction of the ‘orient’ and the pacific through an impressive range of analysis on debates among politicians, writers, geographers and anthropologists from the 1850s to 1930s, when he argues groups such as the Institute of Pacific Relations began to reorientate and shape more positive engagements.³⁴

In the same vein as other Australian historians such as Neville Meaney, a number of Walker’s articles examine in detail how ‘yellow peril’ narratives told and disseminated through fiction and journalism tapped into nineteenth century anxieties about antipodean

³² Hashimoto, Yorimitsu. “Victorian Biological Terror: A Study of ‘The Stolen Bacillus’”, *The Undying Fire: The Journal of the H.G. Wells Society, The Americas* (The H.G. Wells Society, the Americas) 2 (2003): 3–27.

³³ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999)

³⁴ David Walker, 2013, *Conspicuous hospitality: cultivating a new racial etiquette in Australia, 1930–1960*, in *Enriched relations: public diplomacy in Australian-Indian relations*, Readworthy Publications, New Delhi, India, pp.62-90.

Britons security and self-image.³⁵ Fin de siècle Australian writers such as Thomas Roydhouse, Kenneth Mackay and William Lane presented, ‘a vision of drowned cities, lost kingdoms and defeated races tossed aside by forces too powerful to resist. This was the fear of racial annihilation’.³⁶ Walker argues that phrases such as ‘the Awakening East’ and the “‘yellow peril’” became not just colonially recognised motifs, but were also used to ‘transmit a warning to the West’ that European empires needed to do more to prevent the rise of Asia. As Neville Meaney, Sascha Auerbach and Ailise Bulfin have both noted, “‘yellow peril’” pulp fiction writers and cartoonists such as Guy Boothby and William Lane were very much globally mobile Anglo-Australians, blending their metropolitan and colonial travels and experiences to push the plethora of East Asian questions such as Chinese migration and racial mixing as problems of empire and Greater Britain combined, rather than an issue for the geographic and discursive periphery.³⁷

However, as Walker and Kane Collins also explore in *Other voices, other traditions : Swimming against the mainstream in Australian history* (2002), narratives of the “‘yellow peril’” and the Chinese question became heavily infused into the writing and the activities of those intellectuals at the forefront of the drive towards and justification of the White Australia Policies of 1901.³⁸ Charles Pearson, as Walker and Collins argue, was particularly significant

³⁵ David Walker, ‘Survivalist Anxieties: Australian Responses to Asia, 1890s to the Present’, *Australian Historical Studies* 120 (2002):319_30

³⁶ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999)

³⁷ Neville Meaney, “‘The Yellow Peril’—Invasion Scare Novels and Australian Political Culture.” in, *The 1890s: Australian Literature and Literary Culture*. Ed. Ken Stewart, (St Lucia, Qld.: U of Queensland P, 1996), see also, Ailise Bulfin, Guy Boothby’s ‘Bid for Fortune’: constructing an Anglo-Australian colonial identity for the fin-de-siècle London literary marketplace, in, Maggie Tonkin, Mandy Treagus, Madeleine Seys, Sharon Crozier-De Rosa. eds, *Changing the Victorian Subject*, (University of Adelaide Press, 2014), looks to write more joined up histories of the Anglo-Australian marketplace for pulp literature, by examining the career of Anglo-Australian novelist, Guy Boothby.

³⁸ Walker, David and Collins, Kane 2008, *Other voices, other traditions : Swimming against the mainstream in Australian history, in As others see us : the values debate in Australia*, Australian Scholarly Publishing, North Melbourne, Vic., pp.3-14, see also, Ouyang Yu, *Chinese in Australian Fiction, 1888-1988*, (Cambria Press, 2008), has catalogued in some detail Anglo-Australian fiction and journalism describing the Chinese, and the ‘exploitation and promotion’ of ‘endemic’ racist anti-East Asian ‘paranoia’ throughout the

in this, and his book on the future downfall of the white race, *The National Life and Character* (1893) resonated and was appropriated by politicians such as Alfred Deakin to justify the unprecedented shutting off of all non-white immigration to the new Australian Commonwealth. Marilyn Lake has gone even further in *The Day Will Come*, her chapter on Pearson's work and its reception, arguing that the book on the rise of the non-white races to global supremacy was so significant that it became part of an 'imperial commons' of core literature in fin de siècle Euro-American discourse that alerted North Atlantic readers to southern colonial anxieties.³⁹ Disliking Pearson's vision of Asian ascendancy, 'self-styled white men's countries in South Africa, North America and Australasia' enacted similar restrictive methods to keep even non-white British subjects from settling. Pearson's constructions of race were an important part of the intellectual underpinning of the Immigration restriction acts of 1901 and 1902, enacted as Australia became a federation. But at the same time Lake argues that in the longer term, the refusal of racial equality spurred the 'political mobilisation of Asians' throughout the globe, hastening moves toward a Eurasian society that Australian politicians had sought to avoid.⁴⁰

This work supplemented a rich body of scholarship, as a number of historians such as Andrew Markus, Glenda Tavan and James Jupp had already explored the importance of the Chinese question and the "yellow peril" narrative and changing constructions of racial difference, along with the aboriginal question in shaping the White Australia Policy.⁴¹ Ann Curthoys has argued that to really understand histories of the 'yellow peril' we need to

nineteenth and 20th century's through many nodes of popular culture. Crucially he has also explored the 'literary treatment of offspring of mixed Chinese-European parentage'.³⁸p.5

³⁹ Marilyn Lake, 'The Day Will Come': Charles H Pearson's National Life and Character: A Forecast, in, *Ten Books that Shaped the British Empire: Creating an Imperial Commons*, (2014), p.77

⁴⁰ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008)

⁴¹ Andrew Markus, *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850–1901*, (Hale & Iremonger, 1979), Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe, 2005), James Jupp, *From White Australia to Woomera: The Story of Australian Immigration*, (Cambridge University Press, 2002)

explore the Victorian gold rush of 1851 which attracted the first surge of East Asian migrant workers.⁴²

Lake also reflected another recent trend in the writing of Australian history, namely re-discovering the agency and mobility of East-Asian Australians. Kate Bagnall and Sophie Couchman have engaged in recent ground-breaking work on Chinese-Australians. In *Chinese-Australians* (2015) they have not only charted the gradual growth in hostility towards interracial marriage in the late nineteenth century, but also the attempts of Chinese-Australians to contest these negative stereotypes, assert their ongoing rights as British subjects, while at the same time performing and assimilating Australian cultural values into their day to day lives.⁴³ By focusing on notable figures such as Quong Tart, and what their lives tell us about colonial life, Bagnall and others have significantly complicated histories of Australian race relations.⁴⁴ Kane Collins has also suggested that not all settlers imagined the future of East Asian settlement in an apocalyptic light as some historians of the White Australia Policy have claimed.⁴⁵

But most importantly, building on national histories on the question of racial exclusion, Lake and Reynolds have also tried to expand and frame these questions far more transnationally, and understand the “yellow peril” and its impact on Australian politics and society as part of something more global. The result was *Drawing the Global Colour Line*, a text which will be key for the methodological underpinnings of this thesis, tracing the

⁴² Ann Curthoys, “Men of All Nations, Except Chinamen: Chinese on the New South Wales Goldfields”, in Iain McCalman, Alexander Cook, and Andrew Reeves, eds, *Gold Forgotten Histories and Lost Objects of Australia*, (Cambridge University Press, 2001) pp.103 – 24, see also, 2003 “Liberalism and Exclusionism: A Prehistory of the White Australia Policy”, in *Legacies of White Australia: Race Culture and Nation*, Laksiri Jayasuriya, David Walker and Jan Gothard (eds) (1st Edition, University of Western Australia Press, Crawley, Western Australia, 2003) pp 8-33.

⁴³ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008)

⁴⁴ Ibid

⁴⁵ Kane Collins, *Imagining the golden race*, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska eds., *Australia’s Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012), p.101

transnational circulation of ideas and practices surrounding immigration restriction and the preservation of whiteness.⁴⁶ Benjamin Mountford has also used the Chinese question as a lense through which to understand a triangular relationship between Britain, Australia and the Chinese Empire, and through this build a more nuanced picture of imperial issues.⁴⁷ Sascha Auerbach's *Race Law and the Chinese Puzzle*, while ostensibly a study of the rendering of the Chinese in early twentieth century London, made important strides by crediting the White Australia debate, which turned the "yellow peril" into an imperial issue by the time of the Transvaal 1906 controversy, as the factor which contributed towards hardening sentiments towards what was a miniscule East Asian population in the metropole.⁴⁸

Some of this literature has also, albeit in a far more limited way, started to trace an intertwined relationship between the developments of fin de siècle white man's countries, racial exclusion and the 'yellow peril', and evolving scientific theories of racial difference. Robert Julio Decker and Elazar Barkan cite the influence of scientific racists Charles Davenport and Madison Grant on the Immigration Restriction League in the interwar United States, while Alison Bashford presents the influence of the Townsville Institute of Tropical Medicine on Australian settlement discourse.⁴⁹

The work of Alison Bashford, particularly in *Imperial Hygiene*, proves to be a very useful bridgehead for making histories of race, empire and colonialism speak to histories of science, medicine and public health measures. Exploring the 'historical relatedness of public

⁴⁶ Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall. ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015)

⁴⁷ Benjamin Mountford, *The Open Door Swings Both Ways: Australia, China and the British World System, c.1770-1907*, DPhil Thesis, Exeter College, University of Oxford September 2012

⁴⁸ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and "The Chinese Puzzle" in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009)

⁴⁹ Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the Two World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), Robert Julio Decker, "The Transnational Biopolitics of Immigration Restriction in the United States and White Settler Colonies, 1894-1924", in Eva Bischoff, Norbert Finzsch, and Ursula Lehmkuhl (eds.): *Provincializing the United States. Colonialism, Decolonization and Post-Colonialism*, (2014), p.81, Alison Bashford, *Imperial Hygiene: A Critical History of Colonialism, Nationalism, and Public Health* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

health and governance, hygiene and rule over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries' in colonial and Commonwealth Australasia, Bashford approaches the Chinese and East Asian question by exploring two key histories, practises of 'international biopolitics' and quarantining from the late nineteenth century onwards.

Bashford argues that Australia's unique position as a series of colonies in close proximity to a populous East Asia, coupled with ongoing anxious debates among medical practitioners about the vulnerability of the white settler body in the tropics, meant that 'questions of race and a racialized geopolitics structured and shaped the knowledge, practice and bureaucracy of public health in Australia in the same fundamental way that questions of class and urbanisation shaped British public health in the nineteenth century.'⁵⁰

Between the 1880s and the 1950s, Australia continually tightened its regulatory and restrictive practices toward Chinese and Asian immigration and mobility, engaging in processes of both internal and 'international biopolitics' to preserve its 'cordon sanitaire' not only against disease, but against non-white peoples. Developing ideas of public health, racial hygiene and the "yellow peril" started to coalesce in the 1880s around quarantining regimes that were enacted in response to leprosy and smallpox outbreaks in Sydney in 1881 and elsewhere, as such outbreaks were blamed on Chinese-Australians and Asian migrant ships.⁵¹

Coming at a time when New South Wales and elsewhere were forming the anti-Chinese legislation that set the precedent for the White Australia Policy, Walker and Bashford both argue that Canada, New Zealand and California passed similar restrictions in the 1880s, Chinese immigration, and the idea of interracial marriage between East-Asians and Europeans was rapidly cast as a harbinger of disease and contamination. Bashford uses this approach to re-orientate understandings of the drive towards the White Australia Policy. The

⁵⁰ Ibid, P.5

⁵¹ Ibid, p.10

maritime quarantining of East Asian migrant ships in the 1880s was the beginning of a set of intertwined responses to the “yellow peril” leading to the Immigration Restriction Acts of 1901 with the rationale that they protected white European settlers and, ‘secured the (insecure) geo-body and civic body of white Australia as part of the racialised defence response to an ‘invasion narrative’ which governed much law, literature, culture, and policy of the early twentieth century.⁵² As Bashford crucially identifies, phantasmagorical fears of East Asian invasion, colonisation by force and miscegenation with whites, therefore shaped the biomedical and bureaucratic responses.

But as Diana Wyndham admits in her work, histories of racial science and public health in the Australian context have had an insular focus, concentrating on national and state based eugenics and birth control movements rather than making wider connections between similar processes in the global south and North Atlantic.⁵³ So therefore it is imperative to expand on this scholarship, and do more to link the ‘yellow peril’, restriction legislation, and frame it in conversation with histories regarding the growth of biology and anthropology in the 1920s in order to respond to the proliferation of interracial marriage. Therefore I aim to compare and relate the uniqueness of the Asian question in Australia to how medical and anthropological discourse approached it in the North Atlantic.

Histories of Racial Science

Indeed as Kunal M. Parker argues in *Making Foreigners*, ‘opposition to...scientific racial thinking existed, but was overwhelmed’ in the United States of the 1910s and 1920s.⁵⁴

⁵² Ibid, P.137

⁵³ Diana Wyndham. *Eugenics in Australia: Striving for National Fitness*, (London: Galton Institute, 2003)

⁵⁴ Kunal M. Parker, *Making Foreigners: Immigration and Citizenship Law in America, 1600-2000*, (Cambridge University Press, 2015), p.149

Although biologists, anthropologists, biometricians and eugenicists in the United States and elsewhere eventually proved unable to deliver entirely on their promises to shape and improve populations through recommending breeding programs, and identifying ‘inferior’ immigrant ‘types’, racial attitudes and biopolitics had a closer relationship with racial science in the 1920s than they did in the 1890s. Indeed as Elazar Barkan has investigated, physical anthropologists such as Charles Davenport and Madison Grant, both vehement Nordacists opposed to non-white immigration into the United States, were heavily involved with the Immigration Restriction League in the 1920s.⁵⁵ The early 1920s also saw the hardening of negative assumptions that interracial intimacy produced ‘unfit’ and unstable hybrid children. Popular commentators like Lothrop Stoddard, and segregationist race scientists like Reginald Gates at Kings College London, later marginalised and ridiculed for his hard line views on fixed human difference in the 1930s as these certainties destabilised, was in the mainstream when he wrote in 1923 that race crossing should be avoided at all costs.

However scholarship on the ‘yellow peril’ and international biopolitics has not done enough to speak to this work on interwar scientific racism. Arguably the “‘yellow peril” went from being a set of narratives and images about civilisation and culture clash fuelled by economics and migration and colonialism in the late nineteenth century, to a conversation that became incorporated into racial scientists responses to the currents of anti-immigration racist sentiment throughout the 1920s Anglosphere, embodied in the extension of the Chinese Exclusion Act in California in 1924, part of a growing sense that the fitness of resident populations and the character and quality of immigrants could be understood, shaped and filtered by scientific methods.

⁵⁵ Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the Two World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), p.92

Lucy Bland is one of the few historians who has attempted to trace responses of British racial scientists and the British eugenics movement to “yellow peril” narratives, which she draws out of a number of economic disputes, debates about immigration, interracial sexuality changing gender roles, and the sensationalisation of criminal cases.⁵⁶ She uses the 1919 race riots in British port cities, blamed to a large extent on the friction between returning servicemen and their perceptions of non-white immigrant’s sexual liaisons with European women, as a framework within which she conducts a case study of a race crossing investigation of Anglo-Chinese children in Liverpool commissioned by Britain’s Eugenics Society in 1924. Arguing that the anthropometric study was motivated by anxieties about the proliferation of a multi-racial Britain and a crisis of whiteness in the wake of the First World War, Bland found that the investigation, conducted by H.J Fleure and Rachel Fleming, came to more nuanced conclusions about the Eurasian children of Liverpool, and while it replicated assumptions about racial difference that were common to 1920s physical anthropology, it anticipated the gradual decline in scientific hostility to miscegenation in Britain.⁵⁷ The limitation of Bland’s work is that although she references historians who have approached the colonial connections of the 1919 riots, hers is largely a national study of Britain that only hints at the wider connections between the Chinese question and racial science transnationally.

Indeed much of the historical scholarship of racial science has chosen to focus mainly on the Anglo-American and European networks. Much research has also focused on black-white binaries, and where racial scientists of the twentieth century stood on categorising East Asians is less clear, but nevertheless there is a strong historiographical base to draw on. As Gavin Schaffer has argued in, *Like a Baby with a Box of Matches!': British Scientists and the*

⁵⁶ Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and 'Race Crossing': a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on 'Eugenics Old and New', *New Formations*, (2007), 60.

⁵⁷ Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and 'Race Crossing': a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on 'Eugenics Old and New', *New Formations*, (2007), 60.
(2007), Lucy Bland, 'White Women and Men of Colour: Miscegenation Fears in Britain after the Great War', *Gender & History*, Vol.17 No.1 April 2005, pp. 29–61.

Concept of 'Race' in the Inter-War Period, the historical narrative of race science in the interwar years was traditionally one of a relatively straightforward rebuttal of the 'existing scholarship on 'race'' by British scientists, driven by a methodological shift from physical anthropology to genetics, and a desire to combat Nazi 'race' thinking.⁵⁸ The universality of this story, he argues, is 'exaggerated'. In fact the 'ideological factors' and assumptions that drove Anglo-American anti-racism were more complex and haphazard, and racial science had become a fragmented methodological minefield in the mid-1930s, where differing ideas of difference and mixtures from conservative, liberal, socialist leaning intellectuals jostled and co-existed. Complicating our understandings of race science, while admitting the undeniable importance of the events of the 1930s, Schaffer argues that, 'the seeds of the post-Second World War international scientific rejection of 'race' were sown in inter-war Britain amid considerable ambivalence and discord'.⁵⁹

Tony Kushner agrees that there was a political necessity for British intellectuals to resist Nazism and all of its associated doctrines of white superiority.⁶⁰ The Nazi challenge however, 'produced a dilemma for race scientists' in Britain, some of whom found it hard to abandon the concept of racial difference despite their public commitment to anti-racism. Kushner uses the example of Herbert John Fleure, a geographer at the University of Aberystwyth, who had also presided over the conduct of the Eugenics Society commissioned study of Liverpool's Anglo-Chinese children in 1927. His inability, and the inability of other anti-Nazi intellectuals to fully leave behind their private attachment to race science and the concept of human difference, Kushner and Schaffer both argue, very much complicated the de-racialisation of science, and, ironically, such methodological and moral uncertainty gave

⁵⁸ Gavin Schaffer, "Like a Baby with a Box of Matches": British Scientists and the Concept of "Race" in the Interwar Period', *British Journal for the History of Science* (2005), 38: 3, 307–24.

⁵⁹ Ibid

⁶⁰ Tony Kushner (2008) H. J. Fleure: a paradigm for inter-war race thinking in Britain, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 42:2, 151-166

room for the marginal implicit or explicit continuation in Britain and the United States of scientific racism after the Second World War. Despite his public anti-Nazi activity, Fleure even remained on friendly terms after the war with the arch segregationist, anti-Semitic scientific racist Reginald Gates, although Fleure in their correspondence did suggest that Gates should adapt or moderate his consistently extreme views of miscegenation in the 1940s and 50s. Somewhat problematically a number of histories of Anglo-American race thinkers and racial discourse, as well as focusing on black-white binaries as they related to ongoing segregation debates in twentieth century United States, and mass immigration in post-war Britain, have frequently ignored the approaches race scientists used to respond to questions and anxieties about East Asian migration and assimilation.⁶¹ The colonial anthropologists throughout the British Empire are furthermore similarly often banished to the margins as peripheral actors in the rise and fall of scientific racism. As historians of science and public health such as Warwick Anderson have identified, this needs to be rectified. ⁶²

Re-writing race science from the global south

Warwick Anderson has identified that until recently, the historiography of twentieth century racial science has placed lopsided emphasis on discussions of North Atlantic transactions. Nancy Stepan in *The Idea of Race in Science* (1982) had been symptomatic of Anglo or Eurocentric focuses, extrapolating the thought of British eugenicists to tell global stories about the evolution of racial thinking, and in the process ignoring or marginalising the unique conceptual frameworks that grew up in Australia, and the British World of the Global South

⁶¹ Schaffer highlights this in, Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930-62*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)

⁶² Warwick Anderson, Racial Conceptions in the Global South, *Isis*, Vol. 105, No. 4 (December 2014), pp. 785

in the early twentieth century. Elazar Barkan echoed this in *The Retreat of Scientific Racism* (1992) that the modern construction of race sprung from 18th century zoology and the work of Blumenbach, and that the determinist brand of physical anthropology was dead by in the Euro-American world by 1950.⁶³ Similarly Kenan Malik in *The Meaning of Race* constructed racial science in its essence as an Anglo-American movement, building a narrative whereby Galtonian ideas of heredity and racial fitness were then appropriated by Nazi eugenicists.⁶⁴ Although Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine in *The Oxford History of Eugenics* have tried to draw together historians of the eugenics movement throughout the globe, attempts to build useful transnational frameworks through which to understand how far the discourses of racial and miscegenation thinking in the northern and southern hemisphere were both unique and in conversation with one another remain patchy.⁶⁵

As Anderson has argued, this oversight has occurred in part because of the way in which historians of the British Empire have traditionally viewed colonial anthropologists and medical practitioners. Additionally ‘empire’ itself ‘figures in historical narratives as the site of fieldwork, the place where European anthropologists came into contact with natives, sometimes sympathetically, sometimes with rancour’ but ultimately as nothing more than a ‘policy arena on which anthropological expertise’ from intellectuals in North Atlantic institutions in Britain and the United States ‘readily might be projected’.⁶⁶ Several historians have suggested solutions to this issue of transatlanticism. Along with Anderson, Henrika Kuklick, in *The Savage Within* (1991), has also to a limited extent explored the of Anglo-

⁶³ Nancy Stepan, *The idea of race in science: Great Britain, 1800–1960*, (London: Macmillan, 1982), see also, Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the Two World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992)

⁶⁴ Kenan Malik, *The Meaning of Race: Race, History and Culture in Western Society*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996)

⁶⁵ Stephen Garton, “Sound Minds and Healthy Bodies: Re-considering Eugenics in Australia, 1914–1940,” *Australian Historical Studies*, 1994, 26:163–179

⁶⁶ Ross L. Jones and Anderson, “Wandering Anatomists and Itinerant Anthropologists: The Antipodean Sciences of Race in Inter-war Britain,” *British Journal for the History of Science*, FOCUS—ISIS, 105 : 4 (2014), p.3

Australian connections in social anthropology, and has done something to give the history of Australian science some kind of transnational agency and mobility.⁶⁷

As Tamson Pietsch has argued in *Empire Scholars*, looking more deeply into academic networks in the British World in the early twentieth century, we need to interrogate more closely who constructed academic knowledge in the British Empire, and what institutional, political and social environments drove and informed this process.⁶⁸ Charting the evolution of the academic and institutional networks that linked the universities of the metropole with the 'British settler world' of Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa, Pietsch feels that such flows were an important node for developing a shared imperial and Anglo-World identity, despite the issue that, as she claims, such networks were put under increasing strain after 1918 by 'challenges to colonial knowledge and scientific racism', and an increasing influence and interrelationship on the part of institutions such as the University of Sydney with American academic thought on race and climate. However she expresses concern that, 'fluidity' between 'British and 'colonial' or 'settler' academia' has not received sufficient attention from historians, 'despite the growing interest in imperial networks, transnational exchanges, and the construction of colonial knowledge' that has come from both historians of Australian and British history.⁶⁹

Pietsch reference to American influences chimes in with what Bashford, Strange and Anderson, who have recently uncovered a flurry of interwar transaction between Australian and American Universities such as Sydney, Harvard and Chicago on racial science, even further complicating our understanding of the evolution of race science within imperial

⁶⁷ Henrika Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885–1945*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

⁶⁸ Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p.6

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p.2-5

networks and between the Pacific and Atlantic.⁷⁰ Academic conferences, appointments and partnerships between Australian, American and institutions of the Pacific islands were clearly active during the 1920s and 1930s to the point where they transcended at times an imperial, colony-metropole framework.

Brian Moloughney and John Stenhouse, in “‘Drug-Besotten, Sin-Begotten Fiends of Filth’: New Zealanders and the Oriental Other, 1850–1920’, while not focusing on the anthropological, but moral and political frameworks that East Asian immigrants and hybrid populations experienced in the British World, give us useful insights into how to frame the assumptions, anxieties and negotiations that drove settler attitudes.⁷¹ When used to speak to racial science narratives, such work can give us more nuanced understandings of how biological determinism developed in the British World in the nineteenth century, and later intersected with anthropological approaches to miscegenation and the national future in the Australian context.

So it is imperative to move beyond the picture of race science and miscegenation thinking as having been conceived, refined and then disowned in processes almost entirely driven by transatlantic intellectuals, and complicate assumptions that Australian race thinkers uncritically accepted the scientific wisdom of the imperial centre, if we are to get a more nuanced picture of how changing attitudes to Asian intermarriage shaped the academic life of the British World. We can start by taking up the challenge of Warwick Anderson, who asks in ‘Racial Conceptions in the Global South’,

⁷⁰ Anderson, W. (2009). Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific Between the Wars. *Australian Historical Studies*, 40(2), 143-160.

⁷¹ Brian Moloughney and John Stenhouse, “‘Drug-Besotten, Sin-Begotten Fiends of Filth’: New Zealanders and the Oriental Other, 1850–1920’, *New Zealand Journal of History* 33 (1999), pp. 43–64, see also, Barbara Brookes, ‘Gender, Work and Fears of a “Hybrid Race” in 1920s New Zealand’ *Gender & History*, Vol.19 No.3 November 2007, pp. 501–518.

What happens to twentieth-century race science when we relocate it to the Global South?...Once we recognize the Global South as a site of knowledge making, and not just data extraction, the picture of race science in the twentieth century changes. Once situated, or displaced, the conventional North Atlantic history of race science in the twentieth century comes to seem exceptional—and no longer normative.⁷²

Taking on board this recent trend to decentre histories of anthropology, I intend to take up this call. But rather than displacing Britain and the North Atlantic, I intend to use the case studies of two physical anthropologists who conducted anthropometric race crossing research related to Asians in Australia and the Pacific region, Griffith Taylor in the 1920s and Reginald Gates in the 1950s. Taylor was at the University of Sydney while Gates was at Kings College London, and later the Peabody Museum in Massachusetts, in contact with American post-war scientific racists.

Case studies of the global mobility of anthropologists have proven to be an effective way of injecting nuance into histories of racial thinking. Jones and Anderson have used the careers of Australian anthropologists Frederic Wood Jones and Grafton Eliot Smith, and their interactions with British universities and academics, and their exporting of southern ideas about diffusionism, racial and environmental plasticity that challenged the ‘harder’ typologies of Anglo-Americans, to reveal the complex ‘colonial entanglements’ of imperial anthropology.⁷³ Eliot Smith was a Sydney trained Professor of anatomy at University College London who, as Anderson and Jones argue, dominated the Anatomical Society of

⁷² Warwick Anderson, Racial Conceptions in the Global South, *Isis*, Vol. 105, No. 4 (December 2014), pp. 782-792

⁷³ ROSS L. JONES and WARWICK ANDERSON (2015). Wandering anatomists and itinerant anthropologists: the antipodean sciences of race in Britain between the wars. *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 48, pp 1-16

Great Britain and Ireland in the 1920s, supplementing the discussions of human bodies and human difference with theories ‘cultural diffusion’, bringing into focus the importance of ancient nations such as Egypt as the cradle of civilisation. He was close allied with Raymond Dart, a Professor of anatomy at Witwatersrand University in South Africa, and Joseph Shellshear, anatomist at Hong Kong University, who both bought into his ideas.⁷⁴ Eliot Smith and his colleagues there had an important influence in disseminating a different view of anthropology throughout academic networks criss-crossing the British World. Ironically, Eliot Smith, despite being from Australia, a hotbed of physical anthropology and anti-miscegenation scare mongering in the 1920s, played a role in pushing British anthropological discourse away from the idea that Asian miscegenation was degenerative. He argued for the importance of migration and cultural mix in forming civilisations.

There were three key questions that historians have identified as defining Australian interwar racial thought. As Ross Jones has explored, there was a pre-occupation with white bodies in the first half of the twentieth century on the part of Melbourne medical schools and scientists such as W.E Agar and Richard Berry, and studies of the white ability to withstand the strange and difficult geography and climate of the Northern tropics and western deserts were prolific.⁷⁵ However as Russell McGregor has noted, Australians were at once keen to preserve their whiteness, but at the same time fascinated in contradictory fashion by ideas of racial plasticity that set them apart from North Atlantic intellectuals, and regulated regimes of white-aboriginal miscegenation, which, it was increasingly argued in the 1930s by Adelaide anthropologists like Herbert Basedow, would breed out and expunge inferior indigeneity over

⁷⁴ Ibid

⁷⁵ Ross Jones, *Humanity's Mirror: 150 Years of Anatomy in Melbourne*, (Dept. of Anatomy and Cell Biology, University of Melbourne, 2007)

generations.⁷⁶ Although Sydney anthropologist Adolphus Elkin and others studied race-crossing in Hawaii and the Pacific, and came back with more positive ideas about Oceanic miscegenation and the mixed race societies they encountered, very few Australians publicly dared to draw in these ideas from the Pacific and talk about the possibility of a future Eurasian Australian population in the 1920s. Few historians have directly discussed how physical anthropologists viewed white-Asian intermarriage, and how far this interacted with public policy.

The Career of Professor Griffith Taylor

The lack of historiography that speaks to the intersections of race science and 'yellow peril' narratives in the British Empire can be rectified through situating case studies of academic careers within the context of colonial crises and immigration panics, as Lucy Bland has done in the case of 1920s Britain. University of Sydney Geographer and Antarctic explorer Griffith Taylor's book, *Environment and Race* (1927) was labelled as highly controversial and unusual in the Australian press when he claimed that Asians were at least equal, if not superior to white Britons, and that a future of interracial marriage was both inevitable and desirable in Australia and the wider world. Rather than being elbowed aside by the 'coloured races' as many Anglos had come to fear for decades through their appropriation of Charles Pearson's words in *National Life and Character* (1893), the peoples of the British World would prosper as a golden skinned population suited to settling the tropical Northern

⁷⁶ Russel McGregor, *Imagined Destinies: Aboriginal Australians and the Doomed Race Theory, 1880-1939*, (Melbourne University Press, 1997)

Territory of Australia. Mischievously problematising the ethnic chauvinism of the interwar White Australia consensus as well as transnationally circulating biopolitical regimes of Asian exclusion enshrined in the Immigration Restriction Acts of 1902, Taylor became both a local pariah and widely read figure of interest in Japan, Britain, the United States and Germany. Some North Atlantic scholars found his broad theories and southern hemisphere perspective, like Charles Pearson before him, quite refreshing.⁷⁷

Initially getting into hot water as the most public critic of the scientific-geographic doctrine of ‘Australia Unlimited’ advanced by writers such as E.J. Brady and Daisy Bates to promote white settlement of tropical and desert climates, Taylor segued into a fascination with anthropology, Asian peoples and racial hybridity, and in doing so, as Alison Bashford argues, he further drove a collision course with the heart of Australian identity as a white nation in the 1920s.⁷⁸ Although reception of his work was highly mixed, the transnational footprint of *Environment and Race* tells us that the global scientific discourse was in the throes of flux and confusion, but was also open to different ideas written from different places.⁷⁹

As Kane Collins has argued, figures from the margins had always critiqued ‘mainstream racial hierarchies’ and speculated about a Eurasian future, and Griffith Taylor was the interwar, scientific incarnation of this marginal tradition.⁸⁰ But as Saul Dubow argues, ‘there were of course, always people who questioned the truth of racial superiority, but these critics were compelled to argue within the established terms of what amounted to a

⁷⁷ Carolyn Strange (2010) *Transgressive Transnationalism: Griffith Taylor and Global Thinking*, *Australian Historical Studies*, 41:1, p.39. For more on this, see also, Robert Brown, ‘“Yellow Peril” or golden future? Locating Australian anthropology and miscegenation thinking in the Global South in Griffith Taylor’s *Environment and Race* (1927)’, paper given at, *Modern British Studies: A Collaborative Workshop The Newberry Library*, Chicago 8 April, 2016, http://caxton.press.illinois.edu/epub/BRIDGE_workshop/

⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p.1

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.2

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, p.2

dominant racial consensus'.⁸¹ As Bashford also argues, the evidence that Griffith Taylor received such an aggressive backlash for stepping outside the lexicon in talking positively about Asian mixture, despite the fact that he was using anthropometric methodologies considered relatively mainstream in the 1920s south and north, is very revealing, and a reaction through which we can ask questions as just how much the fantasy of whiteness was cherished, interracial marriage reviled by some interwar colonial anthropologists and politicians.

Carolyn Strange has criticised other historians such as J.M Powell who have dealt with Taylor's career for writing about him through a primarily national lense, arguing that his significance as a signifier for international interwar scientific, political and public culture is far more broad.⁸² By building on the work of Carolyn Strange and giving Taylor a 'transnational turn' the case study will be an important plank of my methodology, showing the ability of 'transnational analysis to invigorate, rather than supplant, national historiographies' of anthropology and miscegenation thinking as they related to the trajectory of the British World.⁸³ I aim to explore the significance of Taylor's writing about the 'yellow peril' and Eurasian future from the pacific in a supplementary vein to the way that Marilyn Lake has written about the work of Charles Pearson and its influence on North Atlantic racial attitudes, creating a timeline of Australian post-colonial visions from the late nineteenth century and throughout the first half of the twentieth century.

⁸¹ Saul Dubow, *Scientific Racism in Modern South Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), P.2

⁸² Joseph. M Powell, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993)

⁸³ Carolyn Strange (2010) Transgressive Transnationalism: Griffith Taylor and Global Thinking, *Australian Historical Studies*, 41:1, p.39

The Career of Professor Reginald Gates in the Global South

Amidst Taylor's post-war return to Australia, the question of what happens to racial thinking after the 1945 slides into focus. Several historians such as Nancy Stepan argued racial science existed between 1850 and 1950, and Elazar Barkan argues the Second World War killed off the credibility of race science in Europe and the United States.⁸⁴ The moral imperative towards anti-racism in the lead up to and aftermath of the anti-Nazi war put international pressure on American and South African segregationists. At the same time the White Australia Policy was increasingly put under internal and external pressure as Marilyn Lake, Henry Reynolds and Gwenda Tavan have shown, by governments of post-colonial Asian nations, and public thinkers such as Taylor who's view that the Immigration Restriction Act and the fantasy of maintaining whiteness were increasingly anachronistic had garnered increasing agreement, in contrast to the 1920s.⁸⁵ As most historians of race in the twentieth century agree, the UNESCO statements on race in 1951 and 1952, and the global dissemination of their message that biological ideas of race were no longer legitimate or useful, marked a watershed point in the decline of the acceptance of biological determinism.⁸⁶

The career of Reginald Gates, a plant geneticist and physical anthropologist at Kings College London between 1919 and 1942, and the subject of an article by Schaffer, provides a framework through which to measure discursive shifts on racial thinking in Britain and United States between the 1920s and 1960s. Convinced of ideas of racial difference, polygenism and the degenerative impact of miscegenation throughout his long career,

⁸⁴ Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the Two World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992)

⁸⁵ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe, 2005)

⁸⁶ Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930-62*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)

Schaffer has charted Gates descent from being a mainstream racial scientist in the 1920s, to his expulsion from Howard University in the United States in 1948 for his racist views, and his increasing inability to get his race crossing research published in mainstream scientific journals.⁸⁷

However, one of Gavin Schaffer's central arguments in 'Scientific' Racism Again?' (2007) is that earth shattering issues such as the Holocaust, Nazi eugenics and its condemnation has distracted attention from what Kushner and others have highlighted as an incomplete move away from racial thinking, leading to an, 'erroneous historical understanding of the decline of race in British scientific and social discourse'. Just because people, politicians, and intellectuals in Britain denounced colonialism, segregation and racism in relation to the Nazis does not mean that scientific belief in race vanished during the interwar and war period.⁸⁸ Schaffer highlighted the uneasiness of organisations such as the British Eugenics society in the wake of mass Caribbean and South Asian immigration into Britain in the 1950s, with anxieties about miscegenation persisting behind the scenes.

At the same time William Tucker mounted a ground breaking exploration of the survival of scientific racism in the United States. In *The Funding of Scientific Racism*, Tucker examines Wycliffe Draper, a wealthy segregationist who's Pioneer Fund, ostensibly an inoffensive think tank, funded pro-segregation scientific experts, a collection of scientific racists producing anti-miscegenationist literature, and campaigns to fight against the American civil rights movement.⁸⁹ Both Draper and the Eugenics Society in Britain believed in the inferiority of blacks, and Reginald Gates was in contact with both organisations, and

⁸⁷ Gavin Schaffer (2007). "'Scientific' Racism Again?": Reginald Gates, the Mankind Quarterly and the Question of "Race" in Science after the Second World War, *Journal of American Studies*, 41, pp 253-278

⁸⁸ Ibid, see also, Tony Kushner, H. J. Fleure: a paradigm for inter-war race thinking in Britain, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 2008, 42:2, 151-166

⁸⁹ William Tucker, *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wycliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002)

was additionally one of the founders of the scientific racist *Mankind Quarterly* journal along with Robert Gayre and Henry Garrett in 1960.⁹⁰

But there is a gap in scholarship on Gates post-war career. Schaffer has noted Gates associations with Anglo-American scientific racists, but this overlooks the fact that Gates was also heavily active in other circles. He gained funding and advice from numerous other individuals such as the Wenner Gren foundation and Luigi Gedda, and he was constantly travelling during the 1950s from his base as a fellow at the Peabody Museum in Massachusetts, conducting race crossing research in Cuba, Mexico, South Africa, India, but crucially also Japan and Australia, where he investigated East Asian interracial marriage and conducted anthropometric measurements.⁹¹

The work of Schaffer and Tucker on the survival and reinvention of post-war North Atlantic scientific racism gives us a springboard to explore what happened and what encounters occurred when Reginald Gates, took his ideas and motives South and East throughout the 1950s. Exploring the research Gates conducted in the global south, on Asian and aboriginal intermarriage in Japan and Australia, utilising previously unused archival material, gives us a chance to revisit and complicate the idea that race drops out of history after World War Two. By juxtaposing his field work in the pacific with Taylor's work in the 1920s, we can get a more nuanced history of racial thinking over a broad sweep of the twentieth century.

As Tom Lawson argues in his work on the memorialisation of the holocaust in Australia, and the decimation and intermarriage of the aboriginal population of British governed Tasmania, British and Australian histories of race and genocide are very much

⁹⁰ Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930-62*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)

⁹¹ On Luigi Gedda, see, Francesco Cassata, *Building the New Man : Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth-Century Italy*. (Nouvelle édition [en ligne]. Budapest : Central European University Press, 2011), (généré le 26 avril 2016). Disponible sur Internet : <<http://books.openedition.org/ceup/697>>.

interlinked, and an Anglo-Australian framework can give us a window into both a more joined up and, ‘darker history’ of the British World.⁹²

Structure and Methodology

The thesis therefore seeks to supplement this scholarship but also create an interdisciplinary and pan hemisphere dialogue between these different bodies of history writing on anthropology, the “yellow peril” and the British World within transnational frameworks. It also seeks to link the nineteenth and twentieth century scholarships of colonialism and racial thinking, tracing narratives that speak to the post-war.

As Warwick Anderson crucially pointed agreed, decentring histories of race science and empire and writing them from the global south gives us a more nuanced view whilst at the same time complicating and enriching our understanding of racial thinking in Britain and the North Atlantic.⁹³ By utilising case studies of both Australia and Britain, and tracking the mobility of British and Australian scientists and their ideas about the place of East Asians within and without empire and the prospect of a Eurasian future, I intend to both join up and complicate changing pictures of racial thinking in the early and mid-twentieth centuries. This is the key premise on which the thesis methodology is built. Australia has previously been seen by historians of racial science as a site for British anthropologists, intellectuals and travel writers to investigate strange climates and indigenous aboriginals, and proximities to Asian nations and bodies, and impart their North Atlantic wisdom regarding the latest scientific advances and debates. Until recently Australia, as Anderson identified, the global south and East Asian nations were featured merely as obscure anthropological backwaters by

⁹² Tom Lawson, *The Last Man: a British Genocide in Tasmania*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p.16

⁹³ Warwick Anderson, Racial Conceptions in the Global South, *Isis*, Vol. 105, No. 4 (December 2014), pp. 782

historians of the interwar period, or as eugenic playgrounds for transatlantic travellers. But in fact I argue that this was not the case. Not only did Australians have their own vernacularized debates about the outcome of race mixture between Asians, whites and indigenes, which informed state policy, but the ‘yellow peril’ anxieties of antipodean settlers, explored through shared cultures of Anglo-Saxonist anxiety about proximities to East Asia and East Asians, directly influenced and drove anti-Asian anxieties that were slower to take hold in the imperial centre.

As Auerbach argues, this culture of fear, suspicion and surveillance of Asian sexuality and mixed marriage, stoked by the First World War, developed a climate of fear about East Asian immigration and mixed race futures that led the British Eugenics Society in 1924 to commission anthropometric studies of Anglo-Chinese children in London and Liverpool, albeit with a harder North Atlantic approach to racial typing than the growing ‘plasticity’ of Australian approaches. Indeed racial plasticity, the idea that human types may have been more malleable and less fixed within the interwar frameworks anthropology, was something that took longer to gain purchase in interwar Britain, despite the efforts of influential and mobile Australians such as Grafton Elliot Smith with his views on cultural hybridity, and Griffith Taylor with his view of the benefits of Asian miscegenation to project a form of cosmopolitanism into British scientific debates.

I argue that Australian interwar cosmopolitans and conservatives, anatomists, geographers and anthropologists not only participated provincially, nationally, and in pacific investigations, conferences and networks in participation with Harvard, Chicago and international race scientists, but figures such as Australian geographer at Glasgow J.W Gregory, with his views on Australia’s climate, white settlement and the inadvisability of Asian immigration and intermarriage, were active intellectual agents in metropolitan

networks, informing British audiences about the biological challenges and challenge of East Asia in the southern hemisphere.

With the move away from race in mid 1930s Britain, necessitated as Schaffer and Kushner have argued by the toxicity of Nazi eugenics, southern ideas of the flexibility of racial types, explored in the 1930s Adelaide work on regimes of miscegenation between whites and aboriginals, and Taylor's work on Asian hybridity, never fully took hold by the time of Huxley's Galton lecture in 1936. Thus the focus on Britain and the US has obscured this divergent narrative of hybrid tropical citizens, Eurasian Australians and whitened aboriginals. It is only when we go back to the global south that we appreciate a totally different picture of the survival of forms of physical anthropology, and biometric measurement of mixed race Asians, which was not largely abandoned until the late 1940s as their modes of population analysis were defeated by the sheer variety of mixed race Australian ancestries proliferating since before the gold rush.

In the 1950s I argue that what has been missed by historians of race is the fact that Australia did indeed become a site for the survival of the transatlantic brand of scientific racism and physical anthropology that had been discredited in the mid-1930s, just as Atlantic discourses, with their moral inflections and the UNESCO statements were moving back to cultural and social scientific appraisals of the East Asian diaspora, and of mixed race communities. The post-war nation had become an uneasy patchwork of scientific and geopolitical approaches, anxieties and aspirations about a Eurasian or Southern European infused future.

So without the global south there would be no Reginald Gates in his latter career. Australia, Japan and Cuba became sites through which the antithesis of scientific cosmopolitanism, Gates, attempted to explore, hone and disseminate marginal transatlantic

racism and anthropometric methods which was connected with American segregationists and later the *Mankind Quarterly*, that had survived Nazism and the assault of UNESCO and Leslie Dunn. Australia was a long way from Auschwitz, an uncertain cultural and intellectual space, with lingering concerns about Asia, indigeneity and race mixture, which gave Gates the space he needed just as he was being ignored or vilified by mainstream scientists and publications. Co-operated with Australian race thinkers from across the spectrum. Or rather approaches had the space to co-exist

At the same time, without the transatlantic, there would be no Griffith Taylor.

Taylor's time spent in England at University and during his childhood, his fascination with cold temperate North Atlantic climates, in addition to, like Deakin, his affinity for the Asia-Pacific climes and cultures, defined his intellectual outlook, and his belief that whites could not prosper in tropical climates, leading to his contentious theses about the benefits of Asian intermarriage for Australia, homoclimes, his involvement with the IPR, his career in Chicago and Canada after he left the University of Sydney in 1928, and his attempt to reach out to British as well as American race scientists such as A.C Haddon, H.J Fleure, and Arthur Keith, through whose mediation he was able to get *Environment and Race* (1927) published. It also meant that in the 1920s he was attacked as having the outlook of a North Atlantic imposter with his emphasis towards whites in temperate climates, as the Englishman turned Victorian Charles Pearson had also argued 30 years before, rather than a patriotic antipodean Briton.

In both interlocking and at times antagonistic ways both Britain and Australia and their bands of both localised and travelling race thinkers told the story of changing reactions to East Asian migration, settlement, segregation and exclusion throughout the British Empire and the white men's countries of the Anglosphere over the long term, between the Victorian gold rush and the uncertain birth pains of an officially more multi-cultural, Eurasian

Australian nation that came more to terms with its place amongst the Asia-Pacific in the 1970s.

This was a story in which interwar anthropological assumptions about the undesirability or accommodation of Asian intermarriage were driven by cultural tropes of the “yellow peril”, East Asians as immoral, malevolent and poisonous. Physical anthropologists like Madison Grant, Charles Davenport, Arthur Keith and K.B Aikman, and popular racial-geopolitical commentators like Lothrop Stoddard were keenly rendering such imaginary fears into a scientific and intellectual reality. It was only as the authority of physical anthropology eroded, or was challenged directly by varying individuals between the hemispheres, that this was superseded by social anthropologists and geneticists, that softer ideas of hybrid Anglo-Asian cultures and co-existence could eventually re-assert themselves as the scientific edifice that had buttressed white men’s countries crumbled.

Chapter Structure

By tracing the long term trajectories and transactions in twentieth century Anglo-Australian anthropology and the way that anthropological responses became entwined with social and political perceptions of the relationship between China, Japan, South East Asia and the British World, the thesis aims to not only better understand the rise and fall of the “yellow

peril’ trope, but also complicate historians understandings of the rise and fall of interwar and post-war racial thinking.

To do this, the first section of the thesis, comprised of two chapters, engages in a broad exploration of what shaped the rising interest in and authority of Anglo-Australian physical anthropology during the interwar years. It will show that the negativity of a number of interwar physical anthropologists responses to East Asian immigration and intermarriage in ‘white men’s countries’, through their pronouncements in newspapers, academic journals and at international conferences, was a continuing part of nineteenth century imperial anxieties surrounding the ‘yellow peril’. Once this framework has been laid, the second broad section comprising chapters three and four will complicate the narrative of the rise and fall of racial thinking and the ‘yellow peril’ in the North Atlantic and global south by locating the careers of Griffith Taylor in the 1920s and Reginald Gates in the 1950s within this framework.

The first chapter explores the evolution of the ‘Chinese question’ in the Australian colonies. It goes back to the gold rush in Victoria during the 1850s, which saw the migration of East Asian workers to the colony, and in some cases their intermarriage with European women. The chapter traces descriptions of Chinese-Australian couples and their children by journalistic investigators in the 1850s, and argues that gold fever saw a hardening of white settler attitudes to the Chinese by the time of the 1861 Lambing Flat riots, and the broad acceptance of the ‘coolie trope’ in the 1870s. Descriptions of interracial marriage, though not entirely based on what could be called a detailed scientific settler methodology in the 1870s, became increasingly inflected with nebulous appeals to ‘Darwinism’ and ‘Spencerism’, negative assumptions about mixed race children as embodying an unwanted permanent presence of East Asians in the British World that built on centuries old prejudices against the ‘half-castes’ propagated by colonial travel writing. The chapter shows that the Immigration

restriction act in 1902 and the accompanying dictation test which was used as a device to prevent Asian immigration, and that this biopolitical machinery relied on the discretion of White Australian customs officials in judging racial characteristics, and the extent to which Chinese-Australians attempting to leave and return to Australia were of European or Asian heritage.

The main thrust of the first chapter is to argue that assumptions about the perilous outcomes of intermarriage of whites and East Asians were well developed in Australian colonies and actively disseminated throughout the British World before physical anthropologists writing for British, North Atlantic and southern journals were addressing this question directly or constructing bodies of scientific knowledge to support these claims. Miscegenation thinking in 1901 it argues was a nexus of the writing of commentators such as Pearson and Bryce, 'yellow peril' narratives, and the aggressive energies of the British colonial project.

In order to make these points, the first two chapters utilise and speak to a wide variety of sources. The debates of the Australia federal parliament, the machinery of immigration restriction legislation, the works of contemporary commentators of race and geopolitics such as Pearson and Bryce form a core of primary material. But journalistic investigations, the reviews of scientific pronouncements in the popular press, and the exploration of the 'yellow peril' narrative among novelists and playwrights. The chapter argues that these were all intertwined conversations through which British settlers explored their fears about being overrun by East Asia's proximity and East Asian settlers.

As Australian and other colonial experiences of the East Asian question became an imperial issue in the 1900s, and spoke to the mother country, the chapter sets the scene for the 1919 race riots and the travails of the interwar white Australia policies, times in which

both Reginald Gates and Griffith Taylor cut their teeth as racial scientists. The chapter argues that in different ways the 'yellow peril' trope and its interconnection with Edwardian and interwar questions of racial purity and white settlement played a role in driving and shaping their academic work for the rest of their careers. The chapter explores the importance of a Liverpool City Council investigation in 1907 into the sexual activities of Chinese immigrants in the city, in response to a public outcry voiced in the local press, was evidence that metropolitans had also become convinced that East Asians had a degenerative impact on white women.

The 1920 and 1930s saw the growing number of anthropometric studies in both Britain and Australia of intermarriage between different 'racial' groups. Chapter two seeks to compare the development of Anglo-Australian anthropological responses to miscegenation and East Asian populations within the British World, and chart the levels of discursive transaction, cross-pollination and uniqueness in scientific developments in the northern and southern hemisphere's of the empire. The chapter sketches out several loose schools of biological thought that could be traced in several Australian institutions. University of Adelaide and South Australian Museum scientists were active in constructing links between aboriginals and white Europeans, and developing different ideas of racial types that were more 'plastic' than the stricter built into North Atlantic 1920s debates. Investigators at the University of Sydney looked to studies of race mixture in Oceania and the Pacific islands, tentatively suggesting that mixed societies were working. The Melbourne Medical School and Department of anatomy had more of an interest in eugenics, white bodies and the preservation of the White Australia Policy. The chapter argues and broadly shows that unlike in the North Atlantic, where critiques of biological idea of fixed difference had gained considerable momentum by the mid-1930s, the tentative decline of Australian physical anthropology began after the Harvard-Adelaide race crossing study in 1939, where Birdsell,

going back after the Second World War to write up the data he had collected, came to realise that anthropometry didn't have the sophistication or the consistency to trace and understand the ever growing variety of mixed heritage families of aborigines, whites and peoples throughout the Asia-Pacific region. This sets the scene for Gates 1950s race crossing studies in chapter four, as in Australia he encountered this landscape of political and scientific confusion in racial thought and changing immigration policy.

The chapter then picks up where the first chapter left off, arguing that 'yellow peril' fears had played a background role in touching off the 1919 race riots. The 1919 race riots in Britain, increased post-war anxieties about a growing colour population and flux in gender roles at the heart of empire, and fears about a lack of knowledge regarding miscegenation in metropole and linking this to lack of colonial knowledge about the mixing of populations over which Britain ruled. The chapter explores the conservatism of the anthropological discourse in early 1920s British universities, such as the great antipathy of Reginald Gates and Arthur Keith to miscegenation. Arguing that 'yellow peril' scares drove the Eugenics society to commission Fleming and Fleure's 1924 race crossing study of Anglo-Chinese and Anglo-Negro children, this section also shows how Fleming came to more nuanced conclusions about Anglo-Chinese children that not only complicated stereotypes of 'half-caste' degeneracy, but also came at a point of methodological flux in the late 1920s, as British race thinkers began to abandon physical anthropology in favour of social anthropology and genetic approaches to inheritance.

Chapter two lays the groundwork for a broad understanding of 1920s anthropology throughout a number of sites and institutions. Chapter Three places the Sydney geographer and physical anthropologist Griffith Taylor and his public pronouncements about climate, migration, miscegenation and the supposed evolutionary pre-eminence of the 'Mongolian' within this contextual frame of white colonial nationalism. The chapter argues that the

controversy and derision that he provoked in Australia gives us insights into the interwar persistence of “yellow peril” anxieties. The chapter will chart Taylor’s transition from a geographer to a race scientist, and piece together the components and controversies in his interdisciplinary approach. Finally the chapter will compare Taylor’s travails to the political and methodological changes that occurred in 1930s Britain, using the Fleming and Fleure study and its aftermath to chart the decline of physical anthropology.

Finally chapter four will use the career of Reginald Gates to build a longer term and more nuanced narrative of the decline of anthropometry and racial thinking. Beginning with Gates ostracisation from the scientific mainstream in the 1930s Britain for his unwaveringly negative views about interracial marriage, the chapter firstly charts his marginal fightback after the Second World War through his association with scientific racists and racist interests such as the Pioneer Fund in the United States. The chapter will then explore three of his race crossing investigations, in Cuba in 1952, Japan in 1954, and Australia in 1958.

Chapter 1:

The Victoria Gold Rush (1851), Asian Exclusion and ‘yellow peril’ Narratives in the British World

The idea of the ‘Chinese Puzzle’ had become a well-worn and well circulated construct by the time Arthur Ransome used it for the title of a book he published in 1927, having been discussed by scores of treaty port writers and journalists in the aftermath of the Boxer Uprising during 1900. Sascha Auerbach argues the term was used to encapsulate the myriad complexities and anxieties that politicians, journalists, playwrights, union figures and working class men throughout the British World experienced when attempts were made to construct, regulate or exclude Chinese immigrants or smooth over perceived cultural and biological ‘incompatibilities’ between Asians and whites.¹ Combined with fluctuating perceptions in the transatlantic and in the Pacific over the rise of the Empire of Japan after its military success against the Qing dynasty over Korea in 1895, and Russia in 1905, coupled with increased Japanese migration throughout Oceania, an ‘East Asian puzzle’ took shape.

In piecing together this puzzle, which was seen increasingly as an issue requiring joined up imperial action, Britons of the southern hemisphere in their proximity to East Asia informed those of the transatlantic, and the Australian experience informed the British. In the

¹ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and “The Chinese Puzzle” in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), p.3, see also a discussion of Arthur Ransome, *The Chinese Puzzle* (1927) and other commentaries or novels on the subject of China and the Chinese on the part of European writers in treaty port society in, Robert Bickers, *Britain in China: community, culture and colonialism 1900-1949*, (Manchester University Press, 1999), Chapter 1-2.

way that much of the metropolitan view of East Asia was refracted through the lens of the global south and the experiences of pacific Britons, ‘the Chinese Puzzle’ became an issue ‘first in imperial discourse’ on the settler periphery, being, ‘later replicated in a domestic context’.² In 1887, Sir Archibald Michie, the former Attorney General of the colony of Victoria, was one among many white settlers already coining the terminology when he described the problem of Chinese gold rush immigration, claiming that the two races could never be compatible or mix together. The rising fear of East Asian economic competition, racialized friction and the growing consensus of White-Asian incompatibility which grew out of the smash and grab nature of gold rush politics and white settlement in the antipodes, quickly diffused itself into metropolitan discourse as Greater Britons traversed pacific networks. Henniker Heaton, conservative MP for Canterbury, had lived and worked in the colony of New South Wales.³ Introducing the problem of Chinese immigration to New South Wales to House of Commons in May 1888 in a letter to *The Times*, he claimed that the two races could not be allowed to mix lest it destroy the cohesion and prosperity of the colony, and that Henry Parkes and his delegation from the New South Wales legislature should be allowed by Westminster to pass further restriction laws.⁴

George Baden-Powell, conservative MP for Kirkdale in Liverpool felt that Chinese migration would turn Australia into a Mongolian society, a prospect that he abhorred.⁵ Also writing to the Times, he claimed Chinese immigration needed to be stopped and the white British working man needed to be protected. Having been involved in Australian politics, and worked in South Africa and the West Indies, Baden-Powell took his Anglo-Saxonist ideas of Britishness and race purity from Pearson and Bryce.⁶ In an era when Darwin had written the

² Ibid, p.10

³ Ibid, P.22

⁴ Ibid, p.25

⁵ Ibid, P.22

⁶ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.8

The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex (1871), but physical anthropology, a coherent 'scientific racism' and the bio or anthropometric measurement of race mixture was in its infancy, the racial-political doctrine of Anglo-Saxonism was becoming a shared vernacular used to describe common racial links between Britain and Australia, and the transnational race consciousness of a white imperial working class.⁷ East Asian settlement was increasingly cast as antithetical to this globalised ideal of white supremacy. In 1905, Britain, although more ambivalent about the open enacting of a race based immigration policy, had even followed the lead of other white men's countries in passing its own exclusionary legislation, the Aliens Act, later strengthened in 1919.⁸

Sascha Auerbach privileges legal and labour discourses in order to understand changing perceptions of miscegenation and the East Asian problem in Britain and Empire, and press narration of criminal trials involving Chinese vice and the alleged corruption of white women, such as the Billie Carlton trial in 1919, were central to hardening attitudes to race mixture in colony and metropole.⁹ However he largely ignores the crucial link between academic and popular cultural assumptions about race mixture, and how the two developed and informed one another.

In the early 1900s, assumptions about the perilous outcomes of miscegenation and the degeneration of mixed offspring were an ever present component of colonial discourse, but

⁷ Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, (London: John Murray. Volume 1. 1st edition, 1871), see also, Darwin, *On the origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*, (London: John Murray. 2nd edition, Second Issue, 1860) Kenan Malik, *The Meaning of Race: Race, History and Culture in Western Society*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996). For more in depth exploration of the appropriation of Darwin's thought and its sublimation into debates of race, class and eugenics in Britain, see, Greta Jones, *Social Darwinism and English Thought*, (Harvester Press and Humanities Press, New Jersey, 1980) , Greta Jones, *Social Hygiene in Twentieth Century Britain*, (Croom Helm, 1986)

⁸ Laura Tabili, *"We Ask for British Justice": Workers and Racial Difference in Late Imperial Britain*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1994), and, Laura Tabili, "Women 'of a Very Low Type': Crossing Racial Boundaries in Late Imperial Britain," in Laura Frader and Sonya Rose, eds., *Gender and Class in Modern Europe*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1996), 165-190;

⁹ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and "The Chinese Puzzle" in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), P.2

had not received the kind of vigorous anthropological investigations that would occur in the 1910s and 1920s. Particularly in Britain, where the Asian populations of the major port cities of London, Liverpool and Cardiff were far smaller than in Melbourne or San Francisco, but were becoming increasingly noted and noticeable, the stories of the journalist, the novelist and the popular stage depicting lurid encounters between Asian men and white women exerted a powerful influence in shaping the way that Edwardian Britons perceived Asians and other non-white groups in their midst and in the Empire, especially in light of the increased employment of non-white sailors by shipping companies to man the merchant navy during the First World War. By 1919 both Britons and Australians had internalised the assumption, described by Charles Pearson in the 1890s, that a trickle of East Asian migration could form the advance guard for the mass migration of a practically limitless and alien population, a fear which led to press exaggeration of small incidents involving small numbers of Chinese.¹⁰

Indeed Victorian ethnologists constructing the 'Mongolian type' had, as Rotem Kowner has also argues, been relatively ambiguous in constructing and agreeing on definite East Asian qualities in the mid to late nineteenth century. Various scientists attached to or writing for the Royal Anthropological Institute, such as John Crawfurd, J Lamprey, Groom Napier, and John Beddoe were engaging in a debate in which few agreed how to racially classify racial groups, but in this debate over the relative characteristics of peoples encountered in Japan, China and South East Asia ambiguity ensued.¹¹ John Beddoe in 1890 was part of a growing emphasis on the importance of skin colour as a marker of racial difference. Beddoe argued that Chinese and Europeans in Queensland were increasingly of

¹⁰ This anxiety tapped into the 'yellow peril' invasion trope. For more on this and Edwardian invasion scares, see, Ailise Bulfin, 'To Arms!': Invasion Narratives and Late-Victorian Literature. *Literature Compass*, 12 (2015): 482–496, Ailise Bulfin, Guy Boothby and the "Yellow Peril": Representations of Chinese Immigrants in British Imperial Spaces in the Late-Nineteenth Century, *Australasian Journal of Victorian Studies* 20.1 (2015)

¹¹ See, Rotem Kowner, 'Lighter than Yellow, but not Enough': Western Discourse on the Japanese 'Race', 1854-1904, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Mar., 2000), pp. 103-131, and, Rotem Kowner, The skin as a Metaphor: early European racial perspectives on Japan, 1548-1853. *Ethnohistory*, (2004) 51, 751-778

very similar lightly bronzed skin colour, speculating that some of the Chinese perhaps shared some ‘Arian’ elements with the Europeans, and that through a Lamarckian process the hot climate of Queensland was increasingly making the two peoples become similar.¹²

The centrality of skin colour in debates about race and hybridity, but also the counteracting contention that East Asians were in fact a partly white or European hybrid type, contradicting the othering and segregating tendencies of ‘yellow peril’ narratives and labour discourses, was a long term feature of the debate, even used by mid-twentieth century marginal scientific racists such as Reginald Gates and Richard Lynn to engage in a bizarre form of pro-Mongolian racialist positivism despite their white supremacist leanings.

In the absence of an anthropological focus on the figure of the Eurasian, we look to a ‘dramatic contrast in tone’ in accounts or fictions written about Chinese in the metropole and interracial relationships, between the latter half of the nineteenth century and the interwar years.¹³ Henry Mayhew’s, *London Labour and the London Poor* (1861) described without condemnation a case of Irish-Chinese intermarriage. George Wade wrote an article ‘The Cockney John Chinaman’ in the *London Illustrated Magazine* (1900) which also depicted Anglo-Chinese marriage and their mixed-race children in terms that were not negative.¹⁴

But the work of the Anglo-Australian ‘yellow peril’ fiction writer and cartoonist was important in the metropolitan context in further introducing the mobility of Chinese migrants and narrating a potentially nightmarish future in which hordes of East Asian migrants displaced white Europeans in their metropolises, as an issue of pan-imperial concern and

¹² John Beddoe, Observations on the Natural Colour of the Skin in Certain Oriental Races, *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 19(1890), pp. 257-263

¹³ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and “The Chinese Puzzle” in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), P.6

¹⁴ Ibid, p.20. For a more detailed analysis of evolving renderings of the ‘Orient’, the Chinese and interracial sexuality, see Ross G. Forman, *China and the Victorian Imagination: Empires Entwined*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013), Ross G. Forman, Peking Plots: Fictionalising the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, *Victorian Literature and Culture* (1999) 19–48, Edward Ziter, *The Orient on the Victorian Stage*, (Cambridge University Press, 2003), Veronica Kelly, *The Empire Actors: Stars of Australasian Costume Drama 1890s-1920s*, (Currency House, 2010)

proportions rather than a distant anomaly on the colonial periphery. Phil May for instance, the Leeds born cartoonist who would end up working for *Punch* magazine in London in the 1890s, produced the ‘Mongolian Octopus’ for the *Sydney Bulletin*, an iconic image that both codified and popularised the conspiracy trope of East Asian malevolence that would evolve into the “yellow peril” narrative.¹⁵ As Auerbach agrees, these were ‘iconic portrayals of the Chinese menace to white communities’ proliferated by anxious colonials fanning the sentiments of the Australian and American hostility to Asian immigration, ‘portrayals whose echoes would later be heard in Britain itself.’¹⁶ M.P Shiel in *The Yellow Danger* (1898) explored ‘yellow peril’ tropes, Pearsonian ideas of demographic disaster for white supremacy, Chino-Japanese invasion and global race war. Crucially he also explored interracial desire through his character Yen How, a Sino-Japanese arch villain of deceit and cunning desperate to entrap and seduce white women. In time such stereotypes were superimposed on the small Chinese communities in British cities.¹⁷

While the question of a future Eurasian society and the proliferation of intermarriage had been an early component in pre-federation Australia, and driven the construction of the White Australia Policy in 1901, ‘it would take nearly two more decades’ for Britons ‘to associate all the threats that appeared in the British domestic debate over ‘white Australia’’.¹⁸ The Boxer rebellion in 1900 would prove to be an engine for this change, raising again the spectre of interracial rape sensationalised during the Indian Mutiny of 1857-9. Auerbach argues that softer descriptions of Chinese migrants to the metropole, and the softer framing of miscegenation persisted even after the coverage of the Boxer rebellion of 1900. However hysterical coverage of this crisis, which had saturated newspapers for six months during the

¹⁵ *Sydney Bulletin*, 21 August, 1886.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, p.26

¹⁷ For discussion of Matthew Phipps Shiel, *The Yellow Danger* (1898), see Ross G. Forman, *China and the Victorian Imagination: Empires Entwined*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013), and Ailise Bulfin, ‘To Arms!’: Invasion Narratives and Late-Victorian Literature. *Literature Compass*, 12 (2015): 482–496

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p.50

siege of Peking and its aftermaths, the stage plays and exhibitions about the massacre in 1901, and the official commentaries and military accounts released in 1904, and the dissemination of representations of 'oriental' sexual violence towards white women through imperial press networks, the, 'Chinese were being depicted...as a dire threat to both the white race and the British nation.'¹⁹

Combined with this there was an outcry over the importation of Chinese labour into the Transvaal between 1903 and 1906, in which issues of racial segregation and the containment of racial mixing in imperial space were prominent, which stirred up the white imperialist indignation of unions and workers groups in Britain and the Dominions. Additionally the increasingly visible presence of East Asian sailors in Britain during the First World War, created a pressure cooker debate about control of non-white migration which gradually gained momentum, and eventually found violent expression in the 1919 race riots. In this climate practices that had been dismissed as exotic but inoffensive by earlier commentators were prompting mass surveillance and deportation or repatriation, interracial sexuality had been deemed 'moral and physical suicide'.²⁰ So the times when constructions of Asians were most prominent and negative in British discourse were when Britain or the wider British World faced military and economic crises.

When white British servicemen tried to return to their previous lives and employment in 1919, there was anger that the increased presence and visibility of non-whites in major cities presented unwanted economic and sexual competition, and the 1919 race riots and calls for mass non-white repatriation were the result.²¹ In this light, the eugenics society congress

¹⁹ Ibid, P.8

²⁰ Ibid, p.16, see also Laura Tabili, *"We Ask for British Justice": Workers and Racial Difference in Late Imperial Britain*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1994), Jacqueline Jenkinson, 'The 1919 Riots', in Panikos Panayi (ed.), *Racial Violence in Britain in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1996), pp. 92–111

²¹ Ibid, p.21

of 1919, resolved that more knowledge needed to be gathered on just how undesirable proliferating mixed race populations in colony and metropole were. This reflected the destabilisation of certainties about the boundaries of Britishness and the resulting necessity to reconstruct racial difference, but also the growth of scientific interest in racial difference and racial mixing in a Britain struggling to come to terms with an increased coloured population. G.P Mudge in the *Eugenics Review* in 1920 wrote of the menace to the English race as a result of increasing Asiatic immigration, conflating Eastern Europeans and East Asians into a sweeping and dangerous racial type.²² Anthropologists took interest in the potentially permanent presence of the Chinese immigrant labourer in British cities, and some were keen to scientifically construct the properties of Eurasian hybrid children who were being noted often in journalistic investigations of Liverpool, Cardiff and London's Chinatowns in the early 1920s.

In the climate of the early 1920s, scientists such as Reginald Gates and Arthur Keith were symptomatic of the public and intellectual hostility toward race mixture between Europeans and non-Europeans.²³ To many observers transnationally, fixed races were in constant local and global competition and conflict with each other, and in the view of Gates, Keith, Madison Grant and others, mixing Asians and Europeans would not only lead to the physical degeneration of individual children, but also the decline of white supremacy in the face of growing East Asian demographic and geopolitical power. Miscegenation in the shell shocked world of 1920s Britain meant both national instability and global race suicide.

With this in mind, and with the growing impetus behind early interwar anthropology, in 1924, The Eugenics Society commissioned a race crossing study of Anglo-Chinese and Anglo-Negro children in Liverpool. The 1927 study suggested that Eurasian children were

²² Ibid, p.35, G.P Mudge., 'The Menace to the English Race and to its Traditions of Present Day Immigration and Emigration', *Eugenics Review* (1920), 11: 4, 202–12.

²³ Lucy Bland, 'White Women and Men of Colour: Miscegenation Fears in Britain after the Great War', *Gender & History*, Vol.17 No.1 April 2005, pp. 50

mentally and physically of higher quality than Anglo-Negro children, and Fleming and Fleure's report was positive, while at the same time keeping to the dominant assumptions about biological racial difference, the need to 'pass for white' in British society, and the use of anthropometric measurement of physical characteristics that were shared across the scientific spectrum in the 1920s. Muriel Fletcher later conducted another investigation of mixed race children. In her conclusions in 1930 Fletcher claimed that, although Eurasian children possessed admirable qualities, the social stigma that continued to surround racial hybridity and contact between whites and Asians in Britain meant that different racial groups should be segregated or discouraged from settling where possible. Coming from social workers and left wing investigators such as Fleure, this suggested that belief in racial difference and the reality of race prejudice persisted in the early 1930s.²⁴

The pre-federation antipodean colonies had been an earlier node for speculation about Eurasian futures within the British Empire and the Anglo-World, as the Victorian gold rush saw the arrival of Chinese workers in the 1850s. In 1893, liberal historian and former Victorian Parliamentarian Charles Pearson, conjured from Melbourne a gloomy post-colonial landscape in which the global ascendancy of 'Anglo-Saxons' would end, and those of European descent would experience a cataclysmic 'loss of place'.²⁵ His book *National Life and Character: A Forecast*, prophesied that the white race would be 'elbowed and hustled, and perhaps even thrust aside' from their colonial holdings by Asian and African peoples whom they at present regarded as a 'servile' nuisance. China would become the greatest power and spread its peoples outward in a deluge of global settlement of the temperate and tropical spaces of the Anglo World.²⁶ India would win independence and Haiti would be one

²⁴ Ibid, p.51

²⁵ Marilyn Lake, 'The Day Will Come': Charles H Pearson's *National Life and Character: A Forecast*, in, *Ten Books that Shaped the British Empire: Creating an Imperial Commons*, (2014), p.77

²⁶ Charles H. Pearson, *National Life and Character: a Forecast*, (London and New York, 1893, reprinted 1894), see also, Charles H. Pearson, 'The Black Republic', in *Reviews and Critical Essays*, ed. Herbert Augustus Strong, London, 1896 (review of Sir Spenser St John, *Hayti, or The Black Republic*, (London 1884, reprinted

among many ‘black republics’. The ‘solitary consolation’ for white civilisation as it found itself swamped and bred out of existence by ‘coloured races’ would be that it had merely been subject to the ‘inevitable’ flow of history, although Pearson hoped that Australia could for a time at least serve as a haven for white regeneration.²⁷ Lack of land in the ‘temperate zones’ suitable for white settlement was the problem that would lead to the death of the United States and Australia as white nations, as Asian migrants competed for these spaces, and so he suggested to the Victorian Parliament in 1881, that perhaps antipodean Britons should attempt to hold onto and guard these areas.²⁸

According to Marilyn Lake, Pearson’s predictions of Asian ascendancy were influenced partly through his consumption of the ‘protest’ literature produced by the Chinese-Australian colonists who had settled in Victoria.²⁹ Working as the chief secretary for the Government of Victoria in 1887, he also experienced at first-hand what he saw as the great authority of the Chinese Empire, as General Wong Yung Ho and a Ch’ing imperial commission arrived to inspect the conditions of Chinese migrants in the colonies.

Pearson’s work was published in London and New York and widely read in transatlantic as well as southern hemisphere circles.³⁰ Theodore Roosevelt even wrote to Pearson that his forecast was troubling and had a ‘great effect’ on himself and his peers on Capitol Hill.³¹ Although a political historian rather than a racial scientist, Pearson’s narrative of human history and post-imperial racial futures from the global south had a profound

New York, 1889), Charles Pearson, ‘The Land Question in the United States’, *Contemporary Review* September-December 1868.

²⁷ Ibid, p.79

²⁸ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008)

²⁹ For instance a pamphlet *The Chinese Question in Australia* (1879) which warned of the consequences of not recognising ‘common human rights’ of Chinese colonists.

³⁰ Marilyn Lake, ‘The Day Will Come’: Charles H Pearson’s National Life and Character: A Forecast, in, *Ten Books that Shaped the British Empire: Creating an Imperial Commons*, (2014), p.80

³¹ Ibid, p.80, Roosevelt to Pearson, 11 May 1894, Pearson papers, Bodleian Library, MS English letters, D190, Theodore Roosevelt, ‘National Life and Character’, reprinted in Theodore Roosevelt *National Ideals and Other Essays*, (London, 1897)

influence on later racial thinking and the underlying attitudes that were to govern anthropological approaches to race mixture in the interwar years.

Commentators of race and geopolitics such as the American Lothrop Stoddard who wrote the transnationally popular work *The Rising Tide of Colour* (1921), appropriated and re-imagined Pearson's work to argue that a race war between East and West was inevitable. To prevent a 'coloured conquest', the Anglo-World had to be closed to East Asian migrants. As Reynolds argues, when the new Australian Commonwealth parliament came to debate racial policy in 1901, its members shared a broad consensus that racial hierarchies existed, and that Northern Europeans inhabited the apex of this natural scale. Such a hierarchy was in constant flux however, and in order to maintain pre-eminence, the superior races had to be kept homogenous, and 'Non-Europeans were threatening, not just as economic competitors, but as a source of racial contamination'.³² By extension intimate contact with Asians, and intermarriage could only ever 'dilute' the biological and social winning formula that had produced white men's countries. The Asian-Australian mixed race child was seen as the embodiment of a changing biological balance, the problematisation of white British racial type in the colonies, and the inexorable encroachment of Asia.

Alfred Deakin had been a man who had travelled to India in his youth, and become fascinated with Sophism and the ancient religions and philosophies of the South Asian subcontinent. In a bout of historical irony, he would be remembered as one of the most remembered of colonial politicians in pushing for Asian exclusion as a pillar of the new federation.³³ An MP in the Victorian Legislative Assembly during the 1880s, he went on to become the second Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia in 1903-1904 as leader of the Protectionist Party, with later spells as Prime Minister in 1905-8 and 1909-10.³⁴

³² Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.62

³³ Ipsita Sengupta, *Entangled: Deakin in India*, p.55, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012)

³⁴ *Ibid*, p.56

Deakin, who Alison Bashford argues was one of the chief architects of what would be referred to as the White Australia Policy, had been a protégé of Pearson at the University of Melbourne in the 1870s, and continued to correspond with him closely. However while Deakin, and the first PM of the Australian Commonwealth Edmund Barton were inspired by Pearson's intellect, they certainly did not feel that the 'humiliation' of Greater British prestige he envisioned was either inevitable or should be accepted. Instead they were instrumental in pushing for the steadfast protection of the, 'white man's status and self-esteem in the south Pacific by transforming Australia into a 'white man's country'.³⁵ And so the White Australia Policy was born in 1901, accompanying the formal creation of Australia as a federated Commonwealth. In 1902 the newly created Commonwealth Parliament pushed through the *Immigration Restriction Act* and the *Pacific Islands Labourers Act* in 1906, allowing for the deportation of Melanesian sugar plantation workers in Northern Queensland who were viewed as unwanted competition for white labour. Indeed historians such as Alison Bashford and Marilyn Lake have increasingly reconfigured the building of the White Australia Policy as operating as a component of a 'transnational effort to secure "white men's countries."' ³⁶

Political leaders, the PM Edmund Barton and Liberal Attorney General Alfred Deakin were, 'supremely conscious of the global context. Their policies reflected and would in turn shape new racial solidarities across the world', and so as two of the most prominent politicians pushing for Australia to become a white man's federation, 'they embarked on a social experiment that placed them, so they thought, at the cutting edge of modern history'. In the United States, Prescott Hall, the President of the advocacy organisation, the Immigration Restriction League, wrote to Barton, desperate for the Americans to copy the

³⁵ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.44

³⁶ See, Alison Bashford, "Quarantine and the Imagining of the Australian Nation," *Health*, 1998, 2:387– 402; Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe, 2005); and Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008).

dictation test method of racial exclusion laid out in Australia in 1902. Americans saw Australians as brave, bold biopolitical reformers, and Australians saw Americans as the lesson from history during the post-civil war reconstruction, of the need to avoid interracial marriage.³⁷ The imperative for ethnic homogeneity, Deakin felt this was what made a strong nation, supported by his readings of Charles Pearson and the medievalist E.A Freeman. Deakin also met James Bryce in 1887 at the Colonial Conference in London. At the first Constitutional Conference in Melbourne in 1890, Deakin advocated Bryce's American Commonwealth as a template to build an Anglo-Saxon Australia.

Living in England but travelling prolifically, Bryce was a focal point for transatlantic miscegenation thinking. Deakin also wanted to promote ethnic homogeneity as a political tool to wrest further powers of self-determination for Australia away from Westminster.³⁸ Portraying Australia to the empire and the outside world as a pure white man's country was key in being able to gain British approval of the drive toward federation in 1901. American ideas about racial segregation underpinned the Australian constitutional debates, which were bound up with crystallising anti-miscegenation stereotypes, and race mixture was constructed as anathema to the Anglo-Saxon nation, but also transnational Anglo-Saxonist affinity built on white race consciousness. Deakin even sent copies of the debates to Josiah Royce at Harvard and others.³⁹

The White Australia conferences, and the added influence of American anti-Asian sentiment and the Exclusion Act of 1882, eventually seeped into the British awareness, driven to the fore by colonial crises, the Transvaal labour questions of 1903-1906 and the Boxer crisis in 1900. These crises created an antagonistic relationship between a 'white imperial working class' as being in opposition to Chinese migrant labour, and constituted

³⁷ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.30

³⁸ *Ibid*, p.33

³⁹ *Ibid*, p.50

through a number of Anglophone nodes, through which the southern hemisphere understanding of a 'yellow peril' narrative informed Britain.⁴⁰

The British historian and diplomat James Bryce who wrote *The American Commonwealth* (1888), which suggested that the post-civil war United States should remain racially segregated. A Regius Professor of civil law at Oxford, and periodic member of the Gladstone government, Bryce was an intellectual figure of weight whose opinions informed American legislators such as Theodore Roosevelt, and his warnings about the negative impact of miscegenation and creating mixed race populations in the United States fed into and helped inform the growing white settler aversion to East Asian migration in Australia, and his racial-historical arguments, while not anthropological in grounding, nevertheless were laced with the assumption that interracial marriage caused physical and societal degeneration. Eventually, in the wake of the Boxer rebellion and increasingly noted East Asian immigration, Bryce's and Pearson's ideas found growing popularity in informing Britain's immigration debate.⁴¹ Australians were obsessed with driving towards self-governance, and used race as a tool in constitutional debates.

The White Australia Policy played a role in driving the increasing divide and segregation between whites and non-whites in the British Empire. Echoing the New Zealand Prime Minister, Richard Seddon, Deakin argued that imperial subjects were not to be equally treated, in contradiction of Joseph Chamberlain who argued that they should, but that whites were the 'ruling race' of the empire in northern and southern hemispheres. An article in the

⁴⁰ For more detailed exploration of the Transvaal crisis, the impact of anxieties about importing Chinese labour on the 1906 British general election, and the wider imperial and transnational significance of this, see, Rachel Bright, *Chinese Labour in South Africa, 1902-10: Race, Violence, and Global Spectacle*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), and, Rachel Bright, 'Asian Migration and the British World, c.1850-c.1914', in, *Empire, Identity and Migration in the British World*, Andrew Thompson, ed, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), and, Laura Tabili, *"We Ask for British Justice": Workers and Racial Difference in Late Imperial Britain*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1994)

⁴¹ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.44

Morning Post stated that ‘Australia and New Zealand are determined to keep their place in the first class’.⁴² So in addition to being informed by the work of racially conscious historians and political scientists, Deakin and the White Australians were opposed to Asian immigration and intermarriage with Europeans because it gave them agency as part of a globally powerful white club, while also being part of a project to take regional and local power away from Westminster.

But this direction also involved supporting white ‘hegemony’ in other colonies as well as in the new federation. This meant supporting white in Natal and the Transvaal in 1903-6 against black rebellion and the importation of Chinese labourers.⁴³ New South Wales and Queensland legislatures attacked Lord Milner’s scheme to use Chinese workers in South Africa as an assault on a self-governing white community, desperate to avoid a precedent that the British government could override colonial concerns, and in turn force Chinese immigrants on White Australia. In 1905 the Canadian government had to override a law passed by the legislature of British Columbia restricting Japanese immigration, and indeed two years later tensions boiled over as race riots rocked Vancouver.⁴⁴ Australian newspapers and Wellington’s *Evening Post* commented uneasily on the Canadian situation that, ‘British policy in the Far East demand that the white man and yellow man shall lie down together on equal terms’.⁴⁵ The feeling on the part of Australians, and later Britons, that the British official mind/policy paid insufficient attention to Asian miscegenation throughout the empire,

⁴² Quoted in, Ibid, p.48

⁴³ Rachel Bright, *Chinese Labour in South Africa, 1902-10: Race, Violence, and Global Spectacle*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), and, Rachel Bright, ‘Asian Migration and the British World, c.1850-c.1914’, in, *Empire, Identity and Migration in the British World*, Andrew Thompson, ed, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)

⁴⁴ Rachel Bright, *Chinese Labour in South Africa, 1902-10: Race, Violence, and Global Spectacle*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), and, Rachel Bright, ‘Asian Migration and the British World, c.1850-c.1914’, in, *Empire, Identity and Migration in the British World*, Andrew Thompson, ed, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p. 65

⁴⁵ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p. 68

and that this had a detrimental impact on global and regional power, was a cultural and political framework that had been laid before the rise of physical anthropologists' interest in the Eurasian, and drove scientific and eugenic schemes to understand and control the East Asian puzzle in the 1920s.

Parliamentary perceptions in 1901 provided a snapshot of fin de siècle attitudes to miscegenation and the threat of Asia. Deakin argued that the desire to keep Australians as a white British people 'without the admixture of other races' had always been the driving force behind late nineteenth century moves to create a federation.⁴⁶ Thomas Glassey echoed approvingly the sentiment that Australia had chosen to keep itself white forever more as a thousand year white man's paradise. Race mixture in his words was a 'danger, a menace, and a disgrace to our civilization'.⁴⁷ Isaac Isaacs, later appointed as the Governor General of the Commonwealth in 1931, neatly summed up that it was also the materially 'higher and fuller life' that 'progressive' white countries such as Australia had the right to preserve, and that high wages, good living and British cultural identity would be dangerously compromised by Asian immigration. The struggle for colonial supremacy and civilisation was a righteous 'white man's war', and Isaacs was determined he would not, 'suffer any black or tinted man to come in and block the path of progress. I would resist...any murky stream from disturbing the current of Australian life'.⁴⁸

Many key public figures openly either vilified or played upon the idea of a 'half-caste' Australian future as an apocalyptic scenario. This was often buttressed by the sentiments of journalists at the Sydney Bulletin, which in 1901 claimed that the individual mixed race 'mongrel' had 'criminal instincts'. The Bulletin neatly summed up that the white

⁴⁶ Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates (CPD), *ibid.*, vol. 4, p. 4804.

⁴⁷ CPD, vol. 5, 1901, p. 7275 from, Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.76

⁴⁸ *ibid.*, vol. 4, p. 4840.

Britisher 'with his passion for...individuality, bears the banner in the van of humanity'. The Bulletin's appeals to the idea that for whites to 'dally' and breed with Asians would upset 'the scheme of evolution', that non-white racial material would 'infect him with a servile submissiveness' were symptomatic of assumptions about miscegenation in popular discourse that appropriated vague scientific terms to validate white settler imperatives.⁴⁹

The new federation had appropriated a framework to enact and police Asian exclusion. Asians were now kept from migrating and settling in Australia through the 'ruse' of a writing or 'literacy test' in which immigrants were challenged to write fifty words in any European language. Although the terms of the exam avoided overt racialized language, so that China and Japan would find it difficult to raise formal complaints about discrimination, the test was made to be unpassable, and was administered only to non-whites.⁵⁰ At the same time even Asian-Australians who were British subjects now travelled in and out of Australia at their own risk, as they were now forced to provide exhaustive documentation and even letters from community friends to prove their 'Australianness' and be granted exemption from the test.

Such a biopolitical bureaucracy represented the national consolidation of anti-Chinese sentiment and Asian restriction legislation that had previously been formed on a state by state basis. Citizenship became more fragile for Eurasians in Australia, caught as they were between two racial worlds, and as Warwick Anderson and Sophie Couchman both suggest, it was implicitly hoped by the architects of such schemes that without further immigration, Asian-Australian populations would shrink dramatically and fade into extinction.⁵¹ The

⁴⁹ *The Bulletin*, 12 July 1902, 'The White Race Instinct'

⁵⁰ Robert Julio Decker, "The Transnational Biopolitics of Immigration Restriction in the United States and White Settler Colonies, 1894-1924", in Eva Bischoff, Norbert Finzsch, and Ursula Lehmkuhl (eds.): *Provincializing the United States. Colonialism, Decolonization and Post-Colonialism*, (2014), p.81

⁵¹ Sophie Couchman, Making the 'last Chinaman': Photography and Chinese as a 'vanishing' people in Australia's rural local histories, *Australian Historical Studies*, 2001, 42:1, 78-91

literacy test was part of wider biopolitical regimes, a transnational exchange of segregation measures on the part of 'self-styled white men's countries under siege', Canada, the United States, New Zealand, and South Africa as well as Australia. Originally devised in Mississippi in 1890 according to Lake, the test made its way from the United States to Australia, via Natal in 1897.⁵²

Australian intellectual involvement in formally contributing to and shaping racial science discourses internationally was embryonic in 1900, and yet abhorrence of Asian and aboriginal miscegenation commanded a broad consensus. The country's only major ethnography journal at the time of federation, *Science of Man*, echoed the colonial vernacular of press and politicians. Dr Alex Carrell explained in an article for the journal in 1900 that racial hybridity produced much of the moral and physical degeneration that could be found in Australian cities. Amalgamation of diverse races replicated all of the worst characteristics of the parents in the offspring, much as was the case when different types of cattle, horses or dogs interbred. Animal analogies were a powerful point of comparison for late Victorian biologists and anthropologists trying to throw light on the white man's position in an increasingly interconnected and competitive human environment.⁵³

Even the *Science of Man* journal, which was the organ of the Royal Anthropological Society of Australasia, was viewed with public suspicion.⁵⁴ *The Sydney Stock and Station Journal* in 1908 argued contemptuously that the journal 'is full of facts. People don't like facts. As a race we hate truth more than we hate fiction', and that Dr. S.A Smith had been vilified in a lecture where he had made light of popular intellectual indifference to matters of science and anthropology. Even though anthropology and biology came to play a strong later

⁵² Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.56

⁵³ *Science of Man*, 22 September 1900, p. 138.

⁵⁴ *The Sydney Stock and Station Journal*, 4 August 1908, "SCIENCE OF MAN." (*NSW: 1896 - 1924*), p.3

role in debates about miscegenation, whiteness and nation formation in the climate and race crossing studies of the 1920s, there was an earlier atmosphere of indignation that an Australian scientific publication was ‘daring’ to tell the public how to view different species and different races. Folk conceptions of Anglo-Saxonism and white superiority, rather than any concerted attempts to investigate or understand miscegenation, still ruled the roost. In the later case of Griffith Taylor, the intertwined but tumultuous relationship between racial science and public mentalities again came to the fore, as a letter written to Taylor from a member of the public, Gavin Long in 1926, displayed ample evidence of public ‘colour feeling’, aversion to Asians, and contempt for the cosmopolitan opinions of the ‘expert’ discussing the benefits of hybridity.⁵⁵

It was not until the interwar years that the anthropological investigation of White-Asian, and aboriginal bodies, and the positive of degenerative potentialities of interracial reproduction really gained provincialized and globalised momentum in the British World. The idea that the First World War had been a ‘white civil war’ depleting the cream of Nordic stock, had been advanced by the popular American commentator Lothrop Stoddard in *The Rising Tide of Colour* (1921). In this atmosphere, Stoddard popularised the assumption that immigration restriction and segregation were crucial if white Europeans were to avoid being subverted by Asian mass migration. But such interwar assumptions had their roots in Charles Pearson’s work, to which Stoddard described his indebtedness. As we will also explore, Victorian cultural narratives and stereotypes tied to transnationally exchanged anxieties about Asian migrants, and the economic concerns of what Laura Tabili describes as a white imperial working class also had a role to play in informing later anthropological frameworks.

⁵⁵ For details of the entire letter from Gavin Long to Professor Griffith Taylor, which encapsulated the line of argument of a number of public attacks on attempts to critique the White Australia Policy, see Appendix I.

Commentators throughout the Anglo-World such as Lothrop Stoddard, and British writer L.E Neame in *The Asiatic Danger in the Colonies* (1908), an alarmist polemic about the proliferation of Chinese labour throughout British colonies, and a commentary upon the Transvaal labour disputes of 1903 and 1906, had noted their indebtedness to their perhaps misguided interpretations of Charles Pearson's prediction of the growth of non-white power in *The National Life and Character* (1893).⁵⁶ Griffith Taylor's more unique interpretation of these Pearsonian migration prophecies in *Environment and Race* (1927), his acceptance that race mixture and hybridity were inevitable realities in modern populations, that white purity was a fallacy, and that White-Asian intermarriage could be part of a positive cosmopolitan future, rather than the nightmarish extinction of white supremacy as depicted by Stoddard and his predecessors, led him to argue that Asians were at least equal, if not superior type to the white 'Britisher'.⁵⁷ By extension, he suggested that limited Asian migration into the Australian North could over time create a better breed of bronzed hybrid settler that could help rather than harm the colonial project, and in doing so he injected a significant amount of uncertainty into interwar assumptions surrounding the 'normalising' of whiteness. Taylor was seen to be advocating a destabilising of white bodies as well as white consensuses, and as a result he faced battle and hostility. His high estimations, particularly of Chinese and Japanese physical and mental qualities, were viewed as scientific heresy by intellectual and popular commentators alike.⁵⁸

Although interwar physical anthropologists and biologists were approaching the Asian miscegenation question with a fresher scientific methodology, new biometric tools, and

⁵⁶ L.E Neame, *The Asiatic Danger in the Colonies*, (London, 1907), Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Colour*, (1921). For further commentary on the transnational dissemination and significance of these works, see, David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999)

⁵⁷ Griffith Taylor, *Environment and Race: A Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1927).

⁵⁸ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), P.28

vigorous enthusiasm, there was a traceable continuity to their assumptions and imperatives that were firmly rooted in pre-anthropological, nineteenth century settler anxieties and speculations about the future impact of Asian working class migration, and the possibility of a Eurasian future for white men's colonies. In order to appreciate this, we have to look to the 1850s antipodean colonies, particularly Victoria and New South Wales, where, Kane Collins argues, 'forecasts of a Eurasian society long predated the ideal of a white Australia.'⁵⁹

Gold Rushes

Gold deposits were discovered in California in 1848, and Victoria in 1851. In 1852, Chinese migrants began arriving in large numbers in Victoria, having often travelled from the deposits in California, and Guangdong province in Southern China. Indeed while the gold mining industry built and accelerated colonial development in the antipodes, this was part of a wider transnational phenomenon that, through the wider dissemination of commercial awareness and credit ticket systems, drew in Asia-Pacific peoples as well as Euro-Americans. In this frenzied and often serial rushing, Anglos and Asians frequently rubbed shoulders as they criss-crossed the Pacific, and bought and worked closely situated plots of land in small teams, known as surface or 'placer mining'. The settler population of the Australian continent quadrupled between 1851 and 1861.⁶⁰

On 16 November 1854 Governor Hotham appointed a Royal Commission on Victorian goldfields problems and grievances. In 1855 this led to residency taxes being levied on Chinese living in Victoria, signalling early alarm at the Asian influx, and demanded

⁵⁹ Kane Collins, *Imagining the golden race*, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska eds., *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012), , p.102

⁶⁰ Mae M. Ngai, Chinese Gold Miners and the "Chinese Question" in Nineteenth-Century California and Victoria, *Journal of American History*, 2015 101: 1082-1105, p.1085

Chinese gold diggers pay a hefty £10 poll tax, along with restricting the number of Chinese passengers per ship tonnage that could be transported. By 1858 there were 33,000 Chinese gold miners in the state of Victoria alone, 'nearly 26% of the total mining population', and in some districts of Victoria, as well as in California, the Chinese even outnumbered Euro-Americans.⁶¹

Most of these Chinese rushers were from rural areas. They were small landholders or contract-labourers hired through credit and payment of passage arrangements, working in small teams.⁶² Chinese camps sprung up around mining towns such as Bendigo and Ballarat in Victoria with a frequency that alarmed some observers. The vast majority of Chinese migrant diggers were men. Such conditions inevitably meant that liaisons and marriage between Chinese men and white European women occurred.⁶³ In this early period of Asian migration and settlement, the 1850s and 1860s, journalists, policemen and state officials were the anthropological investigators of their day. It was often through their newspaper reports on the conditions of Chinese mining camps, urban Chinatowns and slums, and their descriptions of Anglo-Asian intermarriage and Eurasian children, that the shifting perceptions of racial hybridity could be constructed.

When in 1859 a journalist for the *Bendigo Mercury* described his observations of a Chinese-Australian family he had encountered living near a Bendigo mining camp, he did so without significant alarm or revulsion.

In the suburbs of the village there is a nice piece of ground...this belongs to a Chinaman, who has been coupled in the bonds of matrimony with a fair

⁶¹ Geoffrey Serle, *The Golden Age, A History of the Colony of Victoria, 1851-1861*, (Melbourne University Press, 1963), p.388–89

⁶² Mae M. Ngai, Chinese Gold Miners and the "Chinese Question" in Nineteenth-Century California and Victoria, *Journal of American History*, 2015 101:, p.1084

⁶³ Kane Collins, *Imagining the golden race*, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska eds., *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012), p.102

daughter of Erin, who has brought him in due course a daughter, in whose face the amalgamation of the two races is singularly blended.⁶⁴

As Kate Bagnall argues, such examples suggest that in the early gold rush decades, there was more of a 'benign curiosity' on the part of some white Europeans toward mixed marriage and their 'fair' and stably 'blended' offspring.⁶⁵ Racial taxonomies in the late 1850s, at least in the provincial colonial setting, had not hardened sufficiently, or acquired and rendered vernacular the scientific rhetoric of racial hierarchy and white chauvinism that the Australian consciousness would quickly become steeped in. This would change rapidly, and perceptions of racial hybridity deteriorated quickly in the face of growing competition between Chinese and European labourers.

Some European observers were sympathetic to whites and Asians interbreeding. P. Just, a merchant of Scottish origin who stayed in Victoria for several years, and wrote in 1859 on the questions of land settlement in the rapidly expanding colony, was highly interested in the qualities that could arise from a mixing of the 'Celtic' and 'Mongolian'.⁶⁶ A New South Wales 'squatter', T.E. Lance wrote in 1855 that East Asians possessed physical and mental qualities, and adaptability and industriousness that put them near in quality to Europeans, and felt his fellow colonists should accept that after a number of generations, intermarriage with Asians would naturally occur, and probably strengthen the colony.⁶⁷

The Pacific could become a sight for a new golden age, built by people with golden skin. In an 1852 article entitled 'The celestial at home and abroad' in Blackwood's magazine of Edinburgh, it was claimed that an 'Australian Empire' based on race mixture was being

⁶⁴ 'The Chinese in Bendigo', reprinted from *Bendigo Mercury* in the *Border Post*, 9 April 1859, in Kate Bagnall, 'Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915', (PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007), p.151

⁶⁵ *Ibid*

⁶⁶ P. Just, 1858, from Kane Collins, *Imagining the golden race*, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska eds., *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012), p.99-120.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, p.103

‘consummated’. ‘Auriferous Australia will ere long be the scene of an analogous combination...Gold is now the great lodestar of the nations...destined to break up the seclusion of the hermit races of...China’. In the ‘bosom of the Pacific’, new ‘combinations’ of races, brought together by gold, would drive humanity’s future progress. Racial hybridity would transcend oceans and national borders, linking the British world outposts of California, Australia and New Zealand with China and the rest of Asia.⁶⁸ The gold rushes in California and Victoria would be an engine for creating a mixed race people who were suited to the Pacific, a true ‘golden race’. Working class Chinese migrants, James Hingston also argued, had good habits and would make good colonists.⁶⁹

Such visions, often forgotten in hindsight, became more marginal imaginings as anti-Asian sentiment gained momentum, and with it the gradual pathologising of hybridity as more of a biohazard to white settler societies. The Lambing Flat riots of 1861 were just one example of widespread and proliferating violence of European diggers against Chinese gold miners, as competition for money and gold plots intensified.⁷⁰ Mae Ngai argues that a ‘coolie trope’ surrounding Asian labour gained currency in Australian political thinking in the 1870s and 1880s, and with it an intensification of negative stereotypes of Chinese working class morals, hygiene and sexual behaviour.⁷¹ At the same time there were worries about the mobility of Chinese and Pacific island labour in Northern Queensland, and criticism of whites who employed these workers.

In 1881, the Victorian Parliament introduced a ‘Chinese Influx Restriction Bill’, which imposed a £10 entry tax on Chinese people, and a restriction of only one Chinese

⁶⁸ Ibid, P.113, Blackwood’s Edinburgh magazine, vol. LXXII, 1852

⁶⁹ Ibid, p.104. For more on James Hingston and his Asian travels, see David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999), p.2

⁷⁰ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850-1939*, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1999)

⁷¹ Mae M. Ngai, Chinese Gold Miners and the "Chinese Question" in Nineteenth-Century California and Victoria, *Journal of American History*, 2015 101: 1082-1105.

person allowed entry to the colony for every 100 tons of shipping. If leaving the colony temporarily, the Chinese had to get certificates which they would present on their return. The Victorian government also tried to disenfranchise Chinese voters, as before 1881 the rate payer's rolls were used as basis for the electoral register, making many Chinese-Australians eligible.⁷² Lake and Reynolds suggest that such moves were symptomatic of late Victorian assumptions that East Asians intrinsically were not suited to living as democratic citizens, that, 'the Chinese were racially unfit for political rights for they knew nothing of Caucasian civilisation and they lacked the capacity for independence, being controlled by headmen.'⁷³ 1888 saw an inter-colonial Conference on Chinese Immigration in Sydney. The Australian colonies agreed to create a standard, uniform piece of law, drafted by future PM Alfred Deakin. The Chinese were banned from settling permanently in Australia, regardless of whether they were British subjects. The course was very much set towards the later enshrinement of White Australia in 1901 as a bastion against Asianness.

The 'long and strong' Traditions of Euro-American Miscegenation Thinking

According to Katherine Cronin, it is important to note that competition with, and attempts to restrict Chinese migrants intensified during and after the gold rush, when, 'ancient popular ideas of folk racism were elevated to the status of an indisputable scientific theory which

⁷² Ibid, p.1085

⁷³ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.36

declared them non-assimilable on biological grounds".⁷⁴ Anti-miscegenation attitudes mirrored the growth of biological determinism in the colonies. Alexander Saxton and Marilyn Lake argue that during the mid-nineteenth century, 'theories of race' became inextricably intertwined with 'theories of history'.⁷⁵ The medievalist E.A Freeman was symptomatic of this, arguing that the Anglo-Saxon peoples were born colonisers and governors. This was at times contested during Australian settlement in the nineteenth century, and as Kane Collins argues, commentators such as the Reverend James Jeffries of Sydney and the author W. Lumley often compared the Chinese migrants or indigenous peoples to the ancient Britons, 'clad in wolf skins' as they were described and interpreted in works such as Caesar's Gallic Wars.⁷⁶ Surely the humble beginnings of the 'British race' refuted growing claims of white superiority, when at the same time as the ancient Britons were resisting the Romans, the Chinese of antiquity had lived under philosopher kings in a centralised state.

But as a number of historians of race such as Nancy Stepan, Francisco Bethencourt and Henry Reynolds have noted, Euro-American thinking about miscegenation was largely very negative, and drew on older experiences and observations that went back to the origins of European colonialism with Spanish-Portuguese forays into Latin America in the sixteenth century.⁷⁷ There were plenty of instances of colonial travel writers in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and their descriptions of the mixed descent peoples they encountered. Such accounts were largely negative. The Englishman Edward Long, *History of Jamaica*, (1774), painted a nightmarish picture of the 'mongrels' composed of the

⁷⁴ Kathryn Cronin, "Controlling immigration: Australian legislation and practice", Australian Law Reform Commission Reform Journal 6, Reform Issue 75 Spring 1999, p.241

⁷⁵ Marilyn Lake, The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White, *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 58, Autumn 2004, , p.41

⁷⁶ Kane Collins. 2008. 'Julius Caesar versus White Australia: The painted savages of Britain, race, and the use of history'. *History Australia* 5 (1): pp. 5.1 to 5.16

⁷⁷ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.20

intermarriage in Spain's Empire in the Americas between European's, imported African slaves and native peoples, describing the 'mestizo' as 'vicious, brutal and degenerate'.⁷⁸

Disgust towards race mixture was everywhere, and, 'travellers, sociologists and scientists joined hands to write of the degenerate mixture' as the observations of both the layman and the expert investigator reinforced one another. The 'half-caste' was a 'biological dissident' with their moral and physical characteristics inscribed, incapable of change or reform, and this presented a challenge to both European colonial authority and attempts to construct modern, homogenous nation states. Therefore their numbers needed to be quantified and controlled by anxious governments. Reynolds sums up best that opinions about miscegenation of the 'savant' and the 'citizen' were inextricably intertwined, and that the interconnected assumptions of science and society drove the later rise and fall of physical anthropological thinking towards the 'mulatto' in the twentieth century.

From the late eighteenth century to the mid-twentieth century, biologists, ethnographers and social commentators wrote with seeming certainty and frequent unanimity about half-castes. But for all their assumed expertise, technical skill and authoritative language, they came up with much the same sort of account that was common in popular literature. Savant and citizen were in agreement about the hapless half-castes, whose discordant bodies and minds created innumerable social problems.⁷⁹

In terms of scientific and academic construction of human difference, the first half of the nineteenth century saw discursive battle lines drawn between theories of monogenesis and

⁷⁸ Ibid, p.21, Edward Long, *History of Jamaica*, (1774)

⁷⁹ Ibid, p.22

polygenesis. Scientific attitudes to miscegenation were very much shaped by this by this debate. Johanne Blumenbach in 1776, the man who Keevak credits with being a notable proponent of grouping East Asians as a ‘Mongolian’ type, also espoused that the ‘varieties’ of humanity were all part of a single species.⁸⁰ J.C Prichard, the British ethnographer agreed with this, and he used the biblical concept that ‘all mankind are the offspring of common parents’ to back his case.⁸¹ In such a light, if all humans were part of the same family, how could miscegenation be hazardous? This is not to say that some monogenisists such as William Lawrence did not feel that Europeans and ‘the dark races’ were not still different to the point where ‘European-Asiatic’ intermarriage in South East Asia might not lead to the ‘deterioration’ of the European ‘stock’, while at the same improving the ‘qualities of the dark variety’. However polygenisists were more extreme in arguing that human difference was so pronounced, being that races had evolved independently of one another, that therefore miscegenation would constitute inter-species breeding and prove mentally and physically disastrous producing infertility.⁸² Reynolds suggests that the ‘intellectual drive’ behind polygenism came from anxieties about maintaining white colonial rule and hierarchy in the British territories of the West Indies, and black slavery in the southern United States.⁸³

As Francisco Bethencourt argues in *Racisms* (2013), and Nancy Stepan agrees, a bitter irony existed in the broad direction that racial thinking was beginning to take by the 1850s. As the institution of slavery had been dealt a killer blow in the British Empire through the Slavery Abolition Act of 1833, racial science was becoming significantly less ‘egalitarian’, with monogenisists losing ground in favour of the polygenisists greater accentuation of the extent of human difference, through their assertions that humankind was

⁸⁰ Michael Keevak, *Becoming Yellow: A Short History of Racial Thinking*, (Princeton University Press, 2011), p.23

⁸¹ J.C. Prichard, *The Natural History of Man*, (3rd edition, London, 1848), p.6 quoted in, Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.24

⁸² Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800–1960*, (Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1982), p.68

⁸³ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.25

divided into entirely different sets of species. This was the academic manifestation of a reassertion of imperial hierarchies and inequalities of power by Europeans and North Americans in the wake of the growing tide of black emancipation.⁸⁴ The Frenchman Count Arthur de Gobineau, one of the chief proponents of the idea of an ‘Asiatic’ threat to western civilisation that would morph into the “yellow peril” trope in nineteenth century Europe, in, *The Inequality of Human Races: A Philosophical Enquiry Into the Influence of Race Over the Destiny of Nations* (1854), argued miscegenation produced degenerative consequences. The Scotsman, Robert Knox, in his famous and widely read work, *The Races of Man* (1856), like a number of contemporaries who looked to the deterioration of Spanish and Portuguese rule in Latin America in their attempts to construct knowledge that might inform the North European experience, stated that hybridity in this setting had become a ‘disgrace to human nature’.⁸⁵ As has been traced, historians are in agreement that popular European conversations about miscegenation had been active for centuries, but in the second half of the nineteenth century the bulk of Euro-American academic racial thinking was also increasingly denouncing the biological as well as moral dangers of the practice.

One of the knock on effects of the publication Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1872) was to change the terms of the dichotomy on racial thinking. Scientific and public interests drew on Darwin’s thinking to conclude broadly that although humanity was composed of a single species, different races existed, were old and long established, and had evolved differently. This concept blended elements of mono and polygenism while speaking to the deep histories of European racism and invigorating the increasingly enthusiastic colonial constructions of racial hierarchy and white supremacy. Whereas it might have been thought that moving away from polygenism would

⁸⁴ Ibid, p.31

⁸⁵ Ibid, p.34

have created more room for the construction of less toxic knowledge about intermarriage, ‘Darwinian biology and sociology expressed the same concern about miscegenation and drew as readily on the tales told by travellers returning from exotic locations.’⁸⁶ Additionally Reynolds notes that Darwin also stated the ‘mulatto’ was ‘savage and degraded’ in *The Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication*, (1868), drawing on travellers accounts of Latin America.⁸⁷ As will be explored later, references to Darwinism cropped up in Australian newspaper discussions of racial difference and reports of local investigators tales of Asian-Australian communities and families.

In the mid-nineteenth century I would agree with Reynolds that, ‘the ideas and theories about race were principally crafted in Europe and the United States, the phrases coined, the books and articles written. The accounts of explorers, travellers and settlers and the bones and skulls of indigenous people flowed back from the frontiers of Empire to the museums, universities and studies of the great metropolitan centres.’⁸⁸ The gradual development of racial science and miscegenation thought in the United States and the metropole was absorbed but also vernacularized by the practices of constructing local colonial knowledge in the Australian colonies, and practices aimed at the Aboriginal and Asian populations. I agree with Reynolds that we can trace this racial thinking over the long term, that, ‘Australian policies showed the often unattributed influence of major intellectual figures of the Atlantic World. It is not surprising, then, that the half-caste was central to government thinking in the antipodes between the 1880s and 1940s.’⁸⁹ As Peta Stephenson argues, white colonials were hungry to rationalise the explosive growth of the British Empire in Asia and the Pacific as natural proof of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon minds and bodies.

⁸⁶ Ibid, P.36

⁸⁷ Ibid, p.34

⁸⁸ Ibid, P.25

⁸⁹ Ibid, p.31

Bolger and Cottle summarise that, 'Social Darwinian ideology became an unquestioned 'common sense' and as a consequence played a large part in shaping colonial Australian ideology.'⁹⁰ James Jupp concurs that pre-federation antipodean settlers had 'long and strong xenophobic, racist and insular traditions', as they created a unique, anti-Asian settler vernacular out of late Victorian racial-biological theories.⁹¹

In addition, during the 1880s the Chinese, and Eurasian children were increasingly being constructed as a public health hazard. The 1880 smallpox epidemic in New South Wales was blamed on the dirtiness of Chinese immigrants and market gardeners. Although several newspaper articles called out this scapegoating by Governor Henry Parkes, it gave even more impetus to public approval for exclusion legislation in New South Wales.⁹² A greater state imperative to categorise and sanitise Asians took hold through censuses and reports, and much like the cases involving aboriginal-Asian offspring, Eurasian children were automatically cast as victims of familial neglect, unsanitary living conditions and moral squalor. The language of child welfare and education as markers of race and nationality became important, as Chinatowns from Adelaide to San Francisco were pathologised as dens of crime, opium addiction, and the corrupting of white women by coloured men, as sites of interracial transgression and a betrayal of white supremacy.⁹³ There was an increasing drive for official censuses of Asians in Australia, and observations of mixed race people in Chinatowns and camps. In an expose of Sydney's Chinatown by the *Sydney Mail*, 15

⁹⁰ Refereed Paper by Drew Cottle and Dawn Bolger, *Race and Australian Immigration Policy*, Macquarie University, (2009) p.5

⁹¹ James Jupp, *From White Australia to Woomera: The Story of Australian Immigration*, (Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.7

⁹² David Walker, 'Rising Suns', in David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012), p.81

⁹³ *The Express and Telegraph* (Adelaide, SA : 1867 - 1922), Monday 15 April 1878: A South Australian's observation of the Chinatown of San Francisco.

February 1879, investigators invaded the homes of Anglo-Chinese families and engaged in intrusive questioning, which they gleefully documented.⁹⁴

In this new frenzy of scrutiny, suspicion and moral-biological determinism, we revisit a Chinese camp in Bendigo in 1875. Described in *The Sydney Morning Herald* on 6 October 1875, reprinted from the *Bendigo Advertiser* article of 28 September, Mr. Cogden, the police magistrate, and the mayor, detective Alexander were accompanied by an interpreter named Chin Kit as they conducted observations of Anglo-Asian children in the camp.

Several of their children were running about, and furnished a delightful study to a Darwinian gentleman of the company. In them the blending of the two races was strikingly illustrated. The general contour of the face was European, and the features, regarded collectively, partook largely of the European caste; but the thick coarse quality of the hair, the triangular formation of the eye, the tendency of the nose to flatten from the bridge, and the cheek bones cropping up just sufficiently to show the hybrid, unmistakably demonstrated the parentage to be Chinese. Taste differs very much, but in our opinion these children looked remarkably well. Intellectually too, they seemed very capable. But the sight of them in the midst of such surroundings could not fail to sadden and grieve the spectator. Their but too probable fate would frequently recur to the mind in spite of every attempt to divert the attention to more inviting subjects. Moral and physical ruin seemed to loom in the distance and re-nounce their doom.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Kate Bagnall, 'Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915', (PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007), p.50

⁹⁵ *The Sydney Morning Herald* (NSW 1842 - 1954), Wednesday 6 October 1875

The children in this case were actually described positively in terms of both their health and intelligence. The reference to the ‘Darwinian’ nature of such observations of miscegenation is an indicator that the vernacularisation of North Atlantic racial thinking for use in investigations of miscegenation in the colonial setting was well under way in the 1870s. However the environment of the Chinese camp was frequently described throughout the article as an unsanitary pit of dirty dwellings and dirtier behaviour, a hive of opium smoking and prostitution which would inevitably corrupt the ‘half-caste’, no matter how promising they might appear. White-Asian intermarriage equated to an automatic moral destitution.⁹⁶ In the minds of many white Australians, mixed race offspring had both biology and environment stacked against them, and therefore such a population had to be at least kept small lest it threaten cohesion in colonial life, or encouraged ever greater Asiatic immigration as Chinamen and others looked to start new lives and put down roots in established Asian-Australian communities. The term ‘White Australia’ would later formally enter the popular discourse, and according to Raymond Evans, was concocted by the now often cited journalist and white labour activist, William Lane, in the *Brisbane Boomerang* in 1888.⁹⁷ A great body of research, scholarship and debate had by the end of the 1880s already gone into the appropriation of North Atlantic scientific discourses to construct a brand of biological determinism in the Australian colonies, which, in addition to the demonization of indigeneity, had been adapted to reflect anti-Chinese sentiments and ‘yellow peril’ narratives that were both transnational and at the same time uniquely of the southern hemisphere, which help us understand the trajectory that Australia took towards its own idea of nationhood as a white man’s country in the Pacific in 1901, in which Asian immigration had to be barred.

⁹⁶ Deana Heath, *Purifying Empire: Obscenity and the Politics of Moral Regulation in Britain, India and Australia*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p.58

⁹⁷ Raymond Evans, White citizenship: nationhood and race at Federation, *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum, Cultural Heritage Series*2(2), 2002:pp.179-187, p.185, p.185

There were some critics of this snowballing consensus on white superiority and revulsion toward miscegenation. In 1879, in response to tightening restrictions on Asians, the Reverend James Jefferis of Sydney gave a speech arguing that in fact limited Chinese migration could be accommodated, and that Asians should be assimilated rather than excluded.⁹⁸ He reasoned this by appealing to the notion that the Chinese hailed from an ancient, advanced, and refined culture and civilisation, whose continuity proved that they could make stable colonists in an unstable white nation. This was a refutation of racial determinism through appeals to history.

Chinese-Australians joined in making similar appeals and critiques. Leading merchants and lawyers representing the Chinese community in Melbourne published a number of pamphlets, among them, *The Chinese Question in Australia* in 1879, and presented it to the Victorian parliament. They attempted to contest the imperative toward Asian restriction by attacking the body of racial-historical theory that cast Chinese as socially static as well as biologically inferior, arguing that ‘China had reached a stage of civilisation when Britain was peopled by naked savages’.⁹⁹ In 1888 further anti-Asian legislation was desperately protested by the Chinese Committee in Victoria chaired by Cheok Hong Cheong, who presented a 43 page ‘Chinese remonstrance to the Parliament and people of Victoria’, claiming that the anti-Chinese legislation was really about colour, and not levels of civilisation or barbarity. The remonstrance ominously claimed that China would perhaps

⁹⁸ James Jefferis, *The Chinese and the Seamen’s Strike; A lecture delivered in the Pitt Street Congregational Church*, Sydney, Sydney 1878: 10. Quoted in, Kane Collins, ‘Julius Caesar versus White Australia: The painted savages of Britain, race, and the use of history’. *History Australia* 5, (2008) (1): pp. 5.1 to 5.16

⁹⁹ L. Kong Meng, Cheok Hong Cheong, Louis Ah Mouy, ed. *The Chinese question in Australia, 1878-79*, (Melbourne: F.F. Bailliere, 1879). For more use of ‘racial-historical’ theory in the White Australia debates, see Marilyn Lake, *The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White*, *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 58, Autumn 2004, Marilyn Lake, ‘The Day Will Come’: Charles H Pearson’s National Life and Character: A Forecast, in, *Ten Books that Shaped the British Empire: Creating an Imperial Commons*, (2014), Alison Bashford, ‘Is White Australia possible?’ *Race, colonialism and tropical medicine*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, (2002), 23:2, 248-271, Kane Collins. 2008. ‘Julius Caesar versus White Australia: The painted savages of Britain, race, and the use of history’. *History Australia* 5 (1): pp. 5.1 to 5.16

gain revenge for such racial chauvinism one day when it became a great power once again, and this was an idea that Charles Pearson took close note of and later circulated in his writings.¹⁰⁰ History became an important tool of protest through which disparate groups contested racial assumptions about Asian inferiority and the movement towards a pure white future, and such ideas were known and debated when Australia became a Commonwealth in 1901.

But still, the decrying of miscegenation became a founding principle of the new White Australia. This cartoon, 'piebald possibilities' (1902) graphically illustrated the conviction that miscegenation was hazardous, and would create obscene, inferior and immoral cocktails of humanity, unfit to populate a British country.¹⁰¹ Here the patchy skin of 'piebald' humanity is constructed as animalistic and unnatural, like an unfortunate breed of livestock. Powered by the 'coolie trope', Spencerian language had suffused into political and public discourse surrounding race mixture.

Charles Pearson, writing to James Bryce in 1892, the year before he had the *National Life and Character* published, claimed anxiously that if the colonial office in the metropole didn't bow or acquiesce to tariff barriers on Asians agreed at the Australian colonial conference, that 'Australian independence' would happen before the end of the decade. He identified a powerful set of assumptions on the part of antipodean Britons, stating:

The fear of Chinese immigration which the Australian democracy cherishes, and which Englishmen at home find it hard to understand, is, in fact, the instinct of self-preservation, quickened by experience. We know that

¹⁰⁰ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.50

¹⁰¹ Piebald Possibilities – a little Australian Christmas family party of the future', *Sydney Bulletin*, 13th December, 1902, taken from, Kate Bagnall, 'Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915', PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007, p.104

coloured and white labour cannot exist side by side; we are well aware that China can swamp us with a single year's surplus of population; and we know that if national existence is sacrificed to the working of a few mines and sugar plantations, it is not the Englishmen in Australia alone, but the whole civilised world, that will be the losers. Transform the Northern half of our continent into a Natal with thirteen out of fourteen belonging to an inferior race, and the Southern half will speedily approximate to the condition of a Cape Colony, where the whites are indeed a masterful minority, but still only as one in four. We are guarding the last part of the world, in which the higher races can live and increase freely, for the higher civilisation. We are denying the yellow race nothing but what it can find in the home of its birth, or in countries like the Indian Archipelago, where the white man can never live except as an exotic.¹⁰²

The example of Natal in the Cape colony, and the Transvaal, viewed anxiously as a mess of race mixture, poverty, and the undercutting of the white imperial working class by Indian and Chinese coolies, was an important reference point informing Australian attitudes to the Chinese and multi-racial society, as was the provincialized frustration at a perceived lack of racial consciousness in a metropole still largely responsible for helping protect and maintain white colonial prosperity. Fears that Chinese competition created social, biological and economic instability led to the national consolidation of immigration restriction laws in 1902 that were largely put in place to exclude and contain Asian 'contamination' of the nation. As White Australians took their racial destiny into their own hands, while drawing on transnationally circulated practices of racial stratification, the mobility, citizenship and

¹⁰² Charles Pearson, *National life and Character: a Forecast*, (London, Macmillan, 1893), p.30

categorisation of mixed race Anglo-Asian Australians became ever more fraught and ambiguous after 1902 as a result of an outward urge to segregate the European and non-European Pacific.

Chinese–Australians and the Immigration Restriction Acts

As had been established by historians such as Kate Bagnall, most Chinese who came to the Australian colonies in the 1800s were men, some of whom became intimate with white European or indigenous women, and bore mixed race children.¹⁰³ Anglo-Chinese Australians were often prolific and well connected travellers, and from the late Victorian period onwards were travelling mostly to China, Hong Kong, and traversing South East Asia and the Pacific for visiting family networks, education, conducting business deals, and recreation. From the 1860s, mixed race Chinese-Australian children were often taken by their Chinese fathers to familial homes in Hong Kong or the Southern provinces of China to acquire Chinese cultural knowledge and cement community networks.¹⁰⁴ Kate Bagnall's investigations have revealed that a large portion of those Chinese Australians going to and from China, Hong Kong and Australia when the 1901 Immigration Restriction Acts came into force, were of mixed race.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Kate Bagnall, 'Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915', (PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007), p.10, see also D. Hales, 'Local histories: Chinese-European families of Central Western New South Wales, 1850-80', *Journal of Australian Colonial History*, vol.6, 2004, pp.93-112, and, K.A Porter, *Mae Franking's My Chinese Marriage*, (Austin, 1991)

¹⁰⁴ Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall. ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015), p.204

¹⁰⁵ Kate Bagnall, 'Crossing Oceans and Cultures', p.122-123, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska eds., *Australia's Asia: From 'yellow peril' to Asian Century*, (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012)

Anglo-Asians born in Australia were British subjects by birth rather than due to their parents. As was the case in Britain, sometimes aliens could also become 'naturalised' as British subjects, but after 1888 New South Wales in particular passed legislation to stop this happening. The 1888 Chinese restriction and regulation act limited the numbers of 'any person of the Chinese race' from settling in New South Wales.¹⁰⁶ Even those Chinese born in Australia could technically be affected. In 1896 this was extended to cover all 'coloured races' of the rest of the globe. The British colonial office refused to grant royal assent to the 1896 act, and so the Immigration Restriction act of 1898 was introduced instead. The act set out a federal remit to exclude all non-whites from emigrating to and becoming permanent residents of the soon to be created Commonwealth.¹⁰⁷

Asians and other non-whites would now be denied settlement and citizenship through the national implementation of a 'dictation test'. The dictation test was part of wider biopolitical regimes, a transnational exchange of segregation measures on the part of 'self-styled white men's countries under siege', Canada, the United States New Zealand and South Africa as well as Australia.¹⁰⁸ Originally devised in Mississippi in 1890 according to Lake, the test made its way from the United States to Australia, via Natal in 1897.¹⁰⁹ A literacy test bill designed to exclude the 'unfit' and those of 'inferior race' was presented by the Immigration Restriction League in the United States to the American House of Representatives in 1897. It was eventually vetoed by President Grover Cleveland. The

¹⁰⁶ Marilyn Lake, *The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White*, *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 58, Autumn 2004, pp. 50

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p.232

¹⁰⁸ Robert Julio Decker, "The Transnational Biopolitics of Immigration Restriction in the United States and White Settler Colonies, 1894-1924", in Eva Bischoff, Norbert Finzsch, and Ursula Lehmkuhl (eds.): *Provincializing the United States. Colonialism, Decolonization and Post-Colonialism*, (2014), p.135

¹⁰⁹ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.56

literacy test method of excluding Asians was shelved in the United States, but ‘knowledge of the test as a means of racial exclusion circulated in the Anglosphere’.¹¹⁰

In transnational conversations about the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon bio-community, the ‘United States was regarded as both a model and a cautionary tale’ to Australians, New Zealanders, Canadians, South Africans and Britons.¹¹¹ The failure to segregate African-American slaves had led to a degenerate brand of miscegenation with whites, and severe and destabilising social friction that needed to be avoided elsewhere, according to figures such as James Bryce in *American Commonwealth* (1890), a man widely listened to by Australians in racial matters. Bryce also claimed that through measures such as the Chinese exclusion act passed on May 6 1882, America had effectively held the colour line against Asia by restricting the influx of male Chinese workers and minimising the scope for interracial intimacy between whites and Asians.¹¹² With Asian migration seen to be the biggest problem for the British Pacific colonies, Edmund Barton and Alfred Deakin looked to American methods to keep the Chinese out, and came to equate racial stability and white purity with national cohesion and global Anglo-World pre-eminence.

In April 1897, the Natal Legislative Assembly, citing anti-Asian policies in New South Wales as being too overt to bypass the censure of the British government, passed a bill requiring immigrants to pass a writing test in any European language, meaning Asians could be ‘excluded without an overt racial discrimination’.¹¹³ Colonial Secretary in Britain, Joseph Chamberlain then suggested other white colonies could adopt these measures. ‘Anti-Chinese’ measures had been enshrined in law in New South Wales from the 1880s, but the Natal

¹¹⁰ Robert Julio Decker, "The Transnational Biopolitics of Immigration Restriction in the United States and White Settler Colonies, 1894-1924", in Eva Bischoff, Norbert Finzsch, and Ursula Lehmkuhl (eds.): *Provincializing the United States. Colonialism, Decolonization and Post-Colonialism*, (2014), p.133

¹¹¹ Ibid, p.140

¹¹² Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.63

¹¹³ Ibid, p.63

formula offered a means to consolidate universal frameworks of Asian restriction and racial engineering in the new Australian federation.¹¹⁴ The lack of overt racial language also softened and mediated direct confrontation with Japan and China over migrant treatment, and as Robert Julio Decker argues, knowledge of the test dissuaded many Asians from migrating to the new Australian Commonwealth.¹¹⁵ This racial exclusion marked the moment of ethnic ‘nation formation’ for White Australia, and as Marilyn Lake has argued, through a discursive feedback loop Australian policy now became a point of interest for race thinkers and interest groups in the United States.¹¹⁶ Similar methods came into force throughout white settler colonies of global south, along with Canada.

The Immigration Restriction Act of 1901 came into effect across the Australian Commonwealth in January 1902. The category of ‘prohibited immigrant’ was created, which was used to describe those non-whites who failed the dictation test, but also the diseased, the infirm, and the criminal.¹¹⁷ Crucially, even Asians and Anglo-Asians who had been born and grown up in Australia, could alongside those who had just arrived in Australia, be told to sit the dictation test if they were suspected of being an illegal immigrant. Asians were being criminalised as well as pathologised.

The Emigration Act of 1910 also sought to control who left Australia, and was according to Bagnall, implemented in response to public anxieties that Australian girls of white European descent were being manipulated and then moved by ‘Asiatic’ men to China and India. Under the act, if a child of ‘European race’ was travelling without a fellow or guardian who was also ‘European race’, and was being accompanied by a ‘coloured’

¹¹⁴ Robert Julio Decker, "The Transnational Biopolitics of Immigration Restriction in the United States and White Settler Colonies, 1894-1924", in Eva Bischoff, Norbert Finzsch, and Ursula Lehmkuhl (eds.): *Provincializing the United States. Colonialism, Decolonization and Post-Colonialism*, (2014), p.135

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p.135

¹¹⁶ Marilyn Lake, The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White, *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 58, Autumn 2004, pp. 41-62

¹¹⁷ Ibid

traveller, they had to apply for an emigration permit.¹¹⁸ Over a fifth of those children granted permits were of mixed Anglo-Asian descent. The Emigration Act ‘formalised the racial identity of Anglo-Chinese Australians in contradictory ways’.¹¹⁹ Being part Chinese, their movements out of Australia needed to be monitored, as part of the Commonwealth’s attempts to control and restrict peoples of colour. However the white aspect of their heritage meant that the same authorities wanted to guarantee their safety in Asia. This safety for Anglo-Chinese abroad could not always be achieved. In 1923, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Trade Commissioner Edward S Little, writing from Shanghai on 29 March, noted the difficulties facing Anglo-Chinese families when they moved from Australia to China. In one instance, the Chinese father had died after taking his family to his ancestral home. The ‘Chinese character’ of the ‘half-caste’ children meant that they could not be repatriated to Australia in the event of family complications, as the British government only had jurisdiction over the white mother. If the children travelling were ‘half’ Chinese or more, they often were simply labelled as Chinese, and did not need a permit to travel.¹²⁰ Such revelations give us some insights into the early parameters of hybridity as they were constructed in White Australia before scientific investigations and taxonomies of race mixture intensified in the 1920s.

During the 1890s, as the Sydney merchant Ah Fong claimed, Anglo-Chinese Australians leaving and returning to Sydney only needed to show their New South Wales birth certificates in order to be allowed entry and be exempted from the 1888 poll tax on Chinese. However It was increasingly, especially after 1901, up to Anglo-Asians returning to Australia through ports such as Sydney to demonstrate to the Collector of Customs in the

¹¹⁸ Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall. ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015), P.208

¹¹⁹ Ibid, P.222

¹²⁰ Ibid, P.223

given state, who would issue the Certificate of exemption from the dictation test, that they had been born and lived in Australia, by providing official documentation such as proof of school attendance in Australia and testimonies from family and reputable friends confirming that they were indeed members of the community.¹²¹ The Collector of Customs and his deputies possessed sweeping discretionary powers in collating and interpreting the documentation that they received, but also in interpreting the racial and cultural attributes of applicants, meaning that, as Andrew Markus has demonstrated, decision making on individual cases could be highly inconsistent, ranging from draconian to more liberal and accepting.¹²²

Officials working for the state collectors of customs observed and documented arriving ships, assessing the status of passengers and their rights to entry and domicile. In New South Wales at least, they were part of the federal Department of Trade and Customs, but the directives they followed were laid down by the Department for External Affairs, which after 1916 became Department for Home and Territories.¹²³ Through the keeping of these exemption certificates, identity records, birth certificates, correspondence, travel details, as David Walker argues, we can gain insights into the ‘implementation’ of White Australia.¹²⁴ It is easy to forget that Asian exclusion and the scrutinising of racial hybridity became a very real biopolitical framework, as well as a set of nebulous ideas that sprung from currents of transnational Anglo-Saxonism rendered vernacular by the regional eccentricities of colonial anxiety in the Pacific.

¹²¹ Ibid, p.200

¹²² Andrew Markus, *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850–1901*, (Hale & Iremonger, 1979), p.159

¹²³ Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall. ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015), P.209

¹²⁴ David Walker, ‘Rising Suns’, P.80, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012), p.75

As Bagnall illuminates, the legislation from 1901 was designed to prevent non-white immigration and settlement, but a closer examination of the rules shows us that it ‘was not clear on how officials should deal with those who were both Australian born and of mixed race’.¹²⁵ The way in which customs officials judged the racial and cultural parameters of being Australian became important, and the ‘onus was on Chinese entering Australia to prove that they had a right to land.’¹²⁶ As a result Anglo-Asians were forced to work their way through unclear distinctions between ‘aliens’ and ‘Australian subjects’, and what passed as ‘white’ or ‘coloured’ peoples. Thomas Tamplin Donohoe, customs inspector in Sydney, and F.W.E Gabriel, Melbourne customs inspector who also worked on immigration cases throughout the rest of Australia, but additionally in Southern China and Hong Kong, were focal figures in the early shaping of Australian official regulation whiteness and hybridity.¹²⁷

As a case study shows, these customs officers and their colleagues were grappling with how to define race mixture in their policing of Asian exclusion. On December 1915, a man called Mun Kee, claiming the identity of one Herbert Hooklin of New South Wales, landed at Sydney. Mun Kee struggled to prove that he was indeed Herbert, because due to being conceived through extramarital intimacy, his birth was never registered.¹²⁸ As Herbert Hooklin had left Australia in 1890, 11 years before federation, and there were no surviving photographs of him, officials were highly suspicious. The Customs service turned to Dr Charles W. Reid, a medical officer with the Quarantine service, to give an experts judgement on the validity of the family claims. Reid studied the ‘racial make-up’ of Mun Kee and the rest of his family, and concluded that Mun Kee had ‘the typical appearance of a full-blooded Chinese’ while all the other Hooklin siblings displayed, ‘distinct evidence of their European

¹²⁵ Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall. ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015), p.203

¹²⁶Ibid, P.209

¹²⁷ Ibid, P.211

¹²⁸ P.224

descent'.¹²⁹ His final opinion was that, 'It is hardly that Mun Kee is a case of back-breeding having all the Chinese characteristics of his father and showing no trace of European descent from his mother's side'.¹³⁰ Based on this judgement, Mun Kee was forced to depart the Commonwealth, leaving for Hong Kong on 28 April 1916.

Judgements and research about the heritage of Anglo-East Asian applicants, litters the case forms along with the biometrics and photographs that were also taken by customs, with terms such as 'half-caste Chinese' '3/4 Chinese' 'quarter-caste' etc. Although as Bagnall and Paul Jones argue, this terminology was an important part of the biopolitical bureaucracy, and helped officials differentiate between those 'fully Chinese' and those who in fact had European ancestry in investigations of bogus or illegal immigration, such 'official language' was heavily open to officers discretion and slippage. For instance while J.T.T Donohoe was highly thorough and detailed in his descriptions of perceived racial type and difference, other officers frequently conflated 'Chinese' with 'half-caste Chinese' in their documentation during the 1920s and 1930s.¹³¹

Bagnall argues that due to significant corruption in customs departments, Anglo-Asians were often able to forge identities in return for 'inducements'. However this meant that Anglo-Asians found in Australia who had travelled but did not have all the relevant documents, or did not have significant contact with or were not known to customs officers such as Donohoe, were automatically treated with suspicion as illegal Asian immigrants. In these cases, demonstration of 'British' cultural knowledge and community links in Australia were both absolutely crucial if Anglo-Asians classed as 'Chinese' by appearance, were to convince Donohoe and others to grant them exemptions. In these types of cases, the dense

¹²⁹ P.226

¹³⁰ Ibid, p.226, National Archives of Australia:SP42/1, C1916/4059

¹³¹ Ibid, P.227. For other cases in which controversy arose in attempting to judge racial characteristics as grounds to allow or not allow exemption from the dictation test, see, the case of Ernest Sung Yee, and his brother Horace, National Archives of Australia, ST84/1,1909/20/21-30.

amount of paperwork bears testament to the need for community and family members in Australia to vouch for individuals, but also the importance of the perceived level of competency in reading and writing English, and an understanding of Australian values and behaviour. Arguably, Anglo-Asians experienced the sharp end of what was to be demanded in White Australia, where understandings of ‘whiteness’, Britishness and Australian belonging coalesced around a preference for a shared racial and cultural descent/history. As Helen Irving has stated, ‘Chinamen’ were held up as ‘the starkest example of what Australians were not’, and physically and culturally examples of a ‘type of citizenship the future Australian nation would not embrace’.¹³² However if hybrid peoples could speak and behave in a manner deemed to be Australian, it had a powerful bearing on public and official perceptions of their biology and heritage.

Those who left the colonies under the pre-1901 colonial regime, partly due to the fear of fraudulent documents the authorities often asked for extra proof on top of birth certificates that they had been born in Australia. Bagnall suggests that, ‘The right of Anglo-Chinese Australians to claim membership of the Australian community was most threatened by extended periods of time spent overseas’.¹³³ The case of men like Edward Chung Ah Gan and his struggle to get legal exemption from the test in 1933 demonstrate such suspicions. He had been granted a naturalisation certificate in Hobart, Tasmania on 11th December 1891, and attempted to re-enter Australia in 1933 after having lived in China.¹³⁴ Having been naturalised pre-federation, he did not have the documents and testimonies from community relations, and was refused at first.¹³⁵ He and his wife, Mrs Ah Gan, a white woman, attempted to apply for re-admission of herself from Hong Kong, and also for her four

¹³² Helen Irving, *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution*, (Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1997), p.114, taken from Kate Bagnall, p.229

¹³³ Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall. ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015), p.190

¹³⁴ Public Record Office, Victoria, Australia, 1933/22224

¹³⁵ Public Record Office, Victoria, Australia, 1933/22224

children born in Hong Kong, and it was through the white mother that the children were eventually granted domicile.¹³⁶ Anglo-Chinese often objected to having their documents checked and their biometrics taken, while white Britons were allowed to come and go freely, as this they felt equated them with the way criminals were catalogued. To officials, their Chinese heritage implied a level of criminality and alienness, meaning that Anglo-Asians had to be treated sceptically.

The biopolitical-bureaucratic framework of the White Australia policy and the exclusionary dictation test were put together and administered by the Collectors of Customs in part to cement the link in the new federation between the constructs of race, (whiteness) and authentic nationality and citizenship. These developments impacted on the lives and movements of Anglo-Asians, whose existence transgressed these cultural and racial boundary points, and problematized the clunky taxonomic machinery used by the arbiters of Asian exclusion to demarcate whiteness and yellowness. Often their classification as ‘Chinese’ based on facial appearance and the discretion of customs officers meant that Anglo-Chinese and Anglo-Asian Australians could end up on very unsteady ground if they chose to leave and then re-enter Australia as they had been doing throughout the late Victorian years. Their automatic re-admission to the country of their birth, especially if they had left before 1901, unlike in the case of white European Australians, was not now guaranteed. According to Bagnall, ‘it rendered their membership of the Australian community fragile.’¹³⁷ In trying to gain exemption from the dictation test, the ‘white blood’ of the European mother therefore became a crucial biological passport for mixed race peoples to prove their Australian identity. As Bagnall and Couchman have also argued, proving ‘domicile...appropriate cultural knowledge and community ties’ through letters of friends and relatives stating that Australia

¹³⁶ Public Record Office, Victoria, Australia, 1933/22224

¹³⁷ Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall, ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015), p.186

was the place of birth of individual Asian-Australians was also crucial if such individuals were to successfully negotiate through a system that was at the same time harsh, corrupt, fickle, confused and contradictory.¹³⁸ It was not until 1948 that, as a result of the Citizenship Act, there was a formal description of what exactly defined Australian citizenship, moving away from the earlier dichotomy of aliens or British subjects.¹³⁹ As the example of Herbert Hooklin has shown, while not touted specifically as a scientific or anthropological system, the enforcers of the exclusion acts were becoming mindful even before the 1920s that racial science and intellectual constructions of the perils of Asian miscegenation could be either consulted or ‘rendered vernacular’ by non-experts in order to make judgements about mixed race British subjects and others.¹⁴⁰ Next we will briefly explore how negative assumptions about Eurasian miscegenation were culturally vernacularized.

The “yellow peril” Trope, Miscegenation Panics, and the Birth of ‘White Men’s Countries’

We have established that direct and in depth physical anthropological field studies and reports about the scope and outcome of Asian intermarriage with other races, and the use of biometrics or intelligence testing to assess the qualities of hybrid offspring, had not been widely carried out, and scientifically gathered ‘race crossing data’ had not been directly deployed to justify the White Australia policies of 1901 onwards.¹⁴¹ As will be explored

¹³⁸ Ibid, p.195

¹³⁹ Before federation in 1901, Anglo-Chinese were recorded as ‘Chinese’, whereas after 1901, they were recorded as ‘half-caste’. Bagnall argues, ‘racial status was based on appearance’.

¹⁴⁰ See also, National Archives of Australia, 1913/14484, Elizabeth Alice Fong Lock, 1925, and, correspondence of the Queensland Women’s Electoral League, 1923/10770 .

¹⁴¹ There is a case where Sir James Cantlie. Medical doctor at Hong Kong Hospital, was part of conducting a survey in 1888 into Eurasian ‘half-castes’ in treaty port society that partly took into account biometrics. See,

however, there was considerable and growing interest in the racial properties of the aboriginal population.

It was not until 1869 that the first permanent settlement in what would become the Northern Territory, Port Darwin, was successfully established.¹⁴² Around this time gold was discovered at Pine Creek, and as a result by the early 1880s, 4300 out of the 5000 documented inhabitants around Darwin were Chinese gold rushers.¹⁴³ Juxtaposed against the Chinese restriction legislation other states were enacting in the 1880s, Darwin by comparison was now seen as an, ‘open doorway’ — a site of Asian infiltration — and as a repository for national fears about cultural contamination’, and also became a site of fixation for the racialized anxieties of South Westerners.¹⁴⁴ Henry Reynolds encapsulates the assertion of this chapter that well before a comprehensive scientific discourse on miscegenation was developed in the British South, white antipodeans were ‘consistently hostile to the multi-racial north’.¹⁴⁵ Popular newspapers such as the *Bulletin* in Sydney, and many provincial newspapers who bought or appropriated their copy, consistently derided the life ‘up top’ as morally and materially squalid, and race mixture between non-white groups elicited horror. Descriptions such as ‘Queensmongreland’ for Queensland, and ‘Mongrelia’ for the Northern Territory were repeated and absorbed into the popular vernacular.¹⁴⁶ All this despite the fact

Wellcome Library Collections, Cantlie, Sir James, F.R.C.S. (1851-1926), MSS.1456-1499. MS.1499 contains a collation of questionnaire responses relating to the physical measurements and descriptions, analyses of moral and behavioural history of Eurasian "half-castes"

¹⁴² Stephen Carleton, *The background to the play: "White Australia" in 1909: the North as canvass for the nation's racial anxieties*, p.8, in, Richard Fotheringham, "*White Australia*" in 1909: the background to the play and the two surviving scripts, (Playlab, Brisbane, 2005)

¹⁴³ Markus, Andrew, *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850–1901*, (Hale & Iremonger, 1979), p.120

¹⁴⁴ Stephen Carleton, p.10

¹⁴⁵ Henry Reynolds, *North of Capricorn: the Untold Story of Australia's North*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 2003), p.11

¹⁴⁶ Randolph Bedford, *White Australia; or, The Empty North*, (1909), ed. Richard Fotheringham, see also, Stephen Carleton and Richard Fotheringham, "*White Australia*" in 1909: the background to the play and the two surviving scripts, (Playlab, Brisbane, 2005), p.7

that 'coloured' labour was proving essential to develop the area in the absence of a sufficient number of European colonists.¹⁴⁷

Exploration of miscegenation in popular entertainment were very much a symptom of time and place. The White Australian Nationalist writer Randolph Bedford, in his play *White Australia* (1909), first performed in Melbourne, encapsulated the fears of South Westerners that Northern miscegenation not only marked the murky boundary point of white power and modernity, but that Darwin could serve as a node for colonisation by Asian powers hungry to expand into Australian land as Charles Pearson had foretold. This was, as David Walker and Andrew Markus have explored, the high point of the 'Asian invasion narrative' that had become popular with late Victorian readers throughout the British World.¹⁴⁸

Indeed the Edwardian years saw an increasing divergence between Australian and metropolitan perceptions of Asian nations. While Australians worried, the British were shaping a new direction in imperial policy by signing a naval alliance with the growing Japanese Empire in 1902, and in 1905 victory in the Russo-Japanese war cemented Japan's place as a great Pacific power. This created disquiet among imperialist and anti-imperialist Australian nationalists alike. In May 1903, the Japanese dispatched a training squadron to visit Australian ports, a five week period that generated public excitement but also dividing opinion and upsetting many paranoid nationalists. The *Bulletin* newspaper, one of the most prominent mainstream cultural vehicles defending the White Australia ideal, bemoaned what was described in derogatory terms as a wave of 'Jap-worship' by Australians that, accompanied the cultural fascination with 'Japonisme' that had been developing since the 1880s.¹⁴⁹ As Keevak and Kowner have both demonstrated, Anglo-Australian commentators

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, p.10

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, p.12

¹⁴⁹ David Walker, 'Rising Suns', P.80, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012)

increasingly ‘whitened’ the Japanese in this decade, constructing similarities between the physiques of Japanese men and the Elizabethan English, with a growing feeling that the Japanese were also a vigorous naval ‘type’.¹⁵⁰ But to some writers, the Japanese were the new manifestation of the threat of Asia, and the spectre of miscegenation was an important component in the anxious narratives they responded to and constructed.

One man, British born Thomas Roydhouse took suspicion of the Japanese to extremes when he published *The Coloured Conquest* (1903), a vitriolic horror story of invasion and miscegenation. Written just months after the training squadron had visited, the novel situates two characters, Frank Danton and his fiancée, Mabel Graham visiting the squadron while it is docked at Sydney.¹⁵¹ In the midst of the warm reception, Frank anxiously notes that white Australian women are fraternising enthusiastically with the Japanese officers. His disquiet comes to a head when, at a reception, a Japanese sailor makes unwanted advances towards Mabel. In a show of bush masculinity as the ‘Coming man’ of Empire and nation, Frank defends Mabel and attacks the officer, ‘declaring that he would shoot Mabel rather than see her become the sexual plaything of a Japanese’.¹⁵² His actions precipitate a full scale Japanese invasion of Sydney, as they brush aside a British navy that has been severely weakened by the signing of the alliance just a year previously. Consolidating their conquests, Japan establishes ‘Fair Lily Colonies’ where selected European women, Mabel being one of them, are coerced into living with, and having relations with Japanese soldiers. This nightmarish sexual enslavement and new regime of white-asian miscegenation combined contemporary anxieties about the strength and ambitions of Japan, the vulnerabilities of the

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, p.76

¹⁵¹ Thomas Roydhouse, *The Coloured Conquest* (1903). For further discussion of this novel see David Walker, David Walker, Shooting Mabel: warrior masculinity and Asian invasion, *History Australia*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 89.1-89.11, and, David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999)

¹⁵² David Walker, Shooting Mabel: warrior masculinity and Asian invasion, *History Australia*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 89.1-89.11.

populous South West, and longer running stereotypes regarding the cruel and lustful oriental as a danger to white women. But it also played into a trope that established women as the weak link in upholding white British nationalism, and ‘while Japan turned women into gushing and emotive creatures, it made men more thoughtfully aware of the nation’s vulnerability’.¹⁵³ While the *Morning Bulletin* review scoffed that the book ‘may amuse or perhaps alarm weak minds’, fictional terrains were certainly an important component in the popular conversation and construction of prejudice against Asians and mixed marriage.¹⁵⁴

With newspaper claims that the pearling industry in the north was acting as a cover for Japanese scouting and espionage for a possible invasion reaching a fever pitch in the late Edwardian years, Charles Kirmess published *The Australian Crisis* (1909), serialised in the *Lone Hand* between November 1908 and April 1909.¹⁵⁵ The publication was closely associated with Alfred Deakin, one of the key public advocates of racial purity, and one of the chief political architects of the White Australia policy, and keen to shape Australian public opinion when it came to the threat of Asia.¹⁵⁶ Again the story played on angst surrounding British imperial policy in the Pacific, the seeming concessions granted to Japan in the name of British profit, and the emptiness of the North. In the story, the British and Japanese circumvent the sacred White Australia Policy by establishing the ‘Progressive Family System’ whereby Japanese settlers bring their wives, leading to a large Australian born Asian population.¹⁵⁷ This,

¹⁵³ Ibid, p.9

¹⁵⁴ THE COLOURED CONQUEST. (1904, August 27). *Morning Bulletin* (Rockhampton, Qld. : 1878 - 1954)

¹⁵⁵ Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial adventure : Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian popular fiction, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.143

¹⁵⁶ Ibid, p.144

¹⁵⁷ Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial adventure : Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian popular fiction, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.145

Binds the invaders to their adopted land. The subject of eugenics was closely connected with the discourse on nation, and the idea of Australian-born Japanese raised fears not only of insidious infection, but of racial degradation through the threat of hybridity. What is even more alarming than the emptiness of the North is that it might become the teeming womb of a bastard and degraded race, the second grotesque.¹⁵⁸

The idea that white-asian hybridity would become an irreversible problem and destroy the British character and strength of the nation was a fantasy that had become engrained in the Australian imaginary well before biologists and anthropologists began using their calipers and questionnaires to quantify the character of mixed race families on Australian soil. As Robert Dixon admits, the growth in popularity of the ‘yellow peril’ trope attaching itself to anxieties about interracial sexuality during the immediate years after federation, were also entwined with social anxieties about the undermining influences of the coming of the western ‘new woman’. Concerns developed that demands for female freedom of suffrage and sexual choice, and the onward march of modernity and urban living would soften white manhood and thereby leave white women open to the conquest and seduction by Asian men. As Wendy Gan qualifies, these tropes were not unique to Australia, but rather transnational phenomena.¹⁵⁹ As David Walker has explored though, through adventure stories Australian writers attempted to construct the ‘coming man of empire’, a masculine master of the rural bush who would act as a foil to the imperial mismanagement of the metropole, protect white women and fight off Asians. Novels such as Ambrose Pratt’s *The Big Five* (1911), were

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, p.145

¹⁵⁹ Wendy Gan. "Mr. Wu and the Rearticulation of "The Yellow Peril"." *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920* 55, no. 4 (2012): 441-459. <https://muse.jhu.edu/> (accessed September 1, 2016). see also, Wendy Gan, *From Peril to Pity: The Transformations of Mr. Wu* *Adaptation* 2016 : apw031v1-apw031.

highly masculine adventure texts narrating the construction and contestation of national and racial boundaries at the extremities of white control in Northern Australia, Melanesia and South East Asia.¹⁶⁰ Rendering the captivity of white women by non-white men, and their eventual rescue in these stories functioned to both ‘centre’ the nation, other the Asian, but also reflect uneasily on blurring racial categories and the limits of white colonial power.¹⁶¹

The miscegenation trope was a strongly male preserve. Such stereotypes of the white ‘Coming Man’ and the lascivious oriental were so well established that, as David Walker argues, much like P.G Wodehouse’ *The Swoop* (1909) which poked fun at the British invasion genre, the miscegenation theme provoked some satire. Rosa Campbell Praed wrote *Madam Izan: A Tourist Story* (1899). Set against the backdrop of a trip to Japan, the story plays off two protagonists, the masculine Queensland bushman and entrepreneur, and the small yet polite and kindly Japanese tour guide, as they vie for the affections of the beautiful Madam Izan.¹⁶² As an emerging ‘new woman’, Izan eventually falls for the Japanese guide, a more intelligent, cultured and refined man, and thereby subverts the central tenet of much masculine romance and invasion writing, that the rough and ready white bushman must win out as the custodian of white women. Advocates of free trade were also keen to contest the idea of a ‘yellow peril’ threat, often as engagement with the Asia-Pacific region was in their economic interest. Free trade advocate E.W Foxall wrote *Colorphobia* in 1903, criticising the prejudices and motives of protectionists and the Australian Labor Party. Foxall dealt with the fears of white workingmen that white daughters would take coloured husbands, and meditated on the rationale behind popular race prejudice.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰ Ambrose Pratt, *The Big Five* (1911). For further analysis see Robert Dixon Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial adventure : Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian popular fiction, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.140

¹⁶¹ Ibid, p.146

¹⁶² David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999), p.110

¹⁶³ Ibid, p.111

At the same time, sensationalised tales of dirt, crime and interracial transgression in Chinatown's from Sydney to San Francisco to London, Liverpool and Cardiff were becoming backdrops to Euro-American popular crime writing and journalism. The degenerative impact of urban living upon the white body was a popular eugenic discourse. Stories such as Thomas Burke's *Limehouse Nights* (1919) and Arthur Sarsfield's *Fu Manchu* (1913) were transnational best sellers that titillated and terrified readers with images of insidious Asian men in the midst of the modern imperial metropolis, using modern technology and devious methods to seduce white women.¹⁶⁴

The sexology and birth control movement, spearheaded by Marie Stopes in Britain, and Lillie Goodison, who was head of the Racial Hygiene Association of New South Wales, fed in complex fashion into fears of the 'new woman' and the potential deregulation of sexual behaviour and interracial sex. There was an opinion within the eugenics movement that birth control would in fact empower women, and that the knock on effect would be sexual liberation, and a substantial increase in interracial liaisons.¹⁶⁵ Male 'erotic fantasises about the deadly nature of female sexuality' in the late nineteenth century coincided with growing racism and anti-Asian sentiment in Britain, Australia and the United States, and a growing sexual peril was ascribed to Asian men and women.

The masculinist imaginary came to focus on the stereotyped allure of mixed race women, who would lead white men to immorality and self-destruction. Although fears about interracial sex and degeneration often centred round 'men of colour', Eurasian women were also viewed in colonial and metropolitan settings as morally and biologically transgressive. In Sax Rohmer's *Tales of Chinatown* (1916), the vampire villain Lala Huang was of part

¹⁶⁴ Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial adventure: Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian popular fiction, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.145

¹⁶⁵ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850-1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999), p.128, see also, Bland

European, Chinese and Kanaka ancestries, and used her hybrid beauty to lead white men to their deaths. In the *Yellow Claw* the ‘lady of the poppies’ was a similar ‘demonical’ Eurasian woman who uses her beauty to entrap hapless men.¹⁶⁶ Eugenic and fictionalised narratives about the perils of the new multi-racial metropolis coalesced.

The Transvaal labour controversies of 1903 and 1906 whereby Lord Milner had proposed to import Chinese workers to South Africa, had been a debacle that provoked the ire and attention of a white ‘imperial working class’ throughout the British World looking to defend white preference.¹⁶⁷ The crises and their coverage in the *Daily Mail* and other papers became a lightning rod for British public awareness and growing indignation regarding Chinese migration throughout the Empire, and as Auerbach argues was part of a growing narrative of suspicion and surveillance of interracial contact and sexuality that exploded in the race riots of 1919.¹⁶⁸

As Ben Mountford’s research has uncovered, Pember Reeves, the New Zealand High Commissioner in London, had a pamphlet entitled, ‘A Council of the Empire’ published by the British Empire League in 1907, the same year that an imperial conference was held. Reeves wanted it brought to public attention that the question of Chinese migration and the future growth of China had now become a pressing ‘imperial question’.¹⁶⁹

At one time exclusion laws were airily supposed to be an unamiably eccentricity peculiar to Australia and New Zealand...But since 1880 the example of the drastic exclusion laws of the United States has been copied in many parts of the Empire. Such laws have grown to be much more than machinery for levying a

¹⁶⁶Ibid, p.129

¹⁶⁷ *Daily Express*, 15 June 1904, ‘The Chinese labourer is found throughout the British Empire...Fortunately he is not accompanied by Mrs. Chinaman, or there would be a real Yellow Peril’

¹⁶⁸ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and “The Chinese Puzzle” in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009),p.150

¹⁶⁹ The British Empire League was an organisation that attempted to disseminate imperial awareness.

landing tax on Chinamen. We have lived to see the Transvaal importing Chinese while Cape Colony shuts them out...to see the immigration policy of the Transvaal debated in the Legislatures of other Colonies and even become a factor in a British general election; to see British Columbia agitated over incoming Asiatics ... [and] last, but not least, to see a law aiming at the exclusion of undesirable aliens passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. If these facts do not betoken that immigration laws have become an Imperial question of the first moment, then most observers are strangely deluded.¹⁷⁰

The anxieties about the Chinese in the British World of the global south, Australia and New Zealand, had spread from being a peripheral antipodean concern during the late nineteenth century gold rushes, to an issue that sucked in colonial and metropolitan politics.

Mountford agrees that, ‘the historical experience of Australian engagement with China came to influence both the internal dynamics and external relations of the British Empire.’¹⁷¹ The “yellow peril” had become acknowledged as a pan-imperial biopolitical threat.

In Britain the Aliens Act was passed in 1905. In developing a British dictation test through the Merchant Shipping Act in 1906, advocates of imperial protectionism were looking to Natal and Australia.¹⁷² Chinese seamen on British ships now had to demonstrate an understanding of English before they were allowed to sign up. Opponents of Chinese labour in South Africa such as Wilson argued this should be vigorously applied. The language test came into effect on 1 January 1908, but Chinese sailors quickly bypassed this by claiming that they were instead from Hong Kong or Singapore, which were Crown

¹⁷⁰ NLA/Watson Papers/Series.7/2/Pamphlet: W. Pember Reeves, ‘A Council of the Empire’, in, Benjamin Mountford, *The Open Door Swings Both Ways: Australia, China and the British World System, c.1770-1907*, DPhil Thesis, Exeter College, University of Oxford September 2012, p.340

¹⁷¹ *Ibid*, p.339

¹⁷² Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and “The Chinese Puzzle” in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), p.38-40

colonies, and so therefore they were British subjects and could be exempted from the test. This caused anxiety from the NSFU, and increased public anti-Chinese sentiment in Britain. Hudson Kearley, Secretary of the parliamentary board of trade claimed the number of Chinese using the 'Hong King dodge' had gone from 30 percent to 80 percent.¹⁷³ The cunning and mobility of the Chinese migrant, and the seeming ineffectiveness of the official mind and shipping companies in counting, repatriating or excluding some Chinese sailors who were gaining access to Britain caused upset. But what of the activities of the East Asians who already, albeit in small numbers, resided in Britain's coastal metropolises and associated with white British women?

As has already been explored, there was an appetite for fictional and journalistic investigations and sensationalist articles about white-asian race mixture and the seduction through deceit and opium of white women in Britain's Chinatown's, in which while there were far fewer Asians than in Sydney or Melbourne, they attracted attention out of all proportion to their size. In the early 1900s, despite the assumption that miscegenation was degenerative, British anthropologists had not yet measured or investigated race mixture among immigrant populations, and it would not be until the 1920s that Karl Pearson approached this from the biometric or eugenic angle, studying Jewish children.¹⁷⁴ The work of the journalist and pulp novelist, combined with labour anxieties in the popular press, fleshed out these assumptions while the fledgling eugenic movement focused on class, 'racial poisons', and birth control. Negative depictions of seduction, enslavement, and the social stigma attached to white women having children with Chinese men, was a driver behind later scientific assumptions that mixed race children were socially and biologically doomed. Colin

¹⁷³ Ibid, p.50

¹⁷⁴ Karl Pearson will be discussed later. For more on Pearson's study of Eastern European Jewish children in Britain, see, G. Schaffer, "Assets or Aliens? Race science and the analysis of Jewish intelligence in inter-war Britain," *Patterns of Prejudice*, 42:2, p.202

Holmes and John Seed also argue this, and note between 1900 and 1920 the ‘rapid evolution, in British public discourse, of Chinese residents and London’s Chinatown from an exotic curiosity at the turn of the century to a dire threat to society is particularly confounding’.¹⁷⁵

At the same time fears of what became known as racial ‘degeneration’ were rife in both Edwardian Britain and Australia.¹⁷⁶ The Departmental Committee on Physical Degeneration (1904) had noted a high proportion of working class recruits to serve in the Second South African war had been physically unfit for service.¹⁷⁷ The British race was declining, and Robert Reid Rentoul, a Liverpoolian physician, claimed this was partly to do with unwise breeding practices. In *Race culture; or, race suicide? : (a plea for the unborn)* (1906), Rentoul claimed that he and other doctors knew, ‘the terrible monstrosities produced by inter-marriage of the white man and black...or the white man with the Chinese’ and argued Britons needed to regain their sense of ‘race culture’, and avoid miscegenation. Rentoul, as interwar eugenicists would do when they re-visited Britain’s multi-racial metropolises, equated white purity with national and imperial power.¹⁷⁸

On 12th December 1906, a special meeting of Liverpool City Council was called, in response to the publication of an article entitled ‘Chinese vice in England’ in the *Sunday Chronicle* on 2nd December 1906.¹⁷⁹ According to the report, the ‘sensational character’ of

¹⁷⁵ Colin Holmes, 'The Chinese Connection', in G. Alderman and C. Holmes (eds), "Outsiders and Outcasts. Essays in honour of William J. Fishman" (London, Duckworth, 1993), pp. 71–93.

¹⁷⁶ Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial adventure: Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian popular fiction, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995), in chapter 5, 7 and 8 discusses Australian fears that increasing urbanisation was harming racial fitness, that the hardy rural bushman, the ‘coming man of empire’ would be called upon to save the sickly urbanite. See also, Diana Wyndham, *Eugenics in Australia: Striving for National Fitness*, (London: Galton Institute, 2003)

¹⁷⁷ Geoffrey Russell Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: a Study in British Politics and Political Thought 1899–1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), Geoffrey Russell Searle, *Eugenics and Politics in Britain 1900–14* (Leyden: Noordhoff International Publishing, 1976).

¹⁷⁸ Robert Reid Rentoul, *Race culture; or, race suicide? : (a plea for the unborn)*, (London: Walter Scott, 1906), p.3-5, ‘The intermarriage of British with foreigners should not be encouraged. A few of us know the terrible monstrosities produced by inter-marriage of the white man and black, the white man with the redskin, the white man with the Hindu, or the white man with the Chinese...Americans also in legalising the inter-marriage of white with negro, mulatto, and Indian, are but poor patriots.’

¹⁷⁹ *Sunday Chronicle*, 2nd December 1906, ‘Chinese vice in England’. Michael Diamond also briefly mentions the newspaper piece in *Lesser Breeds*.

the articles accusations about the activities of Chinese workers in Liverpool and their association with white British women had stirred up public feeling and therefore necessitated the 'closest investigation'.¹⁸⁰ Although as Auerbach has argued, there wasn't a large coherent and established Chinese community in Liverpool in 1906, the racist outburst in the article, which claimed Chinese business owners of laundries and lodging houses were engaging in the organised seduction and corruption of teenage white girls, had stirred a local belief that a sinister and inscrutable 'oriental' menace was in their midst, and something needed to be done.¹⁸¹ To this end a commission comprised of clergymen, local newspaper editors and two doctors put together a report published on 26th July 1907 which included a section on the 'morality of the Chinese'. Aside from officially dispelling a local rumour that the Chinese on Pitt Street 'were in the habit of giving sweets impregnated with opium to children', the report also investigated 'relations with white women'. Noting that several white women had married Chinese men, the report stated that 'the women themselves stated that they were happy and contented and extremely well treated'.¹⁸²

The report however expressed worry that 'Illicit intercourse with white women' was taking place. 'A class of girls' often from 'respectable' backgrounds, had become 'acquainted' with Chinese men, and through doing this had sullied and destroyed themselves to, 'drift into what can hardly be described as otherwise than prostitution'.¹⁸³ In three cases it was claimed, 'the girls taken advantage of were under 16 years of age at the time'. Although there was no record of a complaint being made, and insufficient evidence for such cases to be brought to trial, 'the evidence of seduction of girls by Chinamen is conclusive...the Chinese

¹⁸⁰ City of Liverpool, Report of the Commission appointed by the City Council to enquire into Chinese Settlements in Liverpool, 26 June, 1907, HO 139147/15

¹⁸¹ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and "The Chinese Puzzle" in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), p.50

¹⁸² City of Liverpool, Report of the Commission appointed by the City Council to enquire into Chinese Settlements in Liverpool, 26 June, 1907, HO 139147/15

¹⁸³ *Ibid*, p.7

appear to much prefer having intercourse with young girls, more especially those of undue precocity'.¹⁸⁴ As Henry Reynolds has also suggested, this exposed the anxious trope that young white women in their associations with men of colour were seen as the 'unwitting revolutionaries' in a moral and biological sense, for the overthrow of whiteness.¹⁸⁵ Though the scale in Liverpool was far smaller than San Francisco, the sentiments towards miscegenation and the East Asian were the same.

The report recommended that the Liverpool watch committee be warned of this Chinese danger to young white women so that law enforcement could be vigilant in future. The council report points to a conflation between interracial sexuality in the case of the Chinese with deception and paedophilia, not the foundations or environment for a respectable marriage and the rearing of a family. The report was similarly concerned about miscegenation arising from the Chinese frequenting of brothels, although no formal evidence of Chinese men running brothels in Liverpool could be substantiated despite the allegations that all laundries acted as fronts for the sex trade.¹⁸⁶

In a letter to the undersecretary of state at the Home Office on 8th December 1906 entitled 'Chinamen in Liverpool', the Liverpool Head Constable had tasked his officers with taking a census of the Chinese resident in Liverpool who 'seemed to be in regular employment'. The figures listed '15 Englishwomen married to Chinamen, 4 English women cohabiting with Chinamen, and 2 English women employed in Chinese laundries'. A 'half-caste' Chinese-English woman also ran a brothel with her Chinese husband, and was arrested in July 1904 for this. In the Head Constable's conclusion there was 'at present a great outcry on the subject, mostly due to a lying article in the Manchester Sunday Chronicle, but there is no doubt a strong feeling of objection to the idea of the 'half-caste' population which is

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, p.6

¹⁸⁵ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), P.35

¹⁸⁶ City of Liverpool, Report of the Commission appointed by the City Council to enquire into Chinese Settlements in Liverpool, 26 June, 1907, HO 139147/15, p.7

resulting from the marriage of the Englishwoman to the Chinaman, but I cannot help thinking that what is really at the bottom of most of it is the competition of the Chinese with the laundries and boarding house keepers'.¹⁸⁷

Arguably popular racist assumptions related to the transnational antipathy to Chinese migration, allied to anxieties about economic competition for white workers were driving this more forensic investigation and analysis of immigrant populations. In the atmosphere surrounding the aliens act of 1905, which was mainly targeted at stemming the settlement of Eastern European Jews fleeing Russian pogroms, a spike of interest in miscegenation proved to be an offshoot, and the 1906 miscegenation panic partly sparked by the *Manchester Sunday Chronicle* set a precedent for public anger in 1919 when once again perceptions of non-white economic competition and interracial sexuality became intermixed, further spiked by greater visibility of men of colour in war time port cities due to merchant naval activity.

1911 saw the 'white lily' incidents, which saw episodes of violence in London ascribed to secretive Chinese gangs, a seamen's strikes in Britain, and the Chinese revolution. There was a growing feeling that Chinese in Britain were in league with other Chinese groups internationally, and growing negative stereotypes in the press about London's Chinatown.¹⁸⁸ In summer 1911, *London Magazine*, owned by Harmsworth brothers, published articles about the Chinatown's of London, Liverpool and Cardiff written by American journalist Hermann Scheffauer. Scheffauer, who had lived near and experienced the San Francisco Chinatown, applied his American stereotypes to a British setting, and talked up the problems of white-Asian race mixing.¹⁸⁹ Sidestepping the usual working class focus of the White versus Chinese labour debate that usually dominated articles in the *Daily Express* and elsewhere,

¹⁸⁷ HO 45/11843, Part 2

¹⁸⁸ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and "The Chinese Puzzle" in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), p.161

¹⁸⁹ Hermann Scheffauer, The Chinese in England: A Growing National Problem, *London Magazine*, July 1911, P.66

Scheffauer explored Asian miscegenation at the heart of the metropole, and the supposedly innately sinister qualities of the Chinese, in a far more eugenic light. Miscegenation between whites and Asians in his view was an unwelcome process by which the Chinese were gaining biological footholds in white men's countries, and Chinatowns were opaque enclaves from which they could spread and build the power of China.¹⁹⁰

However, while Stefanie Affeldt argues the 'yellow peril' miscegenation trope 'echoed the wider international eugenics movement', which 'endorsed ideas of racial purity, white supremacy and racial degeneration through miscegenation', such root assumptions were in circulation in the Australian colonies and being culturally explored well before Francis Galton founded the first eugenics society in 1907.¹⁹¹ Later scientific hypotheses about race mixture on the part of the interwar biologists and anthropologists were grounded in the masculinist cultural imaginations of male antipodean Britons outnumbered, isolated, and ill at ease with their proximity to Asia. In the form of the "yellow peril" speculative narratives of the novelist and the playwright, stories of Asian invasion of Australia which appeared in the late nineteenth century with Kenneth Mackay's *The Yellow Wave* (1897) and William Lane's *White or Yellow? – A Story of the Race-War of A.D. 1908* (1888) increasingly reflected, shaped and vernacularised Australian popular assumptions that the overwhelmingly male populations of Asian migrants were a seductive threat to white women, that whites and Asians were opposed, incompatible peoples.¹⁹²

Coverage of the Boxer rebellion (1900), involved images of sexual violence, miscegenation with Asians became associated with colonial crisis and a humiliation of white

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, p.64

¹⁹¹ Stefanie Affeldt, *White Nation-White Angst. The Literary Invasion of Australia*, in *Racism and Modernity*, (Berlin, 2011), p.229

¹⁹² Ibid, p.230

masculinity.¹⁹³ Edwardian fantasies built on the deeper roots of ‘yellow peril’ fiction of the 1880s, in which William Lane and Kenneth Mackay had both depicted Asian control of white women. Women were seen as a biological and moral weak link in Australian society, but this trope was reproduced throughout Anglo-World discussions of race and immigration. Women would undermine ‘racial hygiene’ in settler society by fraternising with Asian men. With movements towards support for female suffrage, education and social mobility, it was feared by male commentators and novelists that the ‘new woman’ could not be trusted marry white Europeans, preserve racial purity and resist Asian seduction. The results, it was imagined would be the catastrophic blurring of the colour line, and with it the destruction of White Australia. As Walker argues, women and Asia were increasingly viewed as ‘complimentary categories’, fluid and controllable, while white masculinity was ‘defiantly anti-asian’. Much of the later discourse when it came to scientific racism, aboriginal policy and miscegenation thinking was also grounded in a male distrust of women.¹⁹⁴

William Lane, a labour activist, had borne witness to the Chinese commission of 1887. He thought they were agents assessing the suitability of the colonies for a Chinese settlement by force. In his invasion story that he penned soon after, *‘White or Yellow? A Story of the Race-War of AD 1908’*, which appeared in *Boomerang* magazine on 17 March 1888, described by Walker as the first Australian Asian invasion narrative, Lane advanced the stereotype that evil orientals were, unlike westerners, deeply uncivilised because they enslaved and subordinated women. The main Chinese protagonist, Sir Wong Hung Foo, engaged to be married to the daughter of the Premier of Queensland, nevertheless also

¹⁹³ For a more detailed investigation of coverage of the Boxer Uprising in the mass media, and the construction of the uprising on the stage, see Ross G. Forman, *Peking Plots: Fictionalising the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, Victorian Literature and Culture* (1999) 19–48, and John R. Haddad, *The Wild West Turns East: Audience, Ritual, and Regeneration in Buffalo Bill's Boxer Uprising*, *American Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 3/4 (Fall/Winter 2008), pp. 5-38

¹⁹⁴ David Walker, *Shooting Mabel: warrior masculinity and Asian invasion*, *History Australia*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 89.1-89.11., p.3

brutalises, rapes and then murders the innocent, blonde Cissie Saxby, daughter to a Queensland farmer. Seeing Saxby's corpse in an open coffin 'like the virgin Nationality which had found its life in her death', white women finally realise the horror of the oriental treatment of females, shake of their indifference to the Chinese presence in Queensland, and, seeing her body as the personification of the rape of their white colony, start an uprising against Asian cruelty.¹⁹⁵ This leads to a race war between whites and yellows. From the later 1880s, the young golden haired white woman, and her degradation by Japanese or Chinese manipulation, sorcery or violence, as well as the fear that women might co-operate with these men became a consistent theme in worries expressed about the destabilisation of white society through 'mongrelisation'. White-Asian association was equated with betrayal of race.

Lane describes this scenario in the marriage between the Premier's daughter Stella and her Chinese husband, constructed as a precursor to the foundation of, '*a dynasty of Chinese-Australians.*' Stella decides to "rule a yellow race and rear a yellow brood" once married, but after it is realised that Wong Hung Foo has murdered Cissie, Stella's mother Lady Stibbins, kills him to rescue her daughter from, '*a fate worse than death*'. Saxby, the white woman in white robes came to be a motif for Australian purity and vulnerability, which was under threat from conquest by the Asian male.¹⁹⁶

Kenneth McKay also explored the idea that interracial sexuality and miscegenation were 'worse than death' for a white woman. In the *Yellow Wave*, it is the hardy, masculine white bush fighter that saves Australia from Russo-Chinese invasion. Playing upon a trope elucidated by both Charles Pearson and other racial-historical commentators such as James Bryce and Lothrop Stoddard, and later eugenics literature, the future of white men's countries

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, p.7

¹⁹⁶ Stefanie Affeldt, White Nation-White Angst. The Literary Invasion of Australia, in *Racism and Modernity*, (Berlin, 2011),p.230, see also, Stefanie Affeldt, A Paroxysm of Whiteness. 'White' Labour, 'White' Nation and 'White' Sugar in Australia, in: Wulf D. Hund, Jeremy Krikler, David Roediger, eds., *Wages of Whiteness & Racist Symbolic Capital*, (Berlin, 2010)

was dependent on the strength and purity of their manhood, and the male ability to protect and regulate female sexuality. As Walker neatly suggests, practical, political and academic assumptions coalesced as, ‘documenting the threat from the East became a male preserve, an honourable vocation that combined intellectual seriousness and a manly knowledge of the forces shaping the modern world’.¹⁹⁷ In *The Big Five*, McClean, one of the main male protagonists, discovers a half-Chinese, half-Japanese colony in the Northern Territory, where the inhabitants are readying for a migration by force.¹⁹⁸ McClean rescues Molly Trevor from the clutches of the Asians, and has the colony destroyed.¹⁹⁹

Conclusion

The construction of White Australia drew on a number of transnational narratives of racial difference, colonisation and Asian mobility, and the preservation of whiteness through a ‘cordon sanitaire’. As Marilyn Lake argues, the White Australia Policy and the dictation test designed to exclude Asians was seen by its architects as being at the ‘cutting edge of world-historic change’. We have located the White Australia Policy as a project built to defend and preserve the whiteness of an emerging nation, isolated and surrounded by pacific competitors, within both an imperial and a global history of ‘the discovery of personal whiteness’ that the African American intellectual W.E.B du Bois felt had come over the United States and fin de siècle European empires. Juxtaposed with the dissemination throughout Euro-American nodes of an increasingly vivid and sophisticated ‘‘yellow peril’’ trope and anti-Chinese and

¹⁹⁷ David Walker, Shooting Mabel: warrior masculinity and Asian invasion, *History Australia*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 89.1-89.11.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, P.88

¹⁹⁹ Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial adventure: Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian popular fiction, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.128

Japanese sentiment, finding its expression through the California Chinese exclusion act of 1882, the Transvaal controversy in 1903-6 South Africa, and anti-Japanese rioting in Canada in 1907, gold rush racism in Victoria became a node of imperial and transnational significance. The chapter also argued that White Australian imaginings of the 'yellow peril' became entwined with a growing hostility to non-white immigration and the increasing demonization of the tiny East Asian population in the metropole that would come to a head in the 1919 race riots in Britain. The Liverpool City Council's 1907 investigation of the Chinese population of the city in response to a public outcry driven by a sensationalist article about Chinese sexual deviancy and vice that deployed all the hall marks of the 'yellow peril' horror story, was symptomatic of this.

In attempting to draw out the intellectual and racial scientific underpinnings of the fantasies of whiteness and their relationship to the 'yellow peril', the chapter explored how the negative construction of the 'half-caste' by colonial travel writers, and the North Atlantic debates between the mono and polygenists to an extent enmeshed themselves with the political arguments driving Australian nationhood and pathologising Chinese immigrants. Broad theories on migration, colonial settlement and racial difference littered the works of Charles Pearson and James Bryce, ideas upon which Deakin and Barton pivoted their work to build the federation. Although physical anthropologists did not approach the issues of miscegenation or the physical and mental qualities of the East Asian in greater detail until the 1920s, Pearson's ideas about the demographic vulnerability of white European settlers in the Pacific to waves of non-white immigration was part of a narrative of interracial antagonism that continued to shape the maintenance of the White Australia Policy, and the 'yellow peril'.

James Bryce echoed Pearson's sentiments when he described the settlement population, 'problem which confronts the South' as 'one of the great secular problems of the world.'²⁰⁰

The drive towards the fantasy of a homogenous white country was endorsed in the mainstream, not only because fears of Asian immigration and a future of uncontrolled miscegenation was being tentatively explored in discourses such as the racial-geopolitical writing of Pearson and Bryce, and the dissemination of the judgement of racial scientists of the North Atlantic in the global south by 1901. Cultural as well as scientific understandings of East Asian immigration were very much entwined. It had been vividly imagined in the Anglo-Australian pulp novels and sensationalist journalism since the late nineteenth century that without policies to protect race and nation, a dystopian scenario of British stock submerged and exterminated by a wave of lascivious and cruel Asians, would come to pass. Such existing narratives exercised a heavy influence on later scientific debates.

Randolph Bedford, like many commentators, politicians and journalists, had constructed the 'Empty North', still under the control of South Australia, as ripe for Asian invasion, with a tiny population of vulnerable whites. But he and others were also highly mindful that strategies for regulating the lives of the aboriginal population in the North had not been resolved. Fear of a proliferating coloured Australia springing from unregulated Aboriginal-Asian or aboriginal-white intimacy compounded invasion fears and constituted its own internal threat to the project for a white Australia. So it is to the internal issues of aboriginal reproduction, and the governmental and scientific anxieties about intimate associations between indigenes and Asian and South Pacific migrants in remoter regions where the white man's government struggled to assert control, and the fear that undesirable

²⁰⁰ James Bryce, *American Commonwealth*, quote in, Marilyn Lake, *The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White*, *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 58, Autumn 2004, p.59

hybridities could quickly proliferate from within as well as being coercively forced from without through Japanese invasion, that we must also turn.

Chapter 2:

Interwar miscegenation and the rise and demise of physical anthropology in Britain and Australia.

Anti-Chinese and broader anti-Asian sentiment, and fears of working class Asian economic migration or Japanese invasion into which miscegenation and sexual anxieties were interwoven, were an important driving force behind the aforementioned enshrinement of White Australia as a ‘racial-national’ project in 1901. Collins has been able to demonstrate that public engagement with critiques of white purity and considerations of Eurasian racial hybridity as an imagined future were more developed alternatives than have been acknowledged.¹ Kate Bagnall and Sophie Couchman have also advanced a number of case studies that point to the lack of formal legislation prohibiting white-Asian intermarriage, but also the acceptance of Eurasian children through their ability to follow social norms and perform Australian values.² However as Walker agrees, Asian immigration restriction fed into mainstream approval for Asian miscegenation limitation.³

Henry Reynolds has however argued that there were two faces of White Australia, and two regimes for whitening the nation. One looked ‘outward’ to exclude the threat of

¹Kane Collins, *Imagining the golden race*, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska eds., *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012), p.99-120.

² Sophie Couchman and Kate Bagnall (eds), *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, Brill, Leiden, 2015., and, Kate Bagnall, ‘Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915’, PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007.,p.53

³ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850-1939*, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1999), p.121

Asia, and stop Asian migrants from gaining access and a corrupting proximity to white female bodies. The other whitening project constituted a contradictory 'inward' urge, centred round addressing the inconvenient reality that White Australia had never been entirely white in the first place.⁴ What could be done about the populations of indigenous tribes that significantly outnumbered white settlers in Northern Queensland and South Australia, and whose intimate contact with Asian migrant workers in the coastal settlements such as Darwin, Broome and Townsville was seen as a circumvention of settler reproductive and economic authority?

Tom Lawson has explored 'histories of genocide' and endemic colonial violence carried out by British settlers against the aboriginals in the British crown colony of van Diemen's land, later Tasmania. Henry Melville, a journalist in Hobart, even chronicled this in a book, *History of the Island of van Diemen's Land* (1835), drawing metropolitan attention to the excesses of British settlement and racial policy. The island's population was decimated between 1803 and 1876. But at the same time, Lawson argues that by 1820 a 'Creole society was created', and interracial relationships between Europeans and indigenes were common.⁵

The indigenous peoples had fared horrifically from the very early days of European settlement in the 1780s, and by the 1840s, 'folk' settler conceptions of racial difference constructed them as inferior to whites. Frequently regarded as fossilised evolutionary throwbacks inhabiting the bottom of developmental scales, they were commonly exhibited in commercial exhibitions as exemplars of lower stages of development. As an article in the *Age* declared in 1888, demonstrating the extent to which Social Darwinian and Spencerian conceptions had permeated mainstream Australian opinion, natural law dictated the

⁴ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), see also, Henry Reynolds, *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers, and Land* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1987), and, Henry Reynolds, *North of Capricorn: The Untold Story of Australia's North*, (Allen & Unwin, 2003)

⁵ Tom Lawson, *The Last Man: a British Genocide in Tasmania*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p.30-32

aboriginals must become extinct, and this should not be ‘lamented’.⁶ However with white settlement still fragile beyond the temperate South East, Peta Stephenson suggests that anxieties about the proliferation of a ‘coloured Australia’ drove state authorities to legislate an accelerated expunging of the aboriginals.⁷ As Ian Anderson has pointed out, biological ‘assimilationism’ was a ‘colonial regime’ justified by a theoretically nebulous concoction of Social Darwinian anecdotes, conceptions of the rightness of whiteness, and stereotypes of the immorality and incapacity of the ‘full-blood’ indigenes.⁸ ‘Half-caste’ aboriginal women would be selectively bred with white men, and over several generations, as A.O Neville demonstrated in his photographs in *Australia’s Coloured Minority* (1947), physical, and he felt, mental traces of aboriginality would disappear in the offspring.⁹

The body of scientific investigation, measurement and evidence for the efficacy of this selective assimilation was patchily grounded in the late 1890s. However as Warwick Anderson suggests, ideas about the ‘racial plasticity’ of aboriginals as dark Caucasians later gained currency among interwar biologists and anthropologists from the University of Adelaide, and formed a cornerstone of a uniquely Australian, or rather South Australian perspective on miscegenation and racial taxonomy.¹⁰

Asian miscegenation with aboriginal women was frequently described as being rife in a number of states in 1901, and the conditions of both these unions and the offspring they produced were frequently cast by official observers as morally and physically degenerate.

⁶ *The Melbourne Age*, 11 January, 1888

⁷ Peta Stephenson, *Beyond black and white: Aborigines, Asian-Australians and the national imaginary*, (PhD thesis, Faculty of Arts, The Australian Centre, University of Melbourne, 2003), p.7

⁸ For a broad discussion of this, see, Ian Anderson, *Colonialism and the health transition: Aboriginal Australians and poor whites compared*, Victoria, 1850-1985, *History of the Family*, 14, 2009, and, Russell McGregor, *Imagined Destinies: Aboriginal Australians and the Doomed Race Theory, 1880–1939* (Melbourne: Melbourne Univ. Press, 1997), Chapter 1.

⁹ A.O Neville, *Australia’s Coloured Minority*, (1947). Photographs showing several generations of the same family, labelled as, ‘half-caste’, ‘quadroon’, ‘octaroon’ can be found at: <http://collections.museumvictoria.com.au/items/1496210>

¹⁰ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.7

The section argues that Asians were seen as internal pariahs who problematized biological assimilation by irrevocably tainting aboriginal blood, at the same time as they were seen as an external problem to be excluded through immigration restriction. Conceptions of the Asian body as an engine of undesirable hybridity was once again an integral influence on the anxious racial attitudes of White Australia, and until the 1940s this remained a mainstream assumption. Asians and Pacific Islanders, through their associations with aboriginals, and Aboriginal-Asian cultural, economic and sexual interaction became, according to Christine Choo, the ‘common enemy of White Australia’.¹¹

Often financially destitute, aboriginal women who married or cohabited with Asian men and had children added to Australia’s ‘coloured problem population’. Some ‘aboriginal protectors’, state officials responsible for regulating indigenous affairs, such as Walter Roth in 1913 explicitly referred to risks of biological ‘atavism’ when describing these unions, but more commonly they were opposed on moral grounds. As Stephenson states, such unions were almost always viewed as dysfunctional, with assumptions that the children would suffer neglect from non-white parents. There were also economic fears that aboriginals would no longer be dependent on whites, that white settlers would lose their ‘sexual access’ to aboriginal women, and that Asians would use their mixed-race families to try and stay permanently in Australia, something forbidden by the 1901 acts.¹²

Extensive attempts were made by state protection officials and other legislators to stop aboriginals and Asians labouring and establishing families together, by enacting a series of segregation laws. There is disagreement between Curthoys, Stephenson and Ellinghaus

¹¹ Christine Choo, *Mission Girls: Aboriginal Women on Catholic Missions in the Kimberley, Western Australia, 1900-1950*, (University of Western Australia Press, Perth, Western Australia, 2001), p.5, see also, Choo, S., Choo, C., *Carrier, Being Eurasian* in Peter Lang, *Visibly Different: Face, Place and Race in Australia*, Peter Lang, (Bern, Switzerland, 2007)

¹² Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia’s Indigenous-Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007), p.76

about the extent to which we can trace common attitudes and legislative frameworks towards Aboriginal-Asian crossing in different states. Stephenson however suggests that especially in Queensland, Northern Territory, Western Australia, there was a ‘common racial ideology’ to keep the two groups ‘separated at all costs’.¹³ The section will explore changes over time, particularly during the interwar years, in moral, legislative and anthropological approaches towards Aboriginal-Asian ‘interbreeding’, and how they were problematically intertwined with approaches and justifications for ‘biological assimilation’ of indigenes into Australia’s European population. Although miscegenation in Australia was often observed and policed, it was not until the early 1920s that concerted anthropological and biological field studies of mixed race families and communities, and importantly, and questioning of how Asian peoples fitted into these often complex schema of miscegenation, gained momentum. As will be investigated, contradictions and confusions occasioned by the plethora of ‘proliferating hybridities’ that investigators and state officials encountered had by the end of the 1940s, threatened to destabilised the whole framework of fixed racial taxonomies and anthropometric measurement on which much of interwar Australian race science had been developed.

It is therefore also important to be mindful that the earlier imperatives and racial assumptions that led state authorities to separate Asians and aboriginals were built on earlier fears of an uncontrolled ‘black Australia’ envisioned from the years of early settlement, coalescing with fears of Chinese competition, and the potential for Asians to cement their residency in Australia by having families with ‘natives’, perpetuating a ‘coloured population’. It was these ideas it will be argued, that initially informed both scientific inquiry, and the appropriation by aboriginal protectors of scientific frameworks to justify further racial policy. Contradictions had arisen by the 1940s between intellectuals who had

¹³Ibid, p.62

begun to question the reality or usefulness of rigidly classifying aboriginals and Asians, and marking all 'half-caste's as degenerate threat to White Australia, and aboriginal protectors such as A.O Neville and Cecil Cook who had become convinced that whites and aboriginals needed to be rid of the taint of Asian blood through strict measures.

By the 1890s, the sizeable pearl-shelling industries operating on the coasts of South Australia's northern coast and Northern Queensland had become dependent on 'Asian' labour. According to Regina Gantner, 'Asian' had really become an umbrella categorisation for the numerous peoples from throughout the Pacific, the Japanese, Malay, Pacific Islander, Chinese and other indentured labourers and merchants who traversed the dense familial and commercial networks that criss-crossed North Australia, South East Asia and wider Oceania. Japanese pearl divers among others were even given exemptions to move in and out of Northern Queensland through a 'gentleman's agreement with the Japanese government, although they could never become permanent naturalised citizens.¹⁴ As a result the Asian populations of particularly Broome in Western Australia, Darwin in the Northern Territory, and Thursday Island in Northern Queensland grew substantially. In the anxious atmosphere of a newly founded nation obsessed with maintaining its 'whiteness', this demographic shift created concerns about Asian miscegenation with aboriginals, and in these states Asians were barred from employing aboriginal women.¹⁵ Scaremongers such as the novelist Randolph Bedford played on the anxieties of South Eastern Australians that the 'Empty North' could barely even be considered a part of Australia, as it contained so few white settlers, and so

¹⁴ Regina Gantner, *The Pearl-Shellers of Torres Strait: Resource Use, Development and Decline*, (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1994), p.100, see also, Regina Gantner, 'The Wakayama Triangle: Japanese Heritage of North Australia.' *Journal of Australian Studies*.61 (1999): 55-63.

¹⁵ Russell McGregor, *Indifferent Inclusion: Aboriginal people and the Australian nation*. (Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, ACT, Australia, 2011)

many Asian and indigenous peoples, making it a site for potential racial subversion, insurrection and even foreign invasion.¹⁶

Anxieties that Asian men would ‘contaminate’ the aboriginal populations led to a raft of state by state legislation. In 1897 the Queensland parliament passed the ‘Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act’.¹⁷ Being enacted in the wake of a number of moral panics surrounding Aboriginal vulnerability to prostitution, opium and venereal disease, constructed as Chinese vices, McGrath also suggests the laws were part of an attempt to segregate Chinese gold diggers at the Palmer River deposits.¹⁸ Under the act, ‘Aboriginal Protectors’ assigned to regulate and observe the indigenous population, were given the power to forcibly move aboriginals, dictate their employment and behaviour, or uproot them and place them on reservations. This particular anti-miscegenation framework was couched mainly in moral rather than scientific language, as the Chinese in Australia had been stereotyped since the 1860s as immoral, exploitative of women, and disease ridden. However as Choo argues, the real justification was to prevent Chinese companies and businesses from ‘challenging white capitalism’ by offering aboriginals alternative avenues of employment and accommodation to the semi-slavery they were subjected to by white employers.¹⁹

The 1901 amendment of the Queensland Act, Section 9, stated that Asian men had to gain the assent of the state chief protector in order to marry aboriginal women, and this was almost never granted. Resultantly, the ‘hybrid’ Aboriginal-Asian offspring were especially

¹⁶ Randolph Bedford, *White Australia; or, The Empty North*, (1909), ed. Richard Fotheringham, see also, Stephen Carleton and Richard Fotheringham, “*White Australia*” in 1909: the background to the play and the two surviving scripts, (Playlab, Brisbane, 2005)

¹⁷ Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia’s Indigenous-Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007), p,76

¹⁸ Ann McGrath, *Contested Ground: Aborigines under the British Crown*, (Allen & Unwin, 1995), p.50

¹⁹ Christine Choo, *Mission Girls: Aboriginal Women on Catholic Missions in the Kimberley, Western Australia, 1900-1950*, (University of Western Australia Press, Perth, 2001), p.20

assumed to be the subject of neglect at the hands of the 'immoral' and often illegal union of their parents.²⁰ Now designated 'wards of the state', they could be forcibly removed or relocated at any time.²¹ At the same time cohabitation was 'virtually illegal'. William Edward Parry-Okeden, the second Commissioner of Police for Queensland, who also established the Fingerprint Bureau to document criminal biometrics, stated in 1901 that Aboriginal-Asian, "offspring resulting from such intercourse are ... by no means a desirable addition to the population."²² Race mixture clearly produced consistent waves of moral panic in the minds of white settlers, as they felt they saw their white future gradually erode. Stephenson argues that the White Australia Acts were used in tandem with aboriginal protection acts to create an early 'eugenic' framework that tried to stop intermarriage, while stopping aboriginals from circumventing white economic control via their association with Asian workers and employers.²³ As she puts it, laws created, 'ostensibly to protect Aborigines was framed with Asians firmly in mind...Aboriginal policy in the North and North-West of Australia cannot be understood in isolation as a Black/white issue.'²⁴

Although contested in part by Katherine Ellinghaus, the Queensland legislative model to police aboriginal reproduction became a template for four out of the six states by the early twentieth century. Acting upon a report about the moral perils of race-crossing by Dr Walter Roth, a previous 'protector' for Queensland who had played a role in supporting the 1897 Queensland Act, Western Australia passed the 1905 Aborigines Act. Again the act sought to criminalise interracial sex, and deportation for Asians was built into this framework.

²⁰ Regina Gantner, *The Pearl-Shellers of Torres Strait: Resource Use, Development and Decline*, (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1994), p.100

²¹ Ibid, P.62

²² Guy Ramsey, "Cherbourg's Chinatown: Creating an Identity of Place on an Aboriginal Settlement." *Journal of Historical Geography* 29.1 (2003): 109-22, quoted in Peta Stephenson, *Beyond black and white: Aborigines, Asian-Australians and the national imaginary*, (PhD thesis, Faculty of Arts, The Australian Centre, University of Melbourne, 2003), p.70

²³ Ibid, p.71

²⁴ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), p.137

But perceptions of Aboriginals were evolving in other ways. In light of anecdotal assessments of interbreeding with whites which noted hybrid offspring were of more Caucasian appearance, perhaps indigenes were physically more akin to white settlers than first thought? The ethnographic and biological assumptions that would later inform South Australian scientists such as Herbert Basedow, and the policies of Cook and Neville in the 1930s and 1940s, were slowly and sporadically gaining some traction between the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. As Reynolds argues, early Australian race scientists began to transform, ‘the Aborigine from Oceanic Negro to proto-Caucasian’.²⁵

In a speech he gave to the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science in Adelaide in 1907, medical scientist Dr. W. Ramsay-Smith advanced his opinion that although observations of jaws, lips and noses had led most experts to class aborigines in the ‘negro’ family, the 1893 work of Alfred Russell Wallace had convinced him that aborigines were rather ‘racially the uncles’ of the white European ‘Caucasian’.²⁶ Again drawing on observations conducted in the 1890s, Ramsay-Smith again wrote in 1909 that the German scientist Richard Semon had stated that aboriginal peoples were more closely related to Caucasians than they were to Mongolian or Negro ‘types’.²⁷ In Britain the biologist Richard Lydekker echoed in 1908 that ‘Australoids’ were ‘low grade Caucasians’.²⁸ Hermann

²⁵ Ibid, p.138

²⁶ Alfred Russel Wallace, ‘Australasia’ in, *Stanford’s Compendium of Geography and Travel*, (1879, new issue 1893), see also, Alfred Russell Wallace, ‘The Action of Natural Selection on Man’, in *Half-Hours with Modern Scientists*, 2nd series, New Haven, Connecticut, 1873, p.21, from Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, p.72

²⁷ W. Ramsay-Smith, ‘The Place of the Australian Aboriginal in Recent Anthropological Research’, Report of 11th Meeting AAAS, Adelaide, 1907, Adelaide, 1908, p. 574, from *Henry Reynolds, Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.162

²⁸ Richard Lydekker co-authored the internationally well know volume, *The Living Races of Mankind*, (Volumes I and II, London, Hutchinson & co,1901-2), along with J.W Gregory A.H Keane and others. Lydekker wrote a chapter on ‘New Zealand, Tasmania, and Australia’ in Volume I. Quoted from Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, p.136. Also referred to in, Russell McGregor, ‘An Aboriginal Caucasian: some uses for racial kinship in early twentieth century Australia.’ *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, 1996 (1). pp. 11-20. For more on the scientific discourse on biological assimilation, see also, McGregor, Russell (1993) *The Doomed Race: A scientific axiom of the late nineteenth century.* *The Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 39 (1). pp. 14-22, McGregor, Russell (1996) *Intelligent parasitism: A.P. Elkin and the rhetoric of assimilation.* *Journal of Australian Studies*, 20 (50-51). pp. 118-130, McGregor, Russell (2012) *Drawing the local colour line: white Australia and the tropical north.* *Journal of Pacific History*, 47 (3). pp. 329-346.

Klaatsch, having his work translated into English as *The Evolution and Progress of Mankind* in 1923 went further in claiming aborigines were ‘closely’ akin to the European.²⁹ Klaatsch influenced his student, Herbert Basedow, who became one of the major exponents of the Adelaide School of hybridity which will be later discussed. Hybridity thinking was changing slowly but surely in the Pacific over time.³⁰

But anxieties remained prevalent that Asians and Aboriginals were forming their own hybrid communities, bypassing white controls and contesting segregation. Additionally, coastal towns, particularly those such as Broome and Townsville dependent on the pearl shelling industry, were becoming dominated by non-whites who monopolised this work, which meant uncontrolled ‘coloured’ miscegenation, and a minority of white settlers. A reporter for the *Melbourne Age* at the fin de siècle encapsulated the nightmare of the anxious white South Easterner when he described the Broome district.

Through promiscuous intercourse with aboriginal women, a hybrid race is being established, in that far corner of the Continent... to describe some of the children to be seen in the Broome district would utterly puzzle the cleverest ethnologist. The Malay, Jap and Philipino have crossed with blacks. The union of former white men and aboriginal women have produced ‘half-caste’s who, in turn, have bred from Chinese, Malays and Manila men. A half-caste may have crossed with a quadroon or octoroon and so the mixture of nationalities and hybrids

Heidi Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia: Herbert Basedow and the Black Caucasian* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2010).

²⁹ Hermann Klaatsch, *The Evolution and Progress of Mankind*, (London: T. Fischer Unwin Ltd, 1923). Klaatsch travelled to Queensland in 1904 and worked with Walter Roth, an anthropologist and Protector of aborigines. For more on Roth see, Australian Dictionary of National Biography, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/roth-walter-edmund-8280>

³⁰ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), p.137

continues until Mongrelia is literally the name which should be applied to the region.³¹

Indeed Thursday Island in Queensland was later described as a ‘satire of the White Australia policy’ during the 1920s, where Chinese, Japanese and Malays owned most of the businesses, and interbred freely with the ‘natives’.³² *The Dalby Herald* described the problematic tangle of Asian miscegenation on the island, and anticipated the later difficulties that physical and social anthropological investigators would experience in trying to categorise and order such proliferation in hybridity. ‘In so small an island it would be difficult to find a bigger mixture of whites, natives, half-breeds, and quarter-breeds. To attempt to designate some of them would be impossible. There is the man of short sturdy build, with the features of the Japanese, but he is not a Jap. His skin is almost the color of the Kanaka, who is there in abundance’.³³ The lack of anthropological expertise and focus necessary to study these groups in more than anecdotal detail in the early 1920s was viewed by public and official opinion as problematic to the development of the White Australia project. However Thursday Island was described in contradictory fashion by a writer for the Federal Department of Health, Dr. A.J Metcalfe, as one of the ‘healthiest parts of Australia’ based on his examination of the medical records of its mixed race population. This ‘polyglot colony’ of ‘400 whites, 600 Japs, 300 Papuans, and rest Malays, Filipinos, aboriginals, Torres Strait Islanders, Chinese, Indians, and other types’ was he felt, a prospering tropical population.³⁴

³¹ *Melbourne Age*, 16 August, 1899, quoted in, Henry Reynolds, *North of Capricorn: the Untold Story of Australia's North*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 2003), p.20

³² Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia's Indigenous-Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007), p.71

³³ *The Dalby Herald* (Qld. : 1910 - 1954), 3 October 1922, ‘Thursday Island, PEARL FISHERS’, MIXTURE OF RACES’

³⁴ *Daily Standard* (Brisbane, Qld. : 1912 - 1936), 10 June 1924.

Perhaps as Metcalfe contended, Asia-Pacific intermarriage would create a population most suited to colonise Australasia?

Eugenic assumptions about degeneration, atavism and the 'betterment' of races were also becoming infused into the cross-state dialogue about national racial policy. Baldwin Spencer, a professor of biology at the University of Melbourne from 1887-1919 argued in a report to parliament in 1913 that Chinese-Aboriginal instead of aboriginal-white relationships on the northern coast were causing the 'rapid degeneration of the native' in the Northern Territory.³⁵ According to Diana Wyndham, Spencer was an internationally renowned populariser of the idea of Social Darwinism and its application to local and transnational race questions. Although characterised as a relatively liberal figure in the context of White Australia's early decades, he was adamant that aboriginals were not compatible with other races, and that aboriginals would be better off being moved off their lands to reservations, and segregated from white settlers who could then appropriate their lands.³⁶

Anticipating later anthropological attempts to fill knowledge gaps and offset confusion about racial hybrid typologies, Spencer also bemoaned a lack of preciseness or nuance when it came to identifying the great variety of different Asian groups living Australia. New racial understandings and laws would have to develop, 'to include a more clear definition of a half-caste than it now does...It must be remembered that they are also a very mixed group. In practically all cases, the mother is a full-blooded aboriginal, the father may be a white man, a Chinese, a Japanese, a Malay or a Filipino'.³⁷ As we will see, clearer definition and codification of racial hybridities and the impacts of miscegenation between

³⁵ Baldwin Spencer, 'Preliminary report on the Aboriginals of the Northern Territory', *Commonwealth Parliamentary Papers* 3 (45), 1913.

³⁶ Diana Wyndham, *Eugenics in Australia: Striving for National Fitness*, (London: Galton Institute, 2003), p.21

³⁷ Baldwin Spencer, 'Preliminary report on the Aboriginals of the Northern Territory', *Commonwealth Parliamentary Papers* 3 (45), 1913.

whites, indigenes and different 'Asian' groups would still prove elusive when anthropological investigators in Australia moved beyond a pre-occupation with white bodies.

Overall, there has not been sufficient scope in the chapter to discuss differences in state by state attitudes and policies to miscegenation. Ellinghaus, Stephenson and McGregor have already engaged in the minutiae of a more comparative local frame of analysis. However the chapter has given us a broad sense that East Asians and Oceanic peoples in Australia were often pathologised as an impediment to official aboriginal policy.

Measures were enacted or envisioned to segregate those Asians or Pacific Islanders who were seen to threaten white authority to shape reproductive and demographic order. Ellinghaus noted that, 'Perversely—as it seemed to those who envisaged White Australia in terms of racial purity', in 1901, a re-orientation, which gradually became entwined with the research of race scientists such as Basedow and Cleland in the 1920s and 1930s, was slowly occurring toward the logic that, 'the threat deriving from miscegenation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people would paradoxically be remedied by instituting even more comprehensive regimes of miscegenation'. It was this attitude that continued to be consolidated up to the 1940s through the influence of research by anthropologists and biologists often coming from the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Museum. Understanding and augmenting 'reproductive control' in order to limit the internal threat of asian bodies was seen as a key plank in the maintenance of the Deakin demand for a purely white future.³⁸

Australian fears of Asia and Asian bodies were noted further afield. The British *Eugenics Review* editorial in 1910 stated that the spectre of Asian competition, invasion and

³⁸Katherine Ellinghaus, Absorbing the 'Aboriginal problem': controlling interracial marriage in Australia in the late nineteenth and early 20th centuries, *ABORIGINAL HISTORY* (2003) VOL 27, p.184,202 see also, Katherine Ellinghaus, *Taking Assimilation to Heart: Marriages of White Women and Indigenous Men in Australia and the United States, 1887-1937*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006)

miscegenation were an ever present set of anxieties that hung over Australian approaches to increasing fertility, temperance, racial poisons, staving off white degeneration. The undercurrent nightmare that Asia would one day biologically absorb White Australia meant that some eugenicists focusing on measures to promote white masculine fitness did so mindful of pacific proximities.

It is obvious that the menace of the yellow races looms in the background of Australian consciousness and also that it is a healthy influence. The proximity of powerful and threatening neighbours has more than once in the world's history produced a nation of more virile and even heroic men. It is only a short-sighted belief in security which permits a community to be indifferent about its decaying manhood.³⁹

The Anthropological Investigation of Race Mixture in the Interwar Years: The Universities of Adelaide, Sydney and Melbourne.

So separation rather than study had been the broad imperative when it came to approaching the issue of Aboriginal-Asian race crossing in the earliest years of federation. White settlers were more interested in developing methods and rationales in order to survive and negotiate

³⁹ *Eugenics Review*. 1910 Jan; 1(4): 221–228.

the often difficult climates and geographies in which they found themselves, as they expanded beyond footholds in the temperate South East.⁴⁰

However by the 1920s, consistent alarm about the 'half-caste' problem came from South Western journalists describing the Northern Territory, with calls for greater government intervention to sanitise or segregate. Well known journalists such as Ernestine Hill and M.H Ellis fanned the flames of alarm in claiming that the North was an alien territory, with growing crime and squalor blamed on the growing proliferation of racial hybridity.⁴¹ Ellis complained that hybrids were becoming almost indiscernible from whites, making the racial makeup of the nation increasingly impossible to categorise, and the screening out of inferior groups such as Asians virtually impossible. Ernestine Hill added that the inferior qualities of the aboriginal and the Asian made mixed marriage a moral disaster. The hybrid child,

Unrecognised by his father and unwanted by his mother...is the sad and futureless figure of the north – half-caste. Child to a tragedy far too deep for glib preaching, half-way between the stone age and the twentieth century, his limited intellect and the dominant primitive instincts of his mother's race allow him to go thus far and no further.⁴²

The white future, as Ellis reiterated to Australians, was a myth when it came to the North, such dreams being replaced by the reality of a 'sinister human broth' of Pan-Pacific intermarriage. Asians were part of this growing sense of racial crisis, and many Asian-Australians, it was noted, still lived in the South Eastern population centres. According to the

⁴⁰ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.227

⁴¹ Quoted in, Henry Reynolds, *North of Capricorn: the Untold Story of Australia's North*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 2003), p.83

⁴² Quoted in, Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), p.126

Sydney Morning Herald on 27 October 1925, in the case of the Chinese of New South Wales alone ‘intermarriage has gone so far as to increase the Chinese half-castes from 3090 in 1901...to 3655 in 1921’, with an increase in the number of Chinese wives in Australia, and an overall fall in the number of ‘full blood’ Chinese according to the yearbook of 1921.⁴³ While these numbers were arguably still very small, they stimulated interest and anxiety out of all proportion to their size. While the immigration restriction laws had stemmed the flow of Chinese migrants, it had not really accounted for mixed marriage within national borders, and it was acknowledged that knowledge gaps in the demographic and anthropological archives would need to be rectified by further study and documentation of mixed race peoples and mixed race communities. The drive to construct and understand a White Australia was becoming more scientifically grounded in the 1920s and 30s.

While some scientists such as Frederic Wood Jones suggested aboriginals should not be biologically interfered with, racial hybridity increasingly became the subject of fieldwork and observation as well as new trajectories of scientifically backed state policy. As Warwick Anderson has noted, historians have increasingly engaged with the importance of Australian interwar anthropology. But he suggests that more needs to be done to understand the interaction and interpretation of transatlantic and global southern race thinking, and how transatlantic miscegenation thinking was ‘rendered vernacular’ by Australian anthropologists studying localised populations.⁴⁴

⁴³ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 October 1925

⁴⁴ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.131, see also, Patricia Jacobs, “Science and Veiled Assumptions: Miscegenation in W.A., 1930–1937,” *Austral. Aboriginal Stud.*, 1986, 2:15–23; David P. Thomas, *Reading Doctors’ Writing: Race, Politics, and Power in Indigenous Health Research, 1870–1969* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2004); and Heidi Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia: Herbert Basedow and the Black Caucasian* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2010). Anderson, *Cultivation of Whiteness* (cit. n. 6). See also Ann Curthoys, “An Uneasy Conversation: The Indigenous and the Multicultural,” in *Race, Colour, and Identity in Australia and New Zealand*, ed. John Docker and Gerhard Fischer (Sydney: Univ. New South Wales Press, 2000), pp. 21–36. Nicholas Brown, “Australian Intellectuals and the Image of Asia, 1920–1960,” *Australian Cultural Studies*, 1990, 9:80–92;

According to Anderson and McGregor, ‘aboriginal-European mixture’ sparked ‘international attention’ among anthropologists ever keener to measure and reconstruct racial difference in the aftermath of the First World War.⁴⁵ However the vehemently anti-miscegenation American biometrician Charles Davenport had already attempted to gather data in this area. In 1914, after going to the British Association for the Advancement of Science meeting in Melbourne, he decided to go to Brewarina in western New South Wales to study the ‘Australian mongrel’ by taking anthropometric measurements of the full-bloods and ‘half-caste’s. He measured seven F1 subjects, claiming the ‘first hybrid generation’ had a ‘less dolichocephalic skull’ than their aboriginal mothers, while the ‘half-caste’ hair and eyes were still dark. These he felt were disharmonious crosses. However he did not publish his results until 1925 when, Anderson argues, ‘the need for scientific data on half-castes was more widely recognised’, which suggests that a more rigorous anthropological/biological focus on race mixtures did not materialise instantly after the end of the First World War.⁴⁶ Three years after publication, teaming up with Morris Steggerda, Davenport published *Race crossing in Jamaica*, where he constructed the black-white cross as a ‘dangerous experiment’.

In the mid-1920s his conclusions about the efficacy of biological absorption chimed in with those such as Raphael Cilento, at the Townsville institute of Tropical Medicine, who argued that white bodies were highly capable of adapting to different environments, and that therefore hybridity between Europeans and non-Europeans was unnecessary and unhelpful to Australia’s white colonial project.⁴⁷ Serving as the Director of Public Health in New Guinea, which after the First World War had been parcelled off as an Australian mandated territory,

⁴⁵ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.215, Russell McGregor, *Imagined Destinies: Aboriginal Australians and the Doomed Race Theory, 1880–1939* (Melbourne: Melbourne Univ. Press, 1997)

⁴⁶ Quoted from, Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.242

⁴⁷ Raphael W. Cilento, *The White Man in the Tropics with Especial Reference to Australia and its Dependencies*, (Melbourne: Government Printer, 1925), p.73

Cilento took a Lamarckian view of white supremacy, suggesting the white man in the tropics was in a 'transition stage' that would lead to a comfortable adaption to the climate.⁴⁸ Asians and non-whites were not therefore needed in Australia or its overseas empire. The frameworks of Davenport and Cilento would gradually be superseded or contested as the interwar years wore on. Racial scientists in the 1920s and 1930s were increasingly adopting typologies that embraced racial plasticity, reframing the boundaries of whiteness, and reconfiguring the aboriginal as a 'dark Caucasian', more similar to the white European Caucasian, rather than as a dying degenerate throwback.

Medical scientists and anthropological investigators, many of them from the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Museum in addition to some scientists in Western Australia, took an increasing interest in aboriginal absorbability into White Australia. They brought to the anthropological table a provincialized conception of racial plasticity for their own state, and their own brand of Lamarckism, the idea being that adaption to Australia's common environment would make different racial groups even more similar over time.

Herbert Basedow, an Adelaide anthropologist stated that there was really no danger of atavism for offspring with a 'black fellow born of a white woman' because biologically they were similar, and the aboriginal 'colour' would disappear in subsequent generations.⁴⁹ 'half-caste' aboriginals, race enthusiast Stan Larnach claimed, could form part of a new proletarian class that would be physically very well adopted to labour in and colonise the central deserts and the tropical north. So amalgamation between whites and aboriginals was now paradoxically being constructed as part of a scientifically validated white future for Australia, as the Adelaide school contributed to the growing opinion that biological absorption would

⁴⁸ Ibid, see also Alison Bashford, 'Is White Australia possible?' *Race, colonialism and tropical medicine*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, (2002), 23:2, 248-271

⁴⁹ Quoted in, Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.244

not produce inferior 'dark' throwbacks, and that soon hybrid offspring would be able to pass for white in highly colour conscious communities.⁵⁰ J.B Cleland was one of the more prominent race scientists at the University of Adelaide, and along with a number of his compatriots, he felt that the 'dark Caucasian genes' of aboriginals would gradually intermingle with white Caucasian genetic material. In tandem with educational programmes teaching western values and proper hygienic habits, in a similar vein to some of the initiatives suggested by eugenicists W.E Agar and Richard Berry for elevating poor slum dwelling whites, aboriginality he felt could be dissolved over time.⁵¹

Warwick Anderson adds that, 'of course, those who were part Asian appeared to present a serious biological impediment to this schema' of race crossing, but neglects to elaborate on anthropological frameworks and studies that articulated this standpoint more specifically in the Australian context.⁵² Two figures most closely involved in aboriginal race crossing projects, the aboriginal protection officials Cecil Cook and A.O Neville, did certainly argue that this was the case, and were adamant that Asian or 'coloured' blood represented an atavistic danger when crossed with the aboriginal, assuming that this would produce an unstable, inferior throwback. Furthermore it is clear that to an extent this assumption sprung from the relentless 'pathologising' of working class, as opposed to higher status Chinese migrants, as dirty and riddled with disease, which was a deeply rooted trope stretching back to the smallpox panics of the late nineteenth century, such as the 1881 Sydney outbreak which was erroneously blamed by Governor Henry Parkes on Chinese sailors and market gardeners.⁵³

⁵⁰ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), p.132

⁵¹ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.228

⁵² *Ibid*, p.250

⁵³ Greg Watters, 'Contaminated by China', p.30, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012)

Having studied tropical hygiene at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Cecil Cook served a number of roles in the administration of the Northern Territory, and was at the heart of policies of 'half-caste' absorption into the white biological community. Acting as the Chief Protector of the aborigines in the Northern Territory from 1927 to 1939, he had also served as both the chief quarantine officer and chief medical officer, and he was a man steeped in the assimilationist methodology of the Adelaide scientists.⁵⁴ Cook was deeply unsettled by the prospect of Asians breeding with 'half-caste' aborigines. As he put it, 'multiplication of multicolour humanity by the mating of Half-castes with alien coloured blood' had to be strictly stifled through intervention and removal of Aboriginal-Asian children from their families, and by making sure aborigines mated with Europeans.⁵⁵

Cook was a heavy handed paternalistic protector in his treatment of the 'half-caste problem' and genuinely believed that controlling miscegenation could make the White Australia Policy in the Northern Territory a reality. In 1927 he had passed an Aboriginal Ordinance for the Northern Territory. Under this legislation the meaning of the term 'Aboriginal' was modified to allow the chief protector to move and control any man over the age of twenty one if he was deemed to be 'incapable of managing his own affairs.'⁵⁶ Cook's reasoning was that 'adult male half-castes under Chinese or other influences become the victims of gambling habits, alcohol and opium.'⁵⁷ Cook was referring to "yellow peril" stereotypes of Chinese depravity, and even linked the Chinese in Northern Australia with fears of Communism and political subversion.⁵⁸ In 1931 Cook reported that there were 2950

⁵⁴ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), p.129, see also, Austin, Tony. "Cecil Cook, scientific thought and 'half-castes.'" *Aboriginal History* 14 (1990): 104-22, and, Australian Dictionary of National Biography, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/cook-cecil-evelyn-aufreere-mick-12343>

⁵⁵ Quoted in, Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.229

⁵⁶ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), P.129

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, P.129

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p.133

Europeans and 852 'half-castes' in the Northern Territory, but he also expressed worry that as he put it the number of 'part-Asians' was growing.⁵⁹ As Reynolds has revealed, the annual census for schools in the Northern Territory in 1932 showed the extent of intermarriage.⁶⁰

Such reports worried Cook, because he believed that the 'Asiatic' had an 'atavistic tendency' that through Asian miscegenation was producing a growing degenerate population in the territory. He agreed with the research of J.B Cleland at the University of Adelaide, who claimed during the 1830s that by analysing blood groups he and his colleagues had proven that the aboriginals were closer to Europeans than they were to 'Chinamen'.⁶¹ Through figures such as Cook, we come to understand that much of the theory and practice behind selective regimes of miscegenation was geared towards opposing Asians and making their position in Australian communities untenable. Indigenous people were the 'conduits through whom Asian blood could flow' and so they were on the front line of the conflict of colour waged against the Asians in white men's countries, as similar initiatives were being enacted in the United States.⁶²

A.O Neville became the Chief Protector of Aborigines Western Australia in 1915, and from 1937 to 1940 held the position of Commissioner of Native Affairs. Like Cook he was adamant that 'a white man married a coloured woman of Aboriginal descent, possessing some Negro, Asiatic, Indian or other coloured ancestry, then there is a greater risk of atavism in any children of the union'.⁶³

With racial typologies, and the categorisation of hybridity becoming ever more 'plastic' during the interwar years, it is also arguable that Asians, and their interbreeding with

⁵⁹ Ibid, p.135

⁶⁰ Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, taken from the 'Report of the Administrator for Northern Territory, 30 June 1932, Report of Education Board, p.14, Commonwealth Parliamentary Papers, vol III, 1932-33-34, NO.124'

⁶¹ Ibid, P.140

⁶² Cecil Cook to Weddell, the Administrator of the Northern Territory, 27 June 1933, A659/40/1/408, National Archives of Australia, quoted in, Tony Austin, "Cecil Cook, scientific thought and 'half-castes.'" *Aboriginal History* 14 (1990), p. 113

⁶³ Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia's Indigenous-Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007), p.74, taken from, A.O Neville, *Australia's Coloured Minority: Its place in the Community*, (Currawong Publishing Co, 1947)

aboriginals, at times occupied more ambiguous territory in race crossing investigations than Anderson has suggested. Although growing focus on absorption didn't initially make a difference to the segregation policies applied to aboriginals and Asians, Aboriginal-Asian families cropped up in the fieldwork of interested anthropologists such as Griffith Taylor at the University of Sydney. Taylor conducted 'outback jaunts' and observations throughout the 1920s, in trips to the Northern Territory and Eastern New South Wales in which he made sketches and anthropometric measurements of aboriginals and 'aboriginal crosses', one of which was an aboriginal-Asian family in Camooweal, on the border between Northern Queensland and the Northern Territory. ⁶⁴ Taylor claimed, perhaps in exaggeration in his field notes, that his and Jardine's was the "First study of ½ Castes in Australia".⁶⁵

Throughout 1920 and beyond, Taylor had toured much of South East Asia, the Dutch East Indies and Singapore, describing the variety of different peoples that he came across, and writing these travels up into 'popular journalism', published in the *Argus* and the Melbourne *Sun*.⁶⁶ As time went on his observations became more ethnographic and anthropological, and in 1924 he was looking to move into racial 'fieldwork' in order to buttress his burgeoning theories on racial hybridity and migration.⁶⁷ In the summer of 1924, funded by University of Sydney research fund, Taylor and Fitzroy Jardine set off to the remote aboriginal reserves of the Namoi valley in New South Wales to conduct anthropometric measurements of aboriginals and aboriginal crosses. In Taylor's notes of the itinerary and preparation for the trip, he describes how for the latest techniques in racial measurement he relied on Louis Sullivan's *Essentials of Anthropometry: A Handbook for Explorers and Museum Collectors*, later revised by Harry Shapiro at the New York Museum

⁶⁴ Griffith Taylor and F. Jardine. "Kamilaroi and white: A study of racial mixture in New South Wales." *J and Proceedings Royal Society of NSW* 58 (1924), P.269

⁶⁵ Griffith Taylor papers, Box 35, series 11

⁶⁶ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.101

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, p.101-106

of Natural History in 1928.⁶⁸ The aborigines of eastern New South Wales had rapidly become absorbed, displaced or hybridised as white settlement began here in earnest from the early nineteenth century. Echoing scientific consensus that hybridity was accelerating in Australia, Taylor noted excitedly that,

The whole problem of racial mixture can perhaps better be studied now than at any other period of our history. A generation ago, the half-castes and other mixed breeds were relatively few. A generation hence there will be hardly any full-bloods remaining. At present there are about 1000 full-bloods and 6000 half castes; so that there is plenty of anthropological material. Further, the family relations of full-bloods and half castes can in most cases be ascertained by the careful investigator, which will certainly not be the case in another generation.⁶⁹

Taylor wrote to Richard Waterman at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Detroit's Wayne State University commenting that miscegenation question was now becoming the most important anthropological issue, predicted that its investigation would gain further momentum, and regretted not being able to cover it more thoroughly when he and Jardine published their observations.⁷⁰ He also exchanged ideas and sought further advice regarding his patchy, on the job grasp of anthropometry from Adelaide and Royal College of Surgeons anthropologist Frederic Wood Jones.⁷¹ Taylor and Jardine's research

⁶⁸ Ibid, p.104

⁶⁹ Griffith Taylor, and F. Jardine. "Kamilaroi and white: A study of racial mixture in New South Wales." *J and Proceedings Royal Society of NSW* 58 (1924), P.269

⁷⁰ Taylor to 9/4340b Richard A. Waterman, Dept of Sociology and Anthropology, Wayne State University, Detroit. Taylor complained that the paper had sidestepped the miscegenation question which, to him, was the most important part of Australian anthropology.

⁷¹ F. Wood Jones & T. D. Campbell. 'Anthropometric and descriptive observations on some South Australian Aborigines, with a summary of previously recorded anthropometric data.' *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia*. 1924 Vol. xlviii (read 09/10/1924). Pages 303-312 + plates.

paper, 'Kamilaroi and White' a study of Racial Mixture in New South Wales' was read before the Royal Society of New South Wales, 3rd December 1924, and published in the society journal of March 27th 1925. They acknowledged that their approaches were partly influenced by H.J Fleure's work on the races of England and Wales, published in 1923.⁷²

What stood out in the midst of the data on Kamilaroi physical indexes, tribal interaction and language groups, were some of Taylor's observations of a Chinese-Aboriginal hybrid family that he had come across and photographed on one of his research trips in the Northern Territory.

On a recent journey to the Northern Territory, one of us (GT), was able to obtain photographs of an interesting mixed race at Camooweal, just on the Queensland border. Some of these are given on Plate XXVI. Several Chinese gardeners (from Canton we believe), had taken aboriginal wives. In the photographs both of these original races are shown. The husband of the black woman is not shown, but their progeny are the two younger women.⁷³

Taylor did not have his calipers and anthropometric measuring equipment to hand, so he instead noted his observations.⁷⁴ The 'half-castes' bore a closer resemblance to their Chinese father than their aboriginal mother, with the three 'quadroon' daughters looking more 'aboriginal' than the males, with 'larger eyes' and 'fuller lips' that Taylor took to be indigenous physical characteristics. In the classroom he noted, the aboriginal-asian children were

⁷² H. J. Fleure, *The Races of England and Wales: A Survey of Recent Research* (London: Benn Brothers 1923). For more on Fleure see, Tony Kushner, H. J. Fleure: a paradigm for inter-war race thinking in Britain, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 42:2, 2008, 151-166

⁷³ Taylor, T. Griffith, and F. Jardine. "Kamilaroi and white: A study of racial mixture in New South Wales." *J and Proceedings Royal Society of NSW* 58 (1924): 268-92., P.280

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.281

described as *'quite equal to the white children'*, suggesting that hybridity was not degenerative in intellectual terms.⁷⁵ As the *Chronicle* reported, Taylor repeated the message that Asian infusion was not mentally degrading at a lecture he gave to the Sydney Millions Club. Despite the slow uptake in Australia of American led techniques of psychometric and IQ testing of different racial groups, as Charles Davenport had done with the United States Army in 1919, Taylor understood and was keen to disprove, in the case of Asians, long held stereotypes that hybridity had a degenerative impact on the mental ability and chances of success for the offspring. Proving, 'that the children were not behind the white children at the State school' was a controversial claim to make in contesting dominant assumptions in White Australia. Eugenicists such as Wilfred Agar at Melbourne had referred to Davenport's US Army tests, in which 'Nordic' recruits had achieved the highest scores, as proof that Australia should continue in its preference for Northern European immigrants.⁷⁶

The efficiency of family life, Taylor claimed, was increased because the Chinese fathers took care of domestic tasks such as washing and cooking, in addition to their gardening profession, leaving the aboriginal wives to spend 'much more time for the children than is the case in most white families'.⁷⁷ His studies of the early 1920s were often rushed and poorly executed as Warwick Anderson notes, and Taylor was often dismissive of the aboriginals and wary about what he saw as undesirable proliferation of a backward 'black Australia'.⁷⁸ Being far more amenable to the idea of a Eurasian Australia, Taylor's observations nonetheless suggest that he was also curious about the presence of Aboriginal-Asian subgroups that he felt

⁷⁵ Ibid, p.281

⁷⁶ Diana Wyndham, *Eugenics in Australia: Striving for National Fitness*, (London: Galton Institute, 2003), p.50

⁷⁷ Taylor, T. Griffith, and F. Jardine. "Kamilaroi and white: A study of racial mixture in New South Wales." *J and Proceedings Royal Society of NSW* 58 (1924): 268-92., p.280

⁷⁸ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.211

possessed positive physical and mental qualities, further complicating assessments of hybrid ability.

The Harvard-Adelaide Race Crossing Study (1938-39)

Adelaide entomologist Norman Tindale had increasingly become interested in race crossing during the 1930s. Having worked for the South Australian Museum in the 1920s, he visited Harvard University in 1936 to liaise with the anthropologist Earnest Hooton. As a result of his connections to Hooton, who put him in touch with one of his protégé's a young Joseph B. Birdsell they collaborated in 1938, as Birdsell proposed an anthropometric study of 'race mixture' throughout Australia.⁷⁹ The Harvard-Adelaide race crossing study had been initiated, and as a result of the influence of Hooton, Tindale, Birdsell and the team were provided with some financial backing from the Carnegie institution. As Anderson notes, the veteran anthropometrist Charles Davenport, who had conducted a similar study during the First World War, expressed his interest in the field study.

By conducting both sociological and anthropometric investigation, Birdsell hoped to make an assessment on indigenous absorbability by measuring 'the capacity of the hybrids for adapting themselves to European civilization' and the extent to which 'half-castes' could scientifically still be described as a problem population.⁸⁰ What Tindale and Birdsell found when they departed Adelaide in 1938 fascinated them, and they diverged from their initial

⁷⁹ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.235, see also, Warwick Anderson, Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific Between the Wars. *Australian Historical Studies*, 40(2), 2009, 143-160, see also, Heidi Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia: Herbert Basedow and the Black Caucasian* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2010).

⁸⁰ Quoted in, Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.235

focus on the 'black-white' cross, going beyond the study of groups in South Australia to conduct further investigations in Queensland and the South East.⁸¹ By 1939, the two investigators and their team had conducted anthropometric measurements and collected data on over 1200 aboriginals, in addition to recording blood types, but also genealogies and family trees of race mixture. Both Tindale and Birdsell were particularly enthusiastic about what they saw as the marked and surprising physical and mental harmony of the 'Australian hybrids', evidence in the view of Tindale that 'hybrid absorption' was working in Australia, and that state policies should be instituted to accelerate this. They observed 175 'exotic crosses' including among a number of 'hybrid subgroups', 26 Aboriginal-Chinese hybrids, and a number of cases of intermarriage with Malay migrants in the Northern Territory.⁸² Although these hybrid peoples tanned easily and displayed some 'aboriginal morphology', they looked more like a 'dark, aberrant white type' akin almost to 'mediterranean' peoples, rather than, as Birdsell stated, the 'American mulatto' crosses whom he felt displayed physical and mental disharmony.⁸³ Against the backdrop of increased Italian and Southern European migration to Australia during the interwar years, being described as Mediterranean fitted these 'half-caste' people within the lexicon of racial acceptability. There were many of the 'F1 hybrids' at Brewarrina, where Charles Davenport had conducted his own rather more limited race crossing studies more than two decades before. Once again they were struck by what they saw as the impressive capability and behaviour of the people they encountered, and as Anderson argues, this led Birdsell and Tindale to state that the 'racial experiment supported hybrid absorption'.⁸⁴ Asian infusion and dispersal among the aboriginal

⁸¹ Ibid, p.235

⁸² Ibid, p.237

⁸³ Ibid, p.237

⁸⁴ Ibid, p.237

populations of Queensland, Northern Territory and other parts of the country, had not shown marked signs of degeneration, Tindale and Birdsell claimed based on their fieldwork.⁸⁵

Birdsell and Tindale responded differently to the data. Tindale wanted the 'half-caste's to be biologically merged into White Australia, and felt the study supported this. As Anderson agrees, Tindale's ideas were based on local, inward focused ethnic exceptionalist assumptions, a 'uniquely white Australian interpretation of race mixing' that lent itself to a 'facile affirmation of national goals.'⁸⁶ Birdsell didn't contribute to the Tindale report, and later refused to turn his anthropometric data into an article. He felt that hybrids were being unfairly chastised by the Australian state. The 'half-caste' peoples he felt were biologically 'stable', and could be left to their own devices, or be allowed to live among and in tandem with white society, rather than be forcibly whitened through reproductive coercion.⁸⁷

In Tindale's conclusions, and in the sociological report he published to precede a report on the anthropometric data, a contradiction arose. Breeding between white Europeans and the aboriginal hybrids would not, Tindale felt, upset the delicate 'biological balance' of White Australia, since many of these 'half-castes' already had significant Caucasian qualities. However, 'The absorption of ethnic strains of any widely different type is...dis-couraged", and Anderson argues that Tindale interpreted this to mean interbreeding with Asian peoples, despite the supposed virility of the F1 crosses that they had documented and described positively.⁸⁸

There is therefore room to surmise that it was felt Asians still should not mix with aboriginals, not necessarily because it was seen to be particularly degenerative biologically, but because there was still a sense that the rules of White Australia laid down in 1901

⁸⁵ Ibid, p.238

⁸⁶ Warwick Anderson, Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific Between the Wars. *Australian Historical Studies*, 40(2), 2009, p.154

⁸⁷ Ibid, p.155

⁸⁸ Quoted in, Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.240

mattered. While Asian miscegenation may not have caused biological instability, it could stimulate social instability. Continued public adherence to this racial constitution, meant that giving any concessions to an Asian presence in the country would be seen as officially unacceptable and bound to aggravate race feeling and wider geopolitical anxieties that had deeper, nineteenth century roots. The sociological barriers to Asians were still in force. Birdsell was supposed to publish the results of these race crossing studies, but the outbreak of the Pacific war, and Birdsell's enlistment delayed the codification of the team's anthropometric results to add to the existing anthropological analyses. When he came back to his research in the late 1940s and early 1950s, he worried that his racial typologies now lacked useful meaning.⁸⁹ The growing movement toward genetics as the new framework to analyse population difference or 'characteristics' meant that the construction of primary racial types and hybrid subgroups was crumbling, and Birdsell could not rework his old data to fit the new approach.

So arguably, as medically sanctioned and directed biological absorption of the aboriginal population into the white national body had been given the scientific and legislative green light in the 1930s, the proliferation of 'hybridities' among whites, aboriginals and Asians created an expanding and untidy plethora of 'racial subgroups' and race mixing combinations that anthropologists increasingly struggled to define. This had by the end of the Second World War 'destabilised the whole edifice of racial classification', and led to fragmentation and confusion in Australian miscegenation thinking.⁹⁰ It was this overextension of ideas of racial 'plasticity' which were just as important in explaining the decline of race science in the global south as the circulation and reception of transatlantic attempts to dismantle race in the 1930s. Furthermore more broadly, with the growing

⁸⁹ Ibid, p.241

⁹⁰ Ibid, p.241

popularity of genetics as an explanation for the inheritance of characteristics, intellectuals were moving away from anthropometric measurement of difference, although rather later than they had done in transatlantic circles. Frank E. Macfarlane Burnet in 'Migration and race mixture from the genetic angle', published in the *Eugenics Review* in 1959, was symptomatic of a broader Australian re-orientation towards a tentative acceptance that hybridity could prove a positive, and that miscegenation was less of a concrete and dangerous issue than race scientists had previously claimed.⁹¹

Within this backdrop of growing uncertainty by the post-war years, the veteran aboriginal protectors, Neville and Cook, had largely stuck to national or localised ideas inspired by the interwar Adelaide school, that absorbing the aboriginal into the white was a policy that should be continued, and were convinced that any Asian or coloured 'infusion' with indigenous blood would be highly detrimental to their cherished whitening project. Anxieties about an internal Asian threat, therefore persisted in the practices of some official actors through into the 1940s, and Asian immigration restriction was not completely abandoned until the passing of the Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act in 1975. Despite a growing consensus that previous scientific constructions of race mixture, and the place of Asian infusion within the blending of races were relatively meaningless, the perception of Asians as an external and internal demographic threat seemed to remain. Miscegenation regulation and micro-management had for a fleeting decade or so offered to solve the problem of the Asian-Aboriginal 'half-caste'. As Birdsell's eventual pessimism showed, imagined categorisations of Asian, Caucasian and Indigenous had been fractured and defeated by the sheer variety of miscegenation that investigators observed in the urban South East as well as the 'reproductive' frontier of coastal towns and outback enclaves.⁹²

⁹¹ Ibid, p.249

⁹² Ibid, p.251

Sydney Scholars in the Pacific

Particularly Adelaide and South Australian race scientists had become fascinated by the prospect of biologically amalgamating whites and aboriginals within Australia's national biopolitical framework by the 1930s, thereby destroying vestiges of indigeneity. But, as Patrick Wolfe and Warwick Anderson argue, we also need to be mindful that other race scientists, many of them associated with or working for the University of Sydney, had by the end of the 1920s increasingly been looking to networks in Oceania to illuminate and contest the growing negative assumptions about proliferating hybridities.⁹³ What investigators such as A.P Elkin, Stephen Roberts and Harvard anthropologist E.A Hooton came back with was a rather different picture of the 'half-caste' that often involved the intermarriage of white Europeans and numerous groups of Pacific Islanders and East Asians, producing healthy hybrid populations that existed in relative harmony.⁹⁴ The Pacific became a nexus for miscegenation studies, and a 'race laboratory' where transnational intellectual currents mingled. As a result two loose schools of hybridity were coalescing, an 'Oceanic turn' that accepted the 'half-caste' could live and prosper, potentially in advanced societies, and more nationally or provincially orientated figures like Tindale, Cook and Cilento who were far more anxious, and assumed the 'half-caste' was degenerate, and needed to eventually disappear into the white community in Australia.⁹⁵

These were divergent views, at polar opposites. But at the same time most race thinkers operating in Australia and Oceania shared assumptions about fixed racial types and

⁹³ Warwick Anderson, *Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific Between the Wars*. *Australian Historical Studies*, 40(2), 2009, 143-160, Patrick Wolfe, "Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race," *American Historical Review*, 2001, 106:866 –905.

⁹⁴ Warwick Anderson, *Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific Between the Wars*. *Australian Historical Studies*, 40(2), 2009, 143-160

⁹⁵ *Ibid*

fixed racial difference. It was in their social and geopolitical attitudes to hybridity that they often differed, adhering as they did to similar modes of anthropometric measurement and biological theory during the 1920s. As Anderson also suggests, methodological flux meant that approaches were often plastic enough so that, as intellectuals such as Frederick Hoffman and Stephen Roberts observed, scientists could point to the resilience of white settler bodies in the deserts of Alice Springs and the tropics of North Queensland and the Northern Territory, while leaving room to claim that the plethora of ‘melanges’ in Oceania and South East Asia were producing hybrid vigour in offspring.⁹⁶ It was one thing to talk positively of white-asian and other ‘half-caste’s in the Pacific living and prospering in harmony with one another, and quite another to suggest that such processes would be preferable on the soil of Australia, a white man’s country. It is therefore important to look to race crossing studies from Sydney, Harvard and the Bernice P. Bishop Museum in Honolulu, Hawaii, and judge the extent to which ‘Australian racial thought drifted in from the Pacific’.⁹⁷ This body of investigation was more transnationally informed than has previously been admitted by historians of racial science, and it therefore important to investigate where Asian peoples fitted into the problematisation of ethnic nationalist methodologies of white purity that sprung from a more Oceanic perspective.

In 1920, the mixed populations of the Pacific represented a liminal ground in which scientific data and research, and the gaze of interwar miscegenation thinking had not yet penetrated. Fears of depopulation in the Pacific Islands began to draw in anthropological investigators. Vaughan MacCaughey had a similar viewpoint to Charles Davenport, and conducted a miscegenation study in the Pacific, published as *Race Mixture in Hawaii* (1919), where he claimed from his observations that Hawaiian-Caucasian crosses exhibited a ‘blend

⁹⁶ Ibid, p.145

⁹⁷ Ibid, p.146

of the least desirable traits' of the parent stocks, and that such unions should be discouraged.⁹⁸

Stephen Roberts was an historian at the University of Melbourne, and had originally focused on narrower national demographic questions, publishing his Masters research as the book *History of Australian Land Settlement, 1788-1920* (1924). However in 1925 he presented a paper at a conference that had been organised by the Institute of Pacific Relations with which, as will later be discussed, Professor Griffith Taylor was also affiliated. The conference examined the place of Australia as a Dominion of the British Empire and its relation to a 'changing Pacific'.⁹⁹ He converted this research into another book, *Population Problems in the Pacific* (London, 1927), in which he examined hybrid populations throughout the Pacific area, and was particularly interested by miscegenation in Hawaii, having travelled there in both 1925 and 1927. Throughout the Oceanic regions to which he travelled such as Polynesia, Micronesia, Melanesia and Papua he identified three major demographic transitions, namely a considerable drop in the population numbers of 'native' Pacific peoples, accompanied also by mass 'Asiatic' migration, which had rapidly led to a 'confusing proliferation of race mixing'.¹⁰⁰

He found the scale of miscegenation going on both overwhelming and fascinating, a boon for the 'racial enthusiast', and also came to the conclusion that racial hybridity was a positive force in the region. In his view, the void of Pacific depopulation was being ably filled by an Asian influx, and that hybrid Asian-Pacific peoples, in addition to rearing physically and mentally sound offspring, had quickly worked out how to live harmoniously in

⁹⁸ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), p.42

⁹⁹ For more detail on the career of Stephen Roberts, see, Australian Dictionary of National Biography, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/roberts-sir-stephen-henry-11539>

¹⁰⁰ Warwick Anderson, *Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific Between the Wars*. *Australian Historical Studies*, 40(2), 2009, p.147

the midst of demographic and social upheaval, and mass miscegenation. Asian hybridity in his view didn't need to be expunged, it merely needed to be observed and tended to.¹⁰¹

Race scientists at the University of Harvard took a close interest in race crossing during the 1920s and 1930s. Conducting studies throughout the Pacific and Hawaii gave American anthropologists the breathing space they needed from the volatile issues surrounding mixed race populations in the United States, while they also felt that their data could throw fresh light upon the efficacy of multi-racial societies.

Professor Earnest A. Hooton, the anthropologist who later helped sponsor the Harvard-Adelaide race crossing study in 1938 was convinced that miscegenation and its positive anthropological construction would be central to transnational interwar understandings of the self, race and place. Having taught a course on the science of race mixture from 1916 onwards, he also sent several of his colleagues and protégés to South East Asia and the Pacific to conduct observations of hybrids. Alfred M. Tozzer, a Harvard anthropologist, was one of these. Going to Hawaii in 1916 and again in 1920, he took the anthropometric measurements of 508 people, and also made a number of sociological enquiries. Among his samples were a number of White-Hawaiian and Chinese-Hawaiian crosses in his family's neighbourhood on the island. He sent the data to geneticist Leslie C. Dunn to interpret.¹⁰² Dunn felt some of his conclusions about 'white-Hawaiian-Chinese crosses' were rendered problematic due to the heterogeneity of the white crosses, which often made them difficult to define according to interwar typologies that often parcelled Europeans into 'Nordic', 'Alpine' or 'Mediterranean' categories. Although 'European-Polynesian' crosses lacked 'hybrid vigour' in the first generation, subsequent generations of mixture in

¹⁰¹ Ibid

¹⁰² Warwick Anderson, "Racial Anthropology and Human Biology in the Island Laboratories of the United States," *Current Anthropology*, 2012, 53:S95-S107; p.97, Anderson argues 'Initially Harvard's imperial vision had focused on Hawaii'.

this direction increasingly came to resemble the European. This also happened in the direction of Asian characteristics in the Hawaiian-Chinese cross, which was leading to Oceania becoming more 'East Asian' in complexion.¹⁰³

A number of American race and climate thinkers who took an interest in Oceanic and Australian affairs, and corresponded in the case of Roland Dixon with Australian academics like Griffith Taylor, favoured or to some extent accepted the virtues of pacific hybridity. Along with Dixon, William Castle and Herbert Spencer Jennings lent their transatlantic voices toward pushing for a more positive attitude to race mixture in the global south.¹⁰⁴ It is through this more Pacific lens, Anderson argues, that we should view E.A Hooton's role in promoting and gaining funding for the Harvard-Adelaide race crossing study in South Australia in 1938, what he sees as a culmination point for several decades of research into racial hybridity. Hooton was keen to promote a progressive and positive view of racial hybridity, and saw a chance to do this in Australia.

Sydney anthropologist A.P Elkin wanted to 'learn the lessons of Hawaii' and apply them to Australia in his work in 1929. In 1936 he visited Hawaii, and like predecessors from Sydney, Melbourne and Harvard was interested in the hybridity that he saw. An expert in aboriginal anthropology in addition to his reading on the pacific, Elkin was firmly opposed to indigenous absorption in Australia. He felt that studies demonstrating harmonious hybridity in the pacific islands buttressed his claims. In a comparable vein to Griffith Taylor, also of the University of Sydney until 1929, Elkin took this even further. In *The Practical Value of Anthropology* (1928), he conjectured that allowing the modification of the White Australia

¹⁰³ Warwick Anderson, "Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontiers of Australia and the Pacific between the Wars," *Austral. Hist. Stud.*, 2009, 40:143–160., p.151.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, p.152

Policy to allow for a controlled amount of Asian settlement of the tropical Northern Territory could work to the nation's advantage.¹⁰⁵

Joseph Shellshear, the chair of anatomy at the University of Hong Kong between 1922 and 1936, who had gained his doctorate from the University of Sydney, conducted research on the comparative brain structures of Australian aboriginals, Africans and the Chinese. He hoped that anthropology, anatomy and ethnology could all be used to in order to smooth over racist tendencies throughout the southern hemisphere. As he put it,

If anthropologists studying the history of man, ethnologists studying the customs of the races, and anatomists examining the structure of the body, can tell one race why another race does certain things, thinks certain thoughts, science will have helped the world a long way to peace, particularly in the Pacific, where so many peoples are watching each other.¹⁰⁶

Twenty four race crossing studies were conducted in the Pacific over the interwar years, and their conclusions often contested assertions that race mixture was unnatural and degenerative. Indeed some such as Harvard zoologist William Castle felt that miscegenation boosted the adaptability of humans, and condemned much of the science of race mixture circulating during the 1920s as negative 'assumption backed up by loud voiced assertion'. Roberts even went as far in 1927 as to call race a 'fictitious entity'.¹⁰⁷ It also seems that some of these intellectual currents flowed towards Australia. Elkin and other University of Sydney

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, p.157, see also, Elkin, *Practical Value of Anthropology*, p.26, and see also Jens Lyng, 'Racial Composition of the Australian People', in *The Peopling of Australia*, eds. P. D. Phillips and G. L. Wood (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1928), 163.

¹⁰⁶ For a more detailed synopsis of the career of Joseph Shellshear, see, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/shellshear-joseph-lexden-joe-11674>, and, Ross L. Jones and Anderson, "Wandering Anatomists and Itinerant Anthropologists: The Antipodean Sciences of Race in Inter-war Britain," *British Journal for the History of Science*, FOCUS—ISIS, 105 : 4 (2014), p.3

¹⁰⁷ Warwick Anderson, "Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontiers of Australia and the Pacific between the Wars," *Austral. Hist. Stud.*, 2009, 40:143–160., p.148

academics such as Griffith Taylor, Grafton Eliot Smith, Stephen Roberts, who later became associated with Sydney, and Stan Larnach were all interested in the potential positives of mixing races, and reinterpreting hard Australian segregation and absorptionist frameworks. As Anderson neatly relates, what was happening with Asians in the Pacific, ‘seemed to them to present challenges to a purely white Australia.’¹⁰⁸

Miscegenation Thinking at Melbourne

Race scientists at the University of Melbourne, as Ross Jones has argued, appeared to have been more interested than some of their Adelaide and Sydney counterparts in articulating eugenic and medical agendas surrounding racial hygiene and the fortification of whiteness.¹⁰⁹ According to Grant McBurnie, Richard Berry, who was the Professor of anatomy at Melbourne from 1903 to 1929 was the main guiding light behind this direction, and particularly focused on what he felt was the necessity to sterilise and expunge the ‘feeble minded’ from the nation, and improve whites through selective breeding, rather than pathologising any specific racialized group.¹¹⁰ Much of his eugenic rhetoric espoused in numerous public lectures throughout Victoria and New South Wales was inflected with class concerns about slum dwelling, lower class whites in the state capitals. Berry tried to gain support for legislation such as the mental deficiency bills presented to the Victorian parliament in 1926, 1929 and 1939, so that those with low IQs, with whom he included aboriginal people, could be sterilised. Professor Victor Hugo Wallace, founder of the

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, p.147

¹⁰⁹ Jones, Ross L., ‘The Master Potter and the Rejected Pots: Eugenic Legislation in Victoria 1918–1939’, *Historical Studies*, 113 (1999): 319–42.

¹¹⁰ Grant McBurnie, *Constructing Sexuality in Victoria 1930–1950: Sex Reformers Associated with the Victorian Eugenics Society* (Ph.D. thesis, Monash University, 1989)

Eugenics Society of Victoria in 1936 and another powerful influence on trajectories in Victorian race research, focused far more on birth control and sexual health.¹¹¹ Interracial sexuality was, as Ross Jones suggests, so obviously undesirable to figures such as Wallace and Berry that they seemed to sidestep the issue in favour of focusing on how social class and social conditions shaped the racial fitness of White Australians.¹¹²

Wilfred Eade Agar was cut from similar cloth, and in 1919 took over from Baldwin Spencer as Professor of Zoology at the University of Melbourne, and later became president of the Eugenics Society of Victoria when it was re-established in 1936. Although more focused on racial hygiene and the effectiveness and fertility of white bodies, Agar was sent a letter in 1918 by Major Leonard Darwin, president of the Eugenics Education Society in Britain, asking if Agar could furnish him with any data or advice as to investigations in Australia of ‘intermarriage between races’.¹¹³ Although Agar did not reply, he did corresponded with Professor of Biometry and Vital Statistics at John Hopkins University, Raymond Pearl. Agar was inquiring as to whether Pearl had any useful data about Japanese mortality and birth rates, and as Wyndham notes, he stated to Pearl that he was ‘keenly interested’ from his Australian perspective about the ‘possible results of admitting the yellow races’. Not feeling in a position to answer this question, Pearl passed on the query to a Dr. Davis, and in 1927 Agar wrote to Pearl lamenting that pieces of information he wanted on Japanese professions, births, deaths and social habits ‘do not exist’.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ On Victor Hugo Wallace, see, Grant McBurnie, *Australian Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume 16, (Melbourne University Press, 2002) <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/wallace-victor-hugo-11943> and, Wallace papers, Bailleau Library, University of Melbourne Archives.

¹¹² Ross L. Jones and Anderson, “Wandering Anatomists and Itinerant Anthropologists: The Antipodean Sciences of Race in Inter-war Britain,” *British Journal for the History of Science*, FOCUS—ISIS, 105 : 4 (2014), p.3

¹¹³ Diana Wyndham, *Eugenics in Australia: Striving for National Fitness*, (London: Galton Institute, 2003), p.142

¹¹⁴ Quoted in *Ibid*, p.142

Agar referred back to this lack of data when it came to speculating on the demographic significance of non-white populations in Australia, and whether racial ‘balances’ should be re-calibrated. In, *Some Eugenic Aspects of Australian Population problems* in *The Peopling of Australia* published by Melbourne University Press in 1928 he asked what would happen in the event of ‘Asiatic’ settlement in Australia. Would the new migrants outbreed whites, absorbing them into the Asian multitudes?¹¹⁵ Agar suggested that these were more ‘academic’ than practical questions and that ‘neither of these questions is answerable at present’, that the effects of intermarriage were ‘impossible to forecast’.¹¹⁶ However, deploying a stock of examples from the United States and South America that other Australian and British race scientists such as J.W Gregory, Ripley and Reginald Gates continuously recycled, Agar broadly accepted an assertion common in 1920s race science that, ‘the mulatto or half-breed is...as a rule, an inferior being’.¹¹⁷ He did speculate on whether such far flung case studies from the transatlantic and the global south reflected ‘real’ biological inferiority, or rather were symptoms of ‘social handicap’ which Cedric Dover claimed bedevilled those of mixed race in the interwar years, but Agar did nothing to interrogate certainties of racial difference.¹¹⁸

Indeed, although ‘the biological effects of Asiatic immigration on a large scale’ were beyond the capabilities of prediction of interwar race science as Agar admitted, his anti-miscegenation stance rested on the time honoured Australian tradition of looking to the nineteenth century experience of black-white intermarriage in the United States. The proliferation of the white-negro ‘half-caste’ had, Agar thought, created endemic hysterical

¹¹⁵ W.E. Agar, *The peopling of Australia*, (Melbourne University Press, 1928), edited by P.D. Phillips and G.L. Wood; with a foreword by J.G. Latham, p.140, see also W.E Agar, *Eugenics and the Future of the Australian Population*, (Eugenics Society of Victoria, 1939). For more on Agar see, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/agar-wilfred-eade-4975>

¹¹⁶ Ibid, P.142

¹¹⁷ Ibid, p.145

¹¹⁸ Ibid, P.142

panic, conflict and prejudice, which ‘does not encourage us to try the irrevocable experiment’ of allowing non-white migration and mixed marriage.¹¹⁹ The miscegenation worldview of this Melbourne conservative eugenicist rested on old Victorian, transatlantic assumptions more reminiscent of James Bryce *American Commonwealth* (1888), and he would maintain his belief in adhering to the White Australia Policy into the 1950s.

On top of time worn examples of the yellow and black perils in the United States, there were concerns in the 1920s that even inter-European hybridity, and the admission of Southern Europeans into Australia could prove a dangerous mix. Melbourne demographer Jens Lyng discussed European races. In *Non-Britishers in Australia* (1928) he investigated the characteristics of what he labelled the three main races of Europe, Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean, and how to regulate their ‘blending’ in order to create a strong European type.¹²⁰ An economic downturn in the 1920s, and a number of anti-Italian riots had led White Australians to question whether immigration and intermarriage from Southern Europe was advisable, whether the physical and moral character of Mediterranean's was unsuitable for mixture with Northern European stock. This echoed the anxiety expressed by Madison Grant and Reginald Gates that even miscegenation between Europeans had to be carefully regulated. Lyng however argued that the Mediterranean type, and each of the other European races migrating to the continent had ‘something to give’ to Australia.¹²¹ When it came to the Chinese, while noting that he felt those Australians of Chinese ancestry could not really become true Australians, he also pointed to their small numbers and the high levels of educational attainment of hybrids, and suggested that from the viewpoint of the late 1920s the Chinese were no longer seen as an ‘nuisance’ to Australia in the way they had been

¹¹⁹ Ibid, P.143

¹²⁰ Jens Lyng, ‘Racial Composition of the Australian People’, in *The Peopling of Australia*, eds. P. D. Phillips and G. L. Wood (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1928), p.5

¹²¹ Ibid, p.6

throughout the gold rush migrations.¹²² He did however express concern about Japanese domination of Pearl shelling and tropical labour in the north, and low levels of population growth. Did white settlers finally need to admit that they needed Asian labour again?

As has been discussed in relation to the Aboriginal question, anxiety grew that white Australians needed to settle the tropical territories of Northern Queensland and the Northern Territory. The capabilities or deficiencies of white bodies in these conditions were a well-established site of speculation for geographers, biologists, anthropologists, and their conclusions had an influence on popular racial-national sentiment. J.S.C. Elkington's *Tropical Australia: Is it Suitable for a Working White Race?* (1905), W.J. Young's 'The Metabolism of White Race Living in the Tropics' (1915) had both focused on the properties of whiteness. Raphael Cilento's *The White Man in the Tropics* (1925), and 'Observations on the White Working Population of Tropical Queensland' (1926) continued this pre-occupation with whiteness, and Cilento had gone further in constructing his 'tropical white man' of Northern Queensland had experienced a successful Lamarckian adaption to the climate.¹²³

John Walter Gregory, Professor of Geology at Glasgow University, described by Warwick Anderson as a prominent 'race purist' was adamant that whites could be successful in the tropical North.¹²⁴ Gregory had travelled from the University of Melbourne to Glasgow in November 1904 to accept the founding chair of Professor of Geology at the University. He had been the source of controversy at this stage his career after his work, *The Dead Heart of Australia* (1906) was critical of potential schemes to settle the central Australian desert. Prominent in both teaching and pushing for the greater acknowledgement of geography as a

¹²² Ibid, p.7

¹²³ Raphael Cilento, *The White Man in the Tropics: With Especial Reference to Australia and its Dependencies*, (Commonwealth Department of Health Service Publication no.7, 1925), see also, A.T. Yarwood, 'Sir Raphael Cilento and *The White Man in the Tropics*', in Roy MacLeod and Donald Denoon (eds), *Health and Healing in Tropical Australia and Papua New Guinea*, (Townsville: James Cook University, 1991)

¹²⁴ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003)

serious discipline, like other intellectuals such as Griffith Taylor he also segued into writing and lecturing on global race migration and miscegenation debates, particularly as they related to White Australia. Described as ‘intellectually conservative’ by Bishop and Leake, and as a patriotic ‘imperial geographer’, he became sanguine about white settlement in the tropics.¹²⁵ This was particularly as it related to anxieties about whether Asian labour needed to be re-introduced into the Queensland sugar industry, after the Pacific Islander Labourers act of 1904 had expelled ‘coloured’ indentured workers from the trade, leaving white workers and their unions to monopolise the punishing heat and humidity.¹²⁶

Much scholarship has focused on the importance of the British Empire Exhibition held at Wembley exhibition grounds in London as a focal point for the construction and contestation of racial and cultural relations between Commonwealth colonies and the metropole. The exhibition, held in 1924 and 1925, was, according to Anne Clendinning, an enormous ‘imperial spectacle’ that was meant to get metropolitan and colonial visitors alike back in touch with the idea of Britain’s empire as a positive social, political and economic global force at a time of reconstruction and recrimination after 1918. However, while King George at the opening of the exhibition framed the empire as a ‘family of nations’, Clendinning complicated our understandings of the staging of the exhibition by revealing that it also, ‘provided a forum in which to critique racial discrimination within the empire’.¹²⁷ The importance of the white settler Dominions of Australia, Canada, and New Zealand was

¹²⁵ Bishop, P. and Leake, B.E. (2009) The beginnings of geography teaching and research in the University of Glasgow: the impact of J.W. Gregory. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 125 (3-4). pp. 273-284.

¹²⁶ J.W Gregory, *The Menace of Colour: a study of the difficulties due to the association of white and coloured races, with an account of measures proposed for their solution, and special reference to white colonisation in the tropics*, (London, Seeley, Service & Co. Limited, 1925), p.226

¹²⁷ Anne Clendinning, “On The British Empire Exhibition, 1924-25.” *BRANCH: Britain, Representation and Nineteenth-Century History*. Ed. Dino Franco Felluga. Extension of Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net, http://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_articles=anne-clendinning-on-the-british-empire-exhibition-1924-25#_fn4.end, see also, Alexander C. T. Geppert, *Fleeting Cities: Imperial Expositions in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), Sadiyah Qureshi, *Peoples on Parade: Exhibitions, Empire, and Anthropology in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, (Chicago, 2011), Daniel Mark Stephen, “‘The White Man’s Grave’: British West Africa and the British Empire Exhibition of 1924-1925.” *Journal of British Studies* 48.1 (January 2009): 102-128

emphasised by their large pavilions, but there were also ‘Races in Residence’, a practice common to many major international exhibitions, where in this case 273 non-white colonial subjects from areas such as Hong Kong, Burma and Malaya were brought in to live and work in the exhibition and be viewed by a curious public. As Robert Bickers adds, the Hong Kong living exhibit was clearly designed to appeal to aestheticized British imaginations of London’s Chinatown in the Limehouse district, with a generous use of ‘oriental’ decoration.¹²⁸ The performance of complex racial hierarchies were therefore central to our understanding of such exhibitions, but in an added twist, discussions of eugenics and racial science, and how such exciting disciplines could throw light on how to maintain and improve the empire, were also part of the exhibition.

On 14 May 1924, a Eugenics Education Society conference entitled ‘Heredity as the Basis of Efficiency’ began in Conference Hall three.¹²⁹ Major Leonard Darwin, the president of the society opened with a triumphalist speech on the ‘racial qualities’ that had endowed white Britons with the physical and mental raw material to build a thriving ‘Commonwealth’. On 21 May, it was J.W Gregory’s turn, and he gave a paper about race in White Australia in which, like Leonard Darwin, he pointed to, ‘the extraordinary characters of adaptability exhibited by sections of the British race, which made it possible for tropical conditions, at least in Australia, to be withstood’. He echoed the attitudes of Cilento that negative ideas about white fitness and ‘Troddenkoller’ (tropical madness) were a misguided critique of the colonial project in the global south, and, ‘warned against the dangers of a mixture of race, attendant upon the introduction of another race for manual labour’.¹³⁰ By this he meant

¹²⁸ Robert Bickers, *Britain in China: Community, Culture and Colonialism 1900-1949*, (Manchester University Press, 1999), p.56

¹²⁹ Annual Reports – Eugenics Society 1923-24, May 1924, Wellcome Library - Shelfmark: SA/EUG/A.16:Box AMS/MF/144 - Reference number: b16230802 - Persistent URL: <http://library.wellcome.ac.uk/player/b16230802> - Catalogue record: http://encore.wellcome.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1623080

¹³⁰ Annual Reports – Eugenics Society 1923-24, May 1924, Wellcome Library - Shelfmark: SA/EUG/A.16:Box AMS/MF/144 - Reference number: b16230802 - Persistent URL:

Asians and the Pacific islanders of the Torres Straits settlements who had previously acted as cheap migrant workers in the Queensland sugar industry, undercutting whites and leading to aggressive union agitation, and finally immigration restriction.

In much of his work on race, Gregory exhibited an extreme anxiety that global balances of power, and barriers of racial segregation had to be maintained, that allowing different primary races to inhabit the same spaces would automatically lead to race mixing, and with it violence and societal collapse. He saw Asian miscegenation as one of the great threats to white civilisation, and reflected widely held feelings of post-war vulnerability. The *Sydney Morning Herald*, commenting on the lecture, triumphantly proclaimed that 'scientific evidence' sanctioned tropical settlement, and it was only 'cheap coloured labour' that threatened this.¹³¹

A year later Gregory elaborated on his view of the miscegenation question in *The Menace of Colour* (1925). While admitting the existence of a loose pro-miscegenation school, in which figures such as Lord Olivier had put together isolated anecdotes and case studies positively describing the South American 'mulatto', Gregory was not convinced. He noted that Lord Olivier, Governor of Jamaica from 1907-1913 wrote in 1906 that mixed race offspring were a 'superior being' to their parents, based on his contacts with colonial peoples. Professor Earl Finch of Wilberforce University, Ohio, wrote 'Interracial problems' and argued when 'racial blending' occurred between 'distinct races' under 'social sanction', it produced a 'superior type'.¹³² The 'half-caste' races could indeed be superior, but they would need social acceptance within communities in order to flourish, and in the American South

<http://library.wellcome.ac.uk/player/b16230802> - Catalogue record:
http://encore.wellcome.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1623080

¹³¹ *The Sydney Morning Herald* (NSW : 1842 - 1954), 22 May 1924, see also, the *Daily News* (Perth, WA : 1882 - 1950), 22 May 1924

¹³² J.W Gregory, *The Menace of Colour: a study of the difficulties due to the association of white and coloured races, with an account of measures proposed for their solution, and special reference to white colonisation in the tropics*, (London, Seeley, Service & Co. Limited, 1925), p.226

and various colonial settler societies, this was often not the case. Gregory quickly dismissed such suggestions.¹³³

Much like several major race scientists, Reginald Gates, Arthur Keith and Wilfred Agar, Gregory claimed that ‘Mongolian’ miscegenation was degenerative by drawing on the studies of J.A Mjoen at the Winderen laboratory, Oslo, looking at intermarriage between Finns and Lapps, whom Mjoen argued were descended from ‘Asiatics’.¹³⁴ Through anthropometric measurement and analysis of medical data, Mjoen had concluded that Finn-Lapp crosses were smaller, weaker, and far more prone to diseases such as tuberculosis than ‘pure’ white Europeans, rendering miscegenation inadvisable.

Most strikingly, Gregory illustrated the ‘continuity of ideas’ between more anecdotal attitudes to miscegenation on the part of intellectuals in the late nineteenth century, and their later anthropological exploration in the interwar years. Herbert Spencer and Francis Galton, and the appropriation of some of their ideas on heredity and evolution from works such as Galton’s, *Hereditary Genius* (1869) and popular conceptions of Spencer’s ‘survival of the fittest’ were as Peta Stephenson argues, to become an important part of discursive processes of ‘race formation’, exclusion and white exceptionalism in the settler antipodes.¹³⁵ In a letter to the Japanese ambassador Marquis Ito, in 1892 Spencer issued a categorical warning that in

¹³³ Ibid, p,225

¹³⁴ Ibid, see also, J.A Mjöen, Race-crossing and glands, Some human hybrids and their parent stocks. The Eugenics Review, 1931, 23(1), 31–40.

¹³⁵ Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Biology*, 1864, vol. 1, p. 444, ‘*This survival of the fittest, which I have here sought to express in mechanical terms, is that which Mr. Darwin has called "natural selection", or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life.*’ For Galton’s theories, see, Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius*, (London: Macmillan, 1869), Francis Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*, (London: J.M. Dent & Co.1883), Francis Galton, "Co-relations and their measurement, chiefly from anthropometric data," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 45, 1888: 135–145, For discussion of social Darwinism in, Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia’s Indigenous -Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007), see also, Kate Bagnall, ‘Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915’, PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007.

his own opinion, intermarriage between the Japanese and the British, as suggested by Ito, should be absolutely prohibited due to what he saw as the absolutes of 'biology'.¹³⁶

Respecting the intermarriage of foreigners and Japanese, which you say is 'now very much agitated among our scholars and politicians,' and which you say is 'one of the most difficult problems,' my reply is that, as rationally answered, there is no difficulty at all. It should be positively forbidden. It is not at root a question of social philosophy. It is at root a question of biology. There is abundant proof, alike furnished by the intermarriages of human races and by the interbreeding of animals, that when the varieties mingled diverge beyond a certain slight degree the result is invariably a bad one in the long run... This conviction I have within the last half-hour verified, for I happen to be staying in the country with a gentleman who is well-known as an authority on horses, cattle, and sheep, and knows much respecting their interbreeding; and he has just, on inquiry, fully confirmed my belief that when, say of different varieties of sheep, there is an interbreeding of those which are widely unlike, the result, especially in the second generation, is a bad one—there arises an incalculable mixture of traits, and what may be called a chaotic constitution. And the same thing happens among human beings the Eurasians in India, and the half-breeds in America, show this.¹³⁷

Deploying an anecdote regarding interbreeding in the animal kingdom, Spencer claimed that intermarriage between the British and the Japanese would create a strain of human being that

¹³⁶ Herbert Spencer to Marquis Ito, 1892, from Gregory, *Menace of Colour*, p.232-234

¹³⁷ *Ibid*, p.233

would suffer from a ‘chaotic constitution’ comprised of poorly proportioned physiques and disharmonious mental characters.¹³⁸ Segregation then, he seemed to advise Marquis Ito, was the natural order of the day. Spencer sent this letter with the disclaimer that it should not be published until after his lifetime, and so it appeared in *The Times* on 18th January, 1904. It came accompanied by a column of denunciation from the editor, keen in the wake of the Anglo-Japanese alliance not to antagonise Japan, painting Spencer as an out of touch Victorian scientist, as ‘reactionary’ as he was ‘mischievous’ as he passed into irrelevance at the end of a long career.¹³⁹ However Gregory reproduced the letter in full in *The Menace of Colour*, remarking that Spencer had been a prescient student of the evils of miscegenation. In arguing against White-Asian intermarriage in the 1890s, Spencer was, ‘advancing a proposition now recommended by leading eugenicists in Britain and abroad’ that future co-habitation of whites and Asians in shared national spaces should be avoided, and that his letter was ‘simply before its time’.¹⁴⁰ By bringing in the newer disciplines of heredity, anthropology and anthropometry to measure populations and confirm the degeneration of the Eurasian hybrid, ‘the old certainties were given new, contemporary explanations’, and the possibility of a Eurasian future for Australia could be scientifically disavowed by those of an ethnic nationalist persuasion, while the assumptions of white superiority and the need to maintain the purity of the British race in Australia through exclusion could be scientifically re-validated.¹⁴¹

Political scientist H.L Wilkinson from the University of Melbourne, wrote *The World’s Population Problems and a White Australia* (1930). Speculating on the future, ‘interbreeding and segregation of races’ that fascinated interwar intellectuals, he warned

¹³⁸ Ibid, p.234

¹³⁹ *The Times*, 18 January, 1904

¹⁴⁰ J.W Gregory, *The Menace of Colour*, P.234, see also, J.W Gregory, *Race as a Political Factor* (1931), annual Conway Memorial Lecture instituted in memory of Dr Conway by the South Place Ethical Society, foreword by Arthur Keith. Keith argued that

¹⁴¹ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Penguin, 2005), p.41

against, 'the nightmare of an Asiatic migration into Australia'. From his own somewhat anecdotal observations, Wilkinson generally felt that the 'results of interbreeding between Europeans and Chinese, Indians or native Africans...is bad from a physical, mental and moral point of view.'¹⁴² However he described his personal observations as 'casual', and not adequate basis on which to construct a concrete theory of miscegenation thinking, and admitted that he felt environment and upbringing could also determine the relative success of mixed race unions. Theories of environmental impact were seeping into anti-miscegenation perspectives and sowing confusion.

Unsure of his own intellectual foundations on the subject, he referred to Herbert Spencer, J.W Gregory and Bill Hughes at length. He also drew upon examples of the United States and South Africa as failed experiments in racial mixing, extending this to a justification of the White Australia policy and elimination of 'Asiatic' labour competition.¹⁴³ On this he sided heavily with J.W Gregory, and even cited the same examples. He repeated conservative assessments of primary race mixture, arguing that it caused both disharmonious and degenerate offspring that would not have looked out of place in the articles of Charles Davenport or Reginald Gates.

Miscegenation between peoples far apart gives bad results which are not eliminated, but are rather accentuated, in successive generations; and when racial stability is at last reached, the new race is at a distinctly lower level.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² H.L. Wilkinson, *The World's Population Problems and a White Australia*, (London, P.S King & Son, 1930) p.187

¹⁴³ Ibid, p.188

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, p.193

He also cited the reservations of J.H Oldham, secretary of the International Missionary Council, who in *Christianity and the Race Problem* stated with reluctance that, ‘deep, ineradicable hereditary differences between races...is a truth established beyond dispute by modern biological science’ and that despite any cultural good will, race mixture could never be favourable as a result since heredity and race were inviable barriers.¹⁴⁵

Wilkinson refuted the arguments of Fleetwood Chiddell in *Australia White or Yellow* (1926), that inviting Chinese, Japanese and Indian workers to populate the Northern Territory could act as a release valve for international racial antagonisms as long as a ‘colour bar’ dividing Northern Tropical Australia and the temperate South East was ‘strictly maintained’.¹⁴⁶ He stated that the political architects of White Australia and Asian exclusion such as Alfred Deakin had been prudent enough to learn that the large non-white population in the United States had ‘nearly wrecked the great ‘Republic of the West’ as Deakin had put it, through a failure of political or biological assimilation. Australia he hoped would not make the same mistakes.¹⁴⁷

Dr Richard Granville Waddy, gave a paper at the 1929 Australian Racial Hygiene Congress. He argued that although White Australia had been put together in 1901, before the international eugenics movement had developed, ‘Unconsciously, the White Australia Policy was one of the greatest eugenic laws ever passed in Australia. A greater piece of legislation could not have been secured for this country’.¹⁴⁸ Meredith Atkinson, the first Professor of Sociology to be appointed at the University of Melbourne agreed, although he tried to distance himself from his former association with eugenics and the WEA. In his edited work,

¹⁴⁵ See, J.H Oldham, *Christianity and the Race Problem*, p.47, quoted from, H.L Wilkinson, *The World's Population Problems and a White Australia*, (London, P.S King & Son, 1930), p.193

¹⁴⁶ H.L Wilkinson, *The World's Population Problems and a White Australia*, (London, P.S King & Son, 1930), p.200.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, p.202

¹⁴⁸ Richard Granville Waddy, ‘Eugenics’, in *Australian Racial Hygiene Congress Report*, 15-18 Sept, 1929, p.63-64

Australia Economic and Political Studies (1920), he drew heavily on the parliamentary speeches of PM Bill Hughes in 1919 justifying Australia's rejection of Japan's proposed racial equality clause in the treaty of Versailles, and stating that the White Australia acts were the country's greatest achievement. 'This is the only part of the Empire or of the world in which there is so little admixture of races...we are more British than Britain, and we hold firmly to this great principle...because we have liberty and we believe in our race and in ourselves...we can cultivate a super-race, if we but furnish the social conditions of its development.'¹⁴⁹ By continuing to prevent Asian immigration, Asian admixture could also be minimised, and by being selective in choosing the Europeans types allowed into Australia, providing a eugenic education about fertility and racial poisons such as alcohol, and sterilising the physically or mentally 'unfit', Atkinson, Agar and others felt Australia was the breeding ground for a superior white type. Although their impact on policy making is problematic to trace, some of these Melbourne scientists were symptomatic of mainstream attitudes in the 1920s. Agar was still asserting the need for the White Australia policy to be kept up 'at all costs' when interviewed in 1948.¹⁵⁰

As we will understand when investigating the racial science career of Griffith Taylor at the University of Sydney, the idea of modifying White Australia to allow some Asian labour, settlement and biological infusion in the north was a trope that could on the one hand be interpreted as a prudent racial experiment that might boost national biological efficiency, or be denounced as an admission of defeat by a proud white nation keen to cultivate a pure 'British type, keep their worker's wages high, and land hungry Asians away from white and

¹⁴⁹ Meredith Atkinson, *Australia Economic and Political Studies* (1920), p.3,4,55

¹⁵⁰ J.A Alexander, 'White Australia-should our policy be revised?' *Herald*, 3 March 1948, quoted from Diana Wyndham, *Eugenics in Australia: Striving for National Fitness*, (London: Galton Institute, 2003), p.51

aboriginal women. Such sentiments exercised a powerful influence on anthropological approaches to race mixture.

As has also been alluded to, Australian anxiety about the global absorption of white supremacy by Asiatic hordes in the wake of European population depletion during the First World War, a nightmarish inversion of what whites were attempting to do in expunging aboriginality, was part of a transnationally constructed and disseminated trope. A number of the aforementioned Melbourne miscegenation thinkers, Gregory, Wilkinson, Agar, in addition to Mjoen and many others, referred directly or indirectly to the American popular historian and race enthusiast, Lothrop Stoddard, and his internationally popular book, *The Rising Tide of Colour, The Threat Against White World-Supremacy* (1921), introduced by fellow American race thinker, Madison Grant.¹⁵¹

Stoddard argued bombastically that the 'yellow' races had been relatively untouched by the carnage of the First World War, the 'white civil war' as he called, and in fact their populations and prestige were increasing, emboldened as they were from witnessing western self-destruction. Indeed Stoddard further argued that the weakened state of the white empires spelt doom for colonialism in China and Malaya which would mean, 'The prompt expulsion of the white man from every foothold in Eastern Asia'.¹⁵² By winning the Russo-Japanese war in 1905, the Japanese in particular Stoddard feared, were subverting their old 'evolutionary bounds', having learned modern warfare from the 'white man's school'. The rules of 'survival of the fittest' were being subverted by 'mongolians', and this Stoddard felt, could be a prelude to a zero-sum race war with Aryans, in which a combined alliance

¹⁵¹ For a discussion of Madison Grant, Charles Davenport and the American Immigration Restriction League, see, Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the Two World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992). For Lothrop Stoddard, see, Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line*.

¹⁵² Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising tide of Colour*, (New York : C. Scribner's Sons , 1921), p.47

between Asian nations, a 'Monroe doctrine for the Far East' could inherit the earth.¹⁵³ In this climate by extension, and this was reflected in much of the public racial discourse in the early 1920s, racial mixture between whites and Asians would ultimately be as unpatriotic as it was suicidal, and represented the relinquishing of biological territory that white civilisations had fought so hard to gain. As J. Liddell Kelly added, democratic institutions were constructed by and for 'homogenous' societies of 'Nordic blood'. In this sense, 'blood' and 'ideals' of whites were inextricably linked, and the sharing of either with incompatible 'yellow' peoples would prove disastrous. Both had to be jealously guarded.¹⁵⁴ This chimed in with American J.M Mecklin in *Democracy and Race Friction*, (1914) who, as Deanna Heath has argued expressed widely held opinions that extended contact between whites and asians could create unwelcome moral and cultural as well as biological changes to white stock¹⁵⁵ Anglo-world culture, a configuration it was felt that had produced a unique character and winning formula for colonisation and conquest, would be dissipated into inferior mulatto values. Unstable hybrid bodies would create an unstable hybrid civilisation, and poor governance. Henry Reynolds argues that in the interwar years there was a 'continuing assault from both popular and the most expert opinion on the figure of the mulatto...and racial ideology passed rapidly across national borders.'¹⁵⁶

As Madison Grant suggested, transport and communication technologies had made the world smaller and more transnationally interconnected, and so white civilisation in Australasia, the United States and in Europe could easily be irreparably overrun by 'the triumphant colored races, who will obliterate the white man by elimination or absorption' as

¹⁵³ The American Review of Reviews, February, 1905, p. 219, quoted in Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising tide of Colour*, (New York : C. Scribner's Sons , 1921), p.23

¹⁵⁴J. Liddell Kelly, "What Is the Matter with the Asiatic?" *Westminster Review*, September, 1910, P.219

¹⁵⁵ J.M Mecklin, *Democracy and Race Friction*, (1914), p.154, quoted in, Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (2005), p.51

¹⁵⁶ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005), p.53

had happened to the Caucasians of Central Asia.¹⁵⁷ F. Scott Fitzgerald even referenced the public popularity of Stoddard's ideas in *The Great Gatsby*, and the effectiveness with which his thesis of race war had been distilled and understood. As Tom Buchanan reflects anxiously in the novel on *The Rising Tide of Colour*, 'Well, it's a fine book, and everybody ought to read it. The idea is if we don't look out the white race will be — will be utterly submerged. It's all scientific stuff; it's been proved.'¹⁵⁸

Fleming and Fleure's Race Crossing Investigation in Liverpool (1924-1927)

But as Stoddard also commented, Britain, which unlike the United States and the 'white men's countries' of the imperial periphery had supposedly avoided the "yellow peril", had finally seen an awakening of 'colour' consciousness, as the working classes felt the pressure of wartime 'oriental' immigrant competition, and a 'breaking of the exclusion walls erected against the Chinese, in British cities.'¹⁵⁹ It was this that drove British physical anthropology and popular sentiment in a far more anti-East Asian direction. The rise of 'racialised nationalism' of the war years was important in hardening British sentiments against the presence of 'colour' in the metropolis. The war experience of Britain and the settler colonies 'reinforced concepts of Britishness and British masculinity that subsumed discrete colonial identities under a common racial and imperial one'.¹⁶⁰ This led working class whites to make stark racial judgements about those they felt were set apart from their own bio-community, and by 1919 this fed into an anti-Chinese sentiment in Britain that had caught up with and been nourished by the tropes of the White Australia debate and fictional narratives.

¹⁵⁷ Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising tide of Colour* (New York : C. Scribner's Sons, 1921), P.303

¹⁵⁸ See, F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, (New York, 1925)

¹⁵⁹ Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising tide of Colour* (New York : C. Scribner's Sons, 1921), p.269

¹⁶⁰ Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and 'Race Crossing': a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on 'Eugenics Old and New', *New Formations*, (2007), 60.

The well known writer Rider Haggard addressed the British government's National Birthrate Commission in 1919. He expressed worry about declining birthrates in Britain and Australia after the decimation of the First World War, and the lack of settlement in rural Australia in favour of migration to major cities. Haggard suggested the commission might start a 'cinema appeal' to bring this to the attention of the 'peoples of the Empire', though he doubted this would have much impact.¹⁶¹ If white women, newly enfranchised, could not be persuaded to have more children as East Asian women did, the British Empire was doomed in the long term. As the *Adelaide Chronicle* claimed, Haggard rightly linked falling birth rate, particularly in Australia, to the potentially 'sinister' consequence of its 'capacity to resist the 'yellow peril', the growth of which he included among the most ominous symptoms of the time'. This warning loosely coincided with a talk that Dr. T. Bradford Robertson had given in Adelaide, in which he 'spoke impressively of the menace to Australia presented by the teeming populations of the Orient' desperate to break out of China and Japan and colonise new spaces.¹⁶² Although more shrill as regards to the future growth of Chinese and Japanese military might, Haggard and the *Chronicle*, linked their view of the "yellow peril" to what they felt was the prophetic work of Charles Pearson back in 1893, arguing that his predictions were becoming true, that unless action was taken 'the higher races might by miscegenation become assimilated in mental and moral qualities to the lower'.¹⁶³ In contrast to Pearson's stoicism, many Anglo-Australians in 1919 found the prospect of this future melange deeply dangerous and undesirable. Low birth-rate combined with the "yellow peril" had become a formidable post-war anxiety throughout the British World, and worries more unique to the antipodes had firmly come to the metropole.

¹⁶¹ "Race Deterioration." *Nambucca and Bellinger News (NSW: 1911 - 1945)* 24 October 1919

¹⁶² "The Week." *Chronicle (Adelaide, SA: 1895 - 1954)* 1 November 1919

¹⁶³ *Ibid*

Indeed in Britain, the need for manpower in the merchant navy between 1914 and 1918 had led to the admittance of non-white sailors, among them Chinese, often leading to interracial sexual liaisons. These workers were not seen as permanent, and so their continued presence in interwar Britain caused rage and anxiety. In 1919 British cities were convulsed by race rioting, as shell shocked ex-servicemen returned to find previous economic and sexual roles displaced through interracial relationships, which in turn led to a spike in police arrests and surveillance of Chinese lodging houses, and voluntary or forced repatriation. As Lucy Bland argues, racial scientists were anxious that the permanent settlement of Asians was ‘another aspect of the dysgenic consequences of the war’ in which large numbers of physically fit white Britons and their highly bred upper class leaders had been killed. This ‘cream’ they felt, should not be replenished by Asians and other ‘men of colour’, a process they felt was rapidly gaining pace.¹⁶⁴

An American observer, G.C Hodges had according to Stoddard noted anti-Chinese and anti-miscegenation sentiments several years before the 1919 riots. In London in 1916 there had been a mass public meeting of the Sailors and Fireman’s Union on Piggot Street in the Limehouse district of London, home to what was seen to be the Chinatown of the city. The navvies protested, ‘against the influx of John Chinaman into bonny old England. . . . ‘the Chinese invasion’ of Britain...they knew that down on the London docks there were two Chinamen to every white man since the coming of war. They knew that many of these yellow aliens were married.’ Although accepting that the First World War necessitated the ‘orientalising’ of Britain’s merchant navy and ports, they wondered what would happen after

¹⁶⁴ Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and 'Race Crossing': a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on 'Eugenics Old and New', *New Formations*, (2007), 60.
see also, Lucy Bland, White Women and Men of Colour: Miscegenation Fears in Britain after the Great War, *Gender & History*, (2005), 17(1)

the war, Hodges argued that this discontent was more than a localised incident, and that Britain would be the next victim of a massive Chinese influx,

Such is one manifestation of the decisive lifting of gates and barriers that has taken place since the white world went to war. To-day the Chinese for decades finding a wall in every white man's country are numbered by the tens of thousands in the service of the Allies.¹⁶⁵

Once seen as more of a peril for Australia, the East Asian puzzle was set to firmly land in Britain in 1919, as returning British service personnel retaliated against what they saw as the white soul of the nation under attack from foreign immigrants.

While popular and judicial prejudice against miscegenation was not the prime driver of the 1919 race riots, it was certainly a factor, especially in terms of the way in which the popular press configured events. Publicity surrounding the Billie Carleton trials sensationalised the idea of the corruption and seduction of white women by Asian men.¹⁶⁶

Sax Rohmer had also released *Dope*, which explored similar themes, and in the same year the British Eugenics Society Congress sat down to discuss the race frictions at home and in empire that the riots had thrown up.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁵ G. C. Hodges in *The Sunset Magazine*. Quoted by *The Literary Digest*, September 14, 1918, pp. 40-42. As Laura Tabili, Catherine Hall and a number of other historians have argued, there was a longstanding shift that had been taking place in London and other port cities throughout the nineteenth century, and ports had long been the most ethnically heterogenous parts of the modern metropolis. See, Laura Tabili, *"We Ask for British Justice": Workers and Racial Difference in Late Imperial Britain*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1994), and C. Hall & S.O. Rose, *At home with the empire: metropolitan culture and the imperial world*, (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

¹⁶⁶ For further discussion of vice trials, press reporting, fiction and the 'yellow peril' trope, see, Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and "The Chinese Puzzle" in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), P.161, Lucy Bland, *White Women and Men of Colour: Miscegenation Fears in Britain after the Great War*, *Gender & History*, (2005), 17(1), Lucy Bland, *Modern Women on Trial: Sexual Transgression in the Age of the Flapper*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)

¹⁶⁷ Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and "The Chinese Puzzle" in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), P.153

As Jacqueline Jenkinson and Lucy Bland both argue, the 1919 race riots were suffused with, and threw up questions of, colonial race prejudices and hierarchies.¹⁶⁸ As anxious anthropologists tried to map out and understand Britain's potentially 'multi-racial' post-war trajectory, negative popular stereotypes about miscegenation and East Asian immigrants now bubbled over and fed the fear of 'hybrid degeneracy' that anthropological studies became steeped in. The 'Chinese Puzzle' had become a scientific as well as a cultural conundrum for Imperial Britain.

Middle class eugenicists were also worried by these developments. At the Annual General meeting of the Eugenics Education Society at Bedford College on July 8th, 1919, Major Leonard Darwin, son of Charles Darwin and Chairman of the society, presided over an in depth discussion of racial hygiene and heredity as a colonial as well as a metropolitan concern. The thoughts of the notable contributors to this discussion, among them Arthur Keith, Leonard Darwin himself and E.J Lidbetter were later published as a paper entitled 'Eugenics and Imperial Development'.¹⁶⁹ Leonard Darwin was the first to express his concerns to the meeting about what other delegates concurred was a lack of eugenic knowledge regarding the diverse peoples who lived and interacted within the boundaries of the British Empire. Indeed he framed Empire itself as the 'greatest racial experiment' that was being conducted with 'a careless ignorance of the facts' regarding what he saw as the potentially negative impact of mass miscegenation.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ See, Jacqueline Jenkinson, 'The 1919 Riots', in Panikos Panayi (ed.), *Racial Violence in Britain in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1996), pp. 92–111, and Lucy Bland, *White Women and Men of Colour: Miscegenation Fears in Britain after the Great War*, *Gender & History*, (2005), 17(1).

¹⁶⁹ Sybil Gotto and Arthur Keith, in the *Eugenics Review* in 1919, debated 'Eugenics and Imperial Development', (Discussion held, after the Annual Meeting of the Society, under the Chairmanship of Major Leonard Darwin, Sc.D., at Bedford College on July 8th, 1919)

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid*, p.125

E.J Lidbetter concurred, but added that the spectre of Asian miscegenation was a problem that could strike far closer to home.¹⁷¹ Drawing on the audiences immediate awareness of the race riots of that year, the real danger lay in the potential ‘vitiating’ of war-depleted ‘British stock, through marriage alliances with Asiatics who make a very undesirable blend with our own people’.¹⁷² While the ‘Asiatic’ had positive qualities when taken on their own, it was miscegenation with whites that would degenerate the British type and destabilise the nation. The call for ‘extensive enquiry’ into how detrimental this blend could prove also points to a consistent theme in interwar eugenics, with a sense that miscegenation in the metropolitan, imperial and transnational context needed to be further investigated if Britain were to be able to harness, control or nullify a future Eurasian population in its midst. A number of other anthropologists and biologists called for similar studies to be conducted, largely without success. G.P Mudge in the *Eugenics Review* in 1920 discussed increasing immigration, conflating Eastern Europeans and East Asians into an ‘Asiatic’ type that would displace and destroy the ‘English’ if immigration was not restricted.¹⁷³

Leonard Darwin later wrote to the Dominion Premiers on the occasion of the Imperial Conference in London in 1923 to argue that the undesirability of miscegenation was a ‘common belief’ that should in part underpin imperial policy.¹⁷⁴ Darwin’s views were shared by many politicians, writers and scientists in the 1920s, but the way in which race mixture was investigated in Britain and Australia proved be a complex mixture of transnationally gleaned ideas and localised, vernacularized assumptions about race that varied and changed

¹⁷¹ Ibid , p.128

¹⁷² Ibid, p.126

¹⁷³ G.P Mudge., ‘The Menace to the English Race and to its Traditions of Present Day Immigration and Emigration’, *Eugenics Review* (1920), 11: 4, 202–12.

¹⁷⁴ Sybil Gotto and Arthur Keith, in the *Eugenics Review* in 1919, debated ‘Eugenics and Imperial Development’, (Discussion held, after the Annual Meeting of the Society, under the Chairmanship of Major Leonard Darwin, Sc.D., at Bedford College on July 8th, 1919), p.127

over time, according to which type of investigator, physical or social anthropologist, or indeed cultural commentator was employing their methodology.

In Britain, Reginald Gates at Kings College London and Arthur Keith at Cambridge were both deeply hostile to miscegenation and convinced of its degenerative effects on offspring. While the British were a hybrid of Celtic and Nordic peoples, Gates felt this winning formula needed to be kept pure and away from mixture with more divergent types. The University College London biometrician Karl Pearson was of a similar opinion. He and his assistant Margaret Moul had conducted studies on Eastern European immigrant Jewish children in 1910.¹⁷⁵ Pearson had become a practitioner of 'national eugenics' in order to protect and rebuild Britain after the war through a biological program of select breeding. Founding the *Annals of Eugenics* in 1925, as a vehicle to make biometric arguments for restricting Jewish immigration, he published his tests the Jewish children's physical and mental attributes, concluding the immigrant children were inferior to British children. As Schaffer observes, 'racial and environmental evidence' was marshalled by Pearson to create a 'powerful case against further immigration... if more Jews were allowed to enter Britain, they would become 'a parasitic race, a position neither tending to the welfare of their host, nor wholesome for themselves.'¹⁷⁶ He added that even if the most 'intelligent' Japanese were brought to Britain, and vice versa, they would fail to integrate, and thereby become a 'nation within a nation'.¹⁷⁷

Fears about miscegenation were also cropping up through the press narration of court cases and metropolitan life in the immediate years after 1919. J.A.R Cairns, an East End judge who later wrote *The Sidelights of London* (1923), as Auerbach notes had an

¹⁷⁵ M. Moul and K. Pearson, "The Problem of Alien Admission into Great Britain, Illustrated by an Examination of Russian and Polish Jewish Children," *Annals of Eugenics*, 1 (1925), 6–127

¹⁷⁶ G. Schaffer, "Assets or Aliens? Race science and the analysis of Jewish intelligence in inter-war Britain," *Patterns of Prejudice*, 42:2, p.202

¹⁷⁷ M. Moul and K. Pearson, "The Problem of Alien Admission into Great Britain, Illustrated by an Examination of Russian and Polish Jewish Children," *Annals of Eugenics*, 1 (1925), p.7

‘enthusiasm for eugenics theory and his belief that the English race must be rescued from the degenerative practices of miscegenation’ which also played into his dislike for the Chinese of London with their ‘decadent sensuality, and...moral and physical corruption’ which ‘guided his approach to interracial sexuality in the East End’.¹⁷⁸

In the trial of Chinese criminal Doe Foon in 1921, covered in the *Daily Mail* and the *Evening News*, Cairns openly spoke of his detestation of race mixing and interracial contact in Chinese cafés, calling for deportation and segregation. Anxiety about interracial sex in the 1919 race riots was revived in the capital in 1920 and 1921 in the statements of the judges and the popular press.¹⁷⁹ Cairns and the press linked cases to stereotypes of Chinese immorality and organised crime, and a critique of interwar gender roles, white female sexuality and mobility. While Chinese men struggled to wriggle free of the Fu Manchu stereotypes attributed to them, other accounts of Eurasian families in British cities were more ambiguous. In an article, ‘the morals of Chinatown’, the *Adelaide Register* reported that in London Poplar Borough Council were requesting the Home Office to take action over the ‘increasing’ Chinese population, through which the council linked miscegenation to the rise in gambling and crime in the area.¹⁸⁰ There were always numerous reprints in Australian newspapers of any material relating to race rioting or mixed race communities in the metropole. However *The Daily Telegraph*, in June, 1920 in, ‘The Children of Chinatown’ painted a different picture of the Anglo-Chinese children and their Chinese fathers of the East End as peaceful, valued and very much assimilated, a far cry from the narratives of difference, menace, seduction and degeneration portrayed on the stage, screen and paperback.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸ From, Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and “The Chinese Puzzle” in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009), P.170

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, P.172

¹⁸⁰ MORALS OF "CHINATOWN." (1920, December 10). *The Register (Adelaide, SA: 1901 - 1929)*

¹⁸¹ *The Daily Telegraph*, 26 June, 1920

The British Eugenics Society secretary Cora Hodson set out in 1924 an anthropometric study of the physical properties of Anglo-Chinese children in Liverpool and London to be carried out by Professor Herbert John Fleure of the University of Aberystwyth, and his assistant Rachel Fleming. Bill Schwarz argues that Anglo-Chinese children were seen to have, 'belonged nowhere'¹⁸² within public and scientific racial typologies, and this study addressed this by situating their 'capabilities' within a 'hierarchy of hybridity and handicap. However by the time the study was published in the *Eugenics Review* in January 1927 as 'Anthropological Studies of Children', scientific methods and assumptions were shifting from biometrics and the idea of fixed, segregate racial types, to genetics and social anthropological explanations of difference.

As analysis of Fleming's results displays, the very fact that observable features not conforming to an assumed 'English' specification, which was never fully outlined and often taken for granted in Fleming and Fletcher's work, were described as an automatic handicap, is testament to the inherent racialized biases that had become 'common sense' in scientific discourse, along with their unquestioning transmission into media commentary.¹⁸³

Although Fleming's tests in 1927 were not psychometric, she made a number of observations about the intellectual capability of some of the Anglo-Chinese children she studied. Fleming noted that some of these children had 'exceptional literary or artistic talent...one of marked musical ability...two cases were of outstanding "general" ability'. She clearly felt that a number of the Anglo-Chinese, despite growing up in some of Liverpool's poorest districts had the innate intelligence and moral drive to improve their station in British society. However this potential and high intellectual ability as Fleming

¹⁸² Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and 'Race Crossing': a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on 'Eugenics Old and New', *New Formations*, (2007), 60, p.28

¹⁸³ R.M. Fleming, 'Anthropological Studies of Children', *Eugenics Review*, January 1927: p.294-301

perceived it she also attributed to a sense of obligation to the Anglo-Chinese community, but also the perceived positive role played by the Chinese husband in inculcating the necessity of study, in contrast to the Negro father, whom Fleming argued was often a less positive influence on the offspring.¹⁸⁴

Fleming argued that Anglo-Chinese crosses were more 'stable' than those between 'negro and white'. Indeed she supported this through analysis of one second generation mixed race Anglo-Chinese male child whose eyes and nose were very much 'English', and who displayed 'marked artistic and mental abilities'.¹⁸⁵ Contradicting British fears of Eurasian degeneration, the hybrid children were highly capable.

But what did Fleming mean by 'Chinese' and 'English' characteristics? According to the study the child's racial features were far more inherited from the Chinese father's side than from the mother.¹⁸⁶ Assumptions were made about Mongolian features as racial markers, such as Mongolian eyelids.¹⁸⁷ The example of the one 'lad' who had one 'Chinese' eye and one 'English' eye implies the possible physical instability could arise from race-crossing, but also that the 'blending' could be haphazard. Although Fleming and Fleure were relatively positive in their descriptions of the mental and moral characteristics of the Anglo-Chinese, this observation arguably would have played into anti-miscegenation discourses.

As regards the skin colour of the sample, although Fleming noted that the mothers conformed to what she defined as the 'fair 'Nordic' type', '68.4% (of the children) had inherited Chinese skin type and colour', with only one of the children having very 'fair, fresh' skin. The reference to a skin type as 'Chinese', assumes that a common knowledge of what constitutes East Asianness and 'yellowness' existed, despite as Michael Keevak has

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, p.296

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, p.299

¹⁸⁶ Ibid, p.299

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, p.300

argued, considerable divergence on defining the Chinese in the early twentieth century. In terms of eye colour, the 'Chinese' characteristics dominated, with 68.4% having the 'characteristic opaque brown' eye of East Asians, and only one child having blue eyes. This was the same for hair type, where 47.83% of the children had the same hair colour and texture as their Chinese father, while Fleming reported that 'No child had the flaxen hair so common among English children, and only one had curly hair'.¹⁸⁸ However many of the children were observed to have an 'intermediate' hybrid type of hair, and citing the importance that A.C Haddon had placed on the importance of hair type as a genetic marker, Fleming resolved to conduct further tests in more detail.¹⁸⁹

In her general conclusions about the data collected on Anglo-Chinese crosses, Fleming's most 'unexpected' findings came from the information collected on head shape. Although she expected 'Chinese broadheadedness' to be a dominant characteristic in the hybrid children, 85% of the children were in fact 'longheaded', which went against the grain of the discourse on heredity, and according to Fleming in 'direct opposition to a statement often made that in crosses between broadheads and longheads, the offspring tend to be broadheaded'.¹⁹⁰ Given that head shape and cephalic index were viewed by race scientists as important racial markers denoting origin and, in the view of some such as Griffith Taylor, intelligence, the fact that head shape in these crosses appeared to gravitate toward the original Nordic shape appeared to, in Fleming's view, denote Nordic dominance, and contradict the view that through intermarriage Mongolian characters would displace the Nordic type. Although coming to positive conclusions about the Mongolian cross where race scientists such as Gates and Keith were deeply sceptical of such divergent unions, Fleming's anthropometric methods and uncritical acceptance of 'English' and 'Nordic' characteristics as

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, p.302

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, p.301

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, p.302

the superior norm very much reflected interwar scientific understandings of fixed racial type and white supremacist racial hierarchy.

In a complaint that many anthropometrists measuring race crossing repeated, the sample of hybrids was ‘too small to be conclusive’.¹⁹¹ Fleming concluded by advocating further and more transnational studies of this form of race mixture, and discussed the possibility of inverting her present study, measuring instead Chinese mothers and white fathers in ‘Chinese ports’ to observe whether radically different characters were passed on. There was a frustrated desire to think more globally and colonially about White-Asian miscegenation that represents a common thread between these local investigators in the northern and southern hemisphere. Feeding back to the main questions and assumptions underpinning the rise of anthropometric miscegenation studies in the 1920s, the perceived depletion and vulnerability of White Europeans positioned within the framework of global racial and demographic competition with vast Asian nations, Fleming stated that her study, and future studies of the heritability of Chinese physical and mental characteristics could have, ‘significance in the racial history of the type’ and factor into ‘present discussions as to the disappearance of the Nordic type’.¹⁹² So her study was one provincialized part of a global debate as to whether Eurasians were physically, mentally and socially capable of living as citizens of white nations, whether mixed race futures were biological time bombs or manageable.

In another article, ‘Human Hybrids: Racial Crosses in Various Parts of the World’, Fleming brought her research observations in Cape Town to bear on the Liverpool question, remarking that race prejudice in both places made ‘intermixture’ undesirable in social terms.¹⁹³ She also drew on the work of Dunn and Tozzer, who studied race-crossing in

¹⁹¹ Ibid, p.304

¹⁹² Ibid, p.304

¹⁹³ Rachel M Fleming, ‘Human Hybrids: Racial Crosses in Various Parts of the World’, *Eugenics Review*, 21, 4 (1930): p.260

Hawaii, with Hawaiian-White and Chinese intermarriage, noting ‘*mixed crosses may present a mosaic of various hereditary factors*’.¹⁹⁴ She was drawing knowledge of the global south and the Pacific to make judgements about the Anglo-Chinese in Britain.

After a talk that she gave in 1927 on her findings, a debate on race mixture was sparked that led the Liverpool University Settlement established the Liverpool Association for the Welfare of Half-Caste Children, which resolved to conduct further surveys of the Anglo-Chinese, headed by Muriel Fletcher, a social worker who would publish a report of the findings in 1930.¹⁹⁵ The findings of the *Report on an Investigation into the Colour Problem in Liverpool and other Ports* were published in a number of Australian as well as British newspapers such as *Cairns Post* of Queensland.¹⁹⁶ Fletcher stated that the ‘half-caste’ population of Britain often found themselves poverty stricken and disadvantaged, and that in particular, ‘Anglo-Negroid girls are almost hopeless from the time they leave school’. However, by contrast the Anglo-Chinese child was ‘declared to be mentally equal, if not superior, to the white’.¹⁹⁷ According to Fletcher’s analysis, with which *Cairns Post* and *The Times* in England concurred, Anglo-Chinese children were less likely to come from delinquent families or be delinquent themselves.¹⁹⁸ In addition their ‘colouring and features’ were ‘less distinctive’ than the Anglo-Negroid, making their appearance less of a ‘handicap’ and their presence seem less intrusive to the pure white community.¹⁹⁹ But still the report inferred that the stigma attached to the Anglo-Chinese was the fault of the ‘half-castes’ themselves rather than the wider population, and that the degenerative nature of hybridity was assumed. The juvenile employment bureau in Cardiff even recommended to Fletcher that

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, see also, Leslie C. Dunn and Alfred M. Tozzer, ‘An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood’, *Papers of the Peabody Museum*, Harvard University, Vol. XI, No. 3, 1928. pp. 211.

¹⁹⁵ Muriel Fletcher, *Report on an Investigation into the Colour Problem in Liverpool and other Ports*, (Liverpool Association for the Welfare of Half-Caste Children, 1930)

¹⁹⁶ *Cairns Post* (Qld. : 1909 - 1954), 6 January 1931

¹⁹⁷ *Cairns Post* (Qld. : 1909 - 1954), 6 January 1931

¹⁹⁸ Muriel Fletcher, *Report on an Investigation into the Colour Problem in Liverpool and other Ports*, (Liverpool Association for the Welfare of Half-Caste Children, 1930)

¹⁹⁹ *The Times* 16 June, 1930, p7.

white women should be prevented where possible from marrying 'men of colour' due to the social handicap for the children. While such investigations in the 1930s were becoming more social than physical studies, Bland argues that any trace of Chinese features counted against mixed race children, and conjured up the Edwardian "yellow peril" stereotypes of opium smoking Asian fathers who had lured and seduced white women into bearing them children that stood stuck between orient and occident.²⁰⁰

Ruggles Gates continued to publish in an anti-miscegenation vein, with his work in 1934 on 'Racial and Social Problems in the Light of Heredity'. Around the same time, Alfred Mjoen further popularised negative ideas about race mixture with the publication of his study of unions between Mongolian Lapps and Norwegians, defining them as what he called 'disharmonious crosses' with inferior capabilities, and a greater disposition towards diseases such as tuberculosis.²⁰¹

It was the British eugenicist K.B Aikman in the Eugenics Review in 1933 who among this anti-miscegenation discourse, argued that not enough was known about Mongolian hybrids. A geneticist, William Castle attempted to contest Aikman's conclusions, but according to Paul Farber, he did not have much impact, and Aikman's was the dominant viewpoint on Caucasoid-Mongoloid mixture of the early 1930s.²⁰² In an article in the Eugenics Review, abridged from a paper that Aikman gave to the Eugenics Society on June 20th 1933, he not only echoed Leonard Darwin, Gates and Mjoen in casting the impact of

²⁰⁰ Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and 'Race Crossing': a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on 'Eugenics Old and New', *New Formations*, (2007), 60, p.30

²⁰¹ Paul Lawrence Farber, *Mixing races : from scientific racism to modern evolutionary ideas*, (Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), p.33

²⁰² Ibid, p.34, on the American 'geneticist' and Professor of Zoology at Harvard University in the 1920s, William E. Castle, see, Michael A. Little, Kenneth A. R. Kennedy, *Histories of American Physical Anthropology in the Twentieth Century*, (Lexington, 2010), p.89, and, Warwick Anderson, *Cultivation of Whiteness*, p.233

hybridisation as negative, but also identified a specific biological “‘yellow peril’ warning’ regarding Asians.²⁰³

Reviewing and identifying with the main cluster of 1920s anti-miscegenation scholarship, Aikman reiterated the dangers of mixing the primary races, and agreed with Gates supposition that inherited characteristics would become ‘segregate’ in mixed race offspring, and create a ‘chaotic, new constitution’ unsuited to a given environment. This cluster of scientists argued that race was the main determinant of human adaptability, and not environment. However the closer these primary races were, such as in Aikman’s opinion, the case of the ‘Dark Caucasian’ and the ‘Mongolian’, intermixture would be perhaps less damaging for the offspring.²⁰⁴

In light of the climate of commercial rivalry between the British Empire and Japan in the 1930s, coupled with ominous signs of Japanese expansionism in Manchuria, Aikman saw ‘nothing incredible in the idea of another invasion of Europe from the East.’ Previous evidence of such malevolent penetration he argued was inscribed biologically as well as historically in the populations of the Hungarians and the Lapps in Scandinavia, groups whom Mjoen had already claimed were definite Mongolian hybrids.²⁰⁵ Professor H. Lundborg had also argued in this vein that immigration restriction was essential to keeping these ‘lower race elements’ of inferior quality out of Nordic and Celtic spaces.²⁰⁶

If race mixture in the British Empire was not studied and controlled in a far more intensive fashion than was the case in the 1920s and 1930s, Aikman outlined two possible dangerous scenarios. On the one hand he claimed that the ‘Mongolian races of Asia...speaking practically...are the most serious menace to the Caucasian race’, and

²⁰³ Aikman, Race mixture, *The Eugenics Review*, 25(3), 161–166. Abridged from a paper read before the Eugenics Society on June 20th, 1933, P.166

²⁰⁴ Ibid, p.161

²⁰⁵ Ibid, p.161

²⁰⁶ Ibid, p.163

therefore needed to be segregated. If Mongolians were allowed to migrate and settle, drawing upon the nineteenth century words of Gobineau, the ‘‘yellow peril’’ would arise as the ‘ethnological future’, and mark a ‘gloomy’ end to white supremacy.²⁰⁷ The other outcome was a future without segregation in which peoples of all the primary races moved more freely and interbred. To Aikman this mass miscegenation would also be disastrous for racial hygiene and the environmental adaptability of the species, producing a stock of ‘a monotonous morass having the colour of coffee and milk’ and leading to global degeneration.²⁰⁸

He also attacked those scientists who had less scathing assumptions about interracial marriage. While admitting that hybrid vigour could arise in the creation of ‘more efficient types’, degeneration and instability were just as likely outcomes. What Aikman bore in common with anthropologists, geneticists and social scientists studying heredity of all persuasions was a frustration with a lack of knowledge and study of the complex implications of union and ‘subdivision’ between the ‘primary races’. The lack of a unified imperial scientific archive regarding miscegenation made it seem presumptuous in the eyes of many scientific conservatives to encourage mixture. In order to safeguard the racial character and heredity of the Anglo-Saxon/Celtic colonising powers, it was imperative to Aikman that, ‘we must carefully study the mass of material which is available’ and understand race mixture in Africa and Asia, ‘if only because this is essential to any intelligently planned scheme of Empire migration.’²⁰⁹

The settler nations of ‘Celtic-Anglo-Saxon stock’ had already, rightly in Aikman’s view, taken steps based admittedly on ‘practical experience’ and contact with Mongolians and negroes rather than scientific enquiry, to legislate to exclude and prevent race migration.

²⁰⁷ Ibid, p.162

²⁰⁸ Ibid, p.165

²⁰⁹ Ibid, P.166

Although the asiatic exclusion policies of Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States have already been noted, Aikman's warning that race mixture was 'much more than imperial problem' that could destroy the 'future of the white race...and through it of civilisation' was explicitly far more apocalyptic, and far broader than much of the narrower interwar scholarship.²¹⁰ This is a powerful snapshot of the early 1930s, and shows how miscegenation was such an emotive topic in the interwar years, and could indeed cause science and fantasy to intermingle in the form of the Mongolian menace.

Conclusion

As the article by Aikman shows, both the "yellow peril" and assumptions that miscegenation would cause degeneration in 'white men's countries' and white bodies were alive and well in the discourse of Euro-American racial science during the 1920s and early 1930s. Anxieties about the racial fitness of both whites and foreign immigrants had been a feature of the debates within the eugenics movement in post-war Imperial Britain. Racial thinkers Madison Grant, Charles Davenport, Lothrop Stoddard, Arthur Keith and Reginald Gates may have had their ideas increasingly contested by the early 1930s, but their negative views about miscegenation were prominent, resonating with transatlantic fears about the biological damage that World War One had done in depleting the numbers of fit and virile Northern Europeans of once globally dominant Euro-American Empires. The British Eugenics Society secretary Cora Hodson and its president Leonard Darwin hoped that through the dissemination of the message that miscegenation was a colonial and metropolitan evil, as Darwin attempted to do at the Imperial conference of 1923, and investigations such as the

²¹⁰ Ibid, p.164

Fleming and Fleure study, weight might be added to calls for legislating to control immigration and racial mixing, preserving the purity of the British race in the metropole.

However the chapter has also taken a comparative Anglo-Australian approach. It has been shown that racial scientists from throughout Australia both vernacularized and diverged from the North Atlantic discourses of racial thinking and the preservation of whiteness, and took it in fascinatingly different directions in the southern hemisphere. From the late nineteenth century and throughout the first half of the twentieth century, various policies and methodologies had been deployed in order to control the reproductive lives of Australia's indigenous peoples. A school of thought at the University of Adelaide, advanced by the likes of J.B Cleland had likened aboriginals to archaic Caucasians, with the suggestion that selective breeding could dissolve indigeneity into the white population. As the chapter explored, drawing on the work of Warwick Anderson, while adhering to elements of North Atlantic assumptions about racial difference, a number of anthropologists in the global south had a more 'plastic' conception of race as something that was malleable, changed in response to environment, and perhaps could even be shaped.

As Anderson and Tom Lawson both argue, this was part of a far wider debate that accompanied what was arguably the genocide of the aboriginals, but the chapter specifically identified that the reality of the intermarriage of Asia-Pacific peoples with Aboriginals, and a growing hybrid population in North Queensland and the Northern Territory was viewed by both anthropologists and officials such as Cecil Cook as a new "yellow peril" derailing the construction of a whitened population. Against a backdrop of widespread support for the continuation of the White Australia Policy among Australian anthropologists, demographers and other intellectuals, the chapter looked at pacific trajectories and anthropological investigations, cross-pollination of ideas between Australian, American and other researchers, and the development of less negative ideas about race mixture between Oceanic peoples.

The chapter also argued that unlike in the North Atlantic, where the taint of Nazism destroyed the credibility of anthropometry and the frameworks behind miscegenation thinking that had been considered mainstream in the 1920s, it was rather the complexity of heritages that the Australian investigator encountered that eventually rendered their calipers obsolete. The Harvard-Adelaide race crossing study in 1938-9 was examined in order to demonstrate this, as by the 1950s social anthropologists and geneticists had increasingly assumed the authority for unravelling the secrets of Australia's hybrid populations and their cultural and physical heritage. Throughout the period between the 1920s and 1960s Australian racial thought stood at a crossroads, slowly accepting that the national future would be a multi-racial body, while reluctant to move away from the pursuit of an ever elusive whiteness, despite the increasing inability of politicians and medical practitioners to agree what exactly whiteness was supposed to constitute. As we will later discuss, the entire framework of racial classification was destabilised by the need to challenge Nazi eugenics in the mid-1930s, but we need to weigh into this the differing rates of change, direction and plasticity that occurred between the Britons of the Northern hemisphere and global south.

Chapter 3:

'Yellow Peril' or Golden Future? Professor Griffith Taylor and Australian Miscegenation Thinking Between the Wars

As has been demonstrated in the previous chapter, in the early 1920s atmosphere of both globalised and provincialized racial anxiety, very few intellectual or public figures in Australia would dare to talk about relaxing Asian immigration restriction, let alone suggesting that encouraging White-Asian intermarriage might be beneficial to the Commonwealth or helpful in smoothing fraught relations with Asian countries.¹ There were occasionally exceptions in the United States and other parts of the British World. Vancouver anthropologist Dr. Charles Hill Tout in 1931 was an outlying voice recorded in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* stating that 'the intermixing and marriage between Orientals and whites in British Columbia would not only settle the race problem, but the resultant race would be superior to both of the present races', solving racial tensions and building a British-Eurasian future.²

However such 'piebald possibilities' were cast more commonly as the stuff of science fiction nightmare churned out in the 'yellow peril' fiction genre, nightmares that stirred up the indignation of populist race pride in Australia. In the 'race laboratories' of Oceania,

¹ On interwar rivalry between the British Empire and Japan, and Anglo-Australian fears of Japanese espionage, see Max Everest-Phillips, 'The Pre-War Fear of Japanese Espionage: Its Impact and Legacy', *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Apr., 2007)

² ORIENTALS AND WHITES (1931, May 25). *Kalgoorlie Miner* (WA : 1895 - 1950)

racial scientists from Sydney, Harvard and a number of other universities had enthusiastically conducted a plethora of studies of infusions between South East Asians, Pacific Islanders and whites.³ As was the case in the study of the peoples of the Norfolk Islands, the product of intermarriage between the white European mutineers of the HMS Bounty and ‘native’ women, the results talked of ‘hybrid vigour’ in the populations.⁴ There was far greater reticence however when it came to discussing the benefits of hybridity in Australia’s internal demographics.

Positive public statements about allowing Asian immigration on the part of political figures did not become more commonplace until the 1970s as the White Australia policy was eventually dismantled. In 1983 future Prime Minister Bill Hayden typified what he saw as the astuteness of Australian’s belated acceptance of the need to engage in mixing peoples as well as economically and culturally with China, Japan and the emerging powers of South East Asia, when he predicted that his country would be ‘better’ as a ‘Eurasian society’.⁵ Recent scholarship however reveals that we can find such assertions far earlier, scattered throughout the colonial archive of the nineteenth century. Kane Collins explored in *Imagining the Golden Race* (2012) an alternative history of racial thinking in the British antipodes that markedly pre-dated the creation of federation in 1901. Collins uncovered a narrative in which, through the interventions of travel writers, novelists and later anthropologists, far more pragmatic attitudes toward Asian immigration to Australia, the inevitability and benefits of Eurasian intermarriage as producing a populations whose brains, skins and physiques would be better suited to settling Australia’s extreme range of climates, at times bubbled to the surface. This work problematizes and complicates histories of the

³ Warwick Anderson, “Racial Anthropology and Human Biology in the Island Laboratories of the United States,” *Current Anthropology*, 2012, 53:S95–S107;

⁴Ibid

⁵ Kane Collins, *Imagining the Golden Race*, p.101, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012)

White Australia Policy that have focused on ‘mainstream’ characterisations of racial antagonism and white superiority.⁶ It is into this more nuanced picture of entwined narratives of the defence and critique of White Australia and the “yellow peril” trope, that we can chart and interweave the career of Professor Griffith Taylor, a geographer at the University of Sydney during the 1920s, who, among other battles intervened in the question of Eurasian miscegenation, and who Caroline Strange describes as a ‘global thinker’ often overlooked by historians of transnationalism and the British World.⁷

The collation of his academic efforts throughout the 1920s saw the publication of his landmark text, *Environment and Race: A Study of Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man* published by the Oxford University Press with the help of Arthur Keith in 1927. The book saw Taylor draw together decades of work in order to construct big theories that unified deep histories of human migration and difference, with Taylor’s specialties in climate and geography.⁸ While some of his contacts such as Roland Dixon, an anthropologist at Harvard spoke warmly of the ambition in Taylor’s approach in the book, Strange and Livingstone identify that his ideas and methodologies would have been seen as clunky and archaic by interwar academics.⁹ Strange even likens Taylor’s ‘environmental determinism’ and the strict conflation between racial type and climatic zones, with the style of mid-nineteenth century ‘ethno climatological’ tomes like, *Charles Pickering’s The Races*

⁶ Ibid, p.104

⁷ Carolyn Strange (2010) *Transgressive Transnationalism: Griffith Taylor and Global Thinking*, Australian Historical Studies, 41:1

⁸ For a further discussion of the geographical theory in *Environment and Race*, see, David Oldroyd, ‘Griffith Taylor and His Views on Race, Environment, and Settlement, and the Peopling of Australia’, in *Useful and Curious Geological Enquiries Beyond the World: Pacific-Asia Historical Themes; the 19th International INHIGEO Symposium*, ed. David F. Branagan and G. H. McNally (Springwood, NSW: International Commission on the History of Geological Sciences, 1994): p.251-74

⁹ See, David N. Livingstone, ‘Race, Space and Moral Climatology: Notes Toward a Genealogy’, *Journal of Historical Geography* 28, no. 2 (April 2002): 159-80, David N. Livingstone, ‘Text, talk and testimony: geographical reflections on scientific habits. An afterword’, *British Journal of the History of Science* 38, no. 1 (March 2005): 93-100, see also, Nancy J. Christie, *Environment and Race: Geography’s Search for a Darwinian Synthesis*, in *Darwin’s Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific*, ed. Roy M. MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994), p.426-73.

of Man and their Geographical Distribution (1854).¹⁰ His critics regarded his theories as old news, and his decision to shun social and cultural anthropology in favour of utilising anthropometrics, with which he lacked rigour, meant that he did not anticipate or drive changes that re-oriented racial thinking in the 1930s, or the gradual decline of the authority of physical anthropology.¹¹

While it was a work that largely dismissed the advances and growing authority of the cultural anthropologist, it was Taylor's use of anthropometric data in order to claim that a relaxation of the White Australia Policy, limited schemes of East Asian immigration into the tropical North, and Eurasian intermarriage could be a fruitful future trajectory for Australia, that proved so controversial in provoking national debates.¹² It was his critique of white settler nationalism that proved so publicly incendiary and provoked ire in campuses and press offices. The publication of the book with the Oxford University Press, coupled with Taylor's broad array of contacts due to his academic travels that straddled global south and north, meant *Environment and Race* reached out of the insularity of Australian racial thinking and became part of the transnational interwar 'commons', much as Charles Pearson's book had done in the 1890s.

Taylor came to national prominence as a critic of Australian settlement of the continent's central deserts and northern tropics, the 'Australia Unlimited' doctrine of E.J Brady and others, led to his caricaturing as the unpatriotic 'Dr. Dismal', but the chapter looks rather on how this became intertwined with his career as a racial thinker and Asia enthusiast.¹³ Taylor's many travels throughout the outback and the Pacific, his prolific travel

¹⁰Ibid, p.30

¹¹ Carolyn Strange and Alison Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.126

¹² Joseph M. Powell, 'Coming to terms with Australia', in *Geography and National Identity*, ed. David Hooson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994): p.259-76, Alison Bashford, 'Is White Australia Possible?' *Race, Colonialism and Tropical Medicine*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23, no. 2 (March 2000): p.248-71

¹³ Strange and Bashford, p.108-127, have given Taylor's foray into anthropology a limited treatment.

writing on the peoples and cultures he encountered, and his fascination with Asia and the need to engage with the 'orient', much as Alfred Deakin had felt in his nineteenth century travels to India, provide us with some interesting clues as to why he had such high opinions of the racial qualities of the Chinese and Japanese.

The Existing Literature

Several historians have addressed different facets of Griffith Taylor's long career. J.M Powell in, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993) has argued that in the early 1920s, 'British and Australian imperialists...reviled him...as a croaking pessimist' in reaction to his environmental and climatic determinism. Large areas of the Tropical North, and the arid parts of central and Western Australia, he loudly exclaimed to cross-societal howls of outrage, were unsuitable for white settlement.¹⁴ Drawing the link between climate, geography and British World settler nationalism, he also notes how, from being considered known and held in high esteem by the Royal Geographic Society in London his cultivation of academic contacts, his years spent at University in England, and participation Captain Scott's expedition to the Antarctic in 1913, Taylor's negative views of white *lebensraum* led the organisation to ignore and isolate him during the 1920s. Marginalisation from the imperial academic establishment such as this arguably contributed to Taylor moving to the University of Chicago in 1928. As Bashford and Strange also note, we get a sense of how the Australian

¹⁴ J.M Powell, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993) P.26, see also, Russell McGregor, 'Develop the North: Aborigines, Environment and Australian Nationhood in the 1930s', *Journal of Australian Studies*, 81 (2004): p.33-45

climate and ideas about Britishness and white racial destiny became intertwined, as public letters to newspapers show just how much Taylor infuriated public patriotic assumptions.

David Walker, like Powell, argues that Taylor's academic approach to white settlement upset a nation that had become attached to the 'Australia Unlimited' idea of a 200 million strong country, that he had been prescient in calling out the excesses of 'boosterism'. By the late 1930s Walker notes that geographers, politicians and speculators were coming round to the idea that Australia's settlement capacity could be more limited.¹⁵ Bashford and Strange have perhaps done most to explore the motivations of Taylor the anthropologist, arguing that his ideas of race had deep roots in his global travels as a younger man.¹⁶ As Warwick Anderson adds in his brief assessment of Taylor's place in the history of Australian racial thinking, 'for every Cilento there was a Taylor', by which he meant that 'Dr. Dismal' faced off against prominent contributors to Australia's biomedical discourse such as Dr. Raphael Cilento, head of the Townsville Institute of Tropical Medicine, who as Bashford also notes was a vehement advocate of white European settlement of the tropics and the exclusion of Asian settlers.¹⁷ However Anderson does little to situate Taylor's racial theories in the context of transnational anthropological discourse.

Although Walker does discuss Taylor's involvement with the institute of pacific relations, and discussions he had with anthropologists about mixed race societies in Oceania, and Bashford and Strange note the influence of Taylor's American academic friends Ellsworth Huntington and Isiah Bowman on his developing theories of race and hybridity,

¹⁵ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999), p.91

¹⁶ See also, Alison Bashford, 'Nation, Empire, Globe: The Spaces of Population Debate in the Interwar Years', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49, no. 1 (2007): 170–201; Alison Bashford, 'World Population and Australian Land: Demography and Sovereignty in the Twentieth Century', *Australian Historical Studies* 130 (2007): p.211–27

¹⁷ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.257

the transnational dissemination and decentring influence of Taylor's views about East Asian immigration and intermarriage have received insufficient attention.¹⁸ It is Carolyn Strange's article *Transgressive Transnationalism: Griffith Taylor and Global Thinking* (2010) that comes closest to addressing this.¹⁹ Identifying the limited scope of the work of Joseph Powell, she argues that while she agrees that Taylor played an 'inflammatory role in Australian public debate over settlement, economic development and immigration policy' this has largely been approached by Australian historians, and approached 'through a national historiographical lens'. However I intend to use Strange's assertion that 'a transnational perspective casts his career and ideas in a new light' to trace the transatlantic and transpacific intellectual influences, but also Taylor's prolific travels to South East Asia and his travel writing, all of which 'inspired his global thinking'.²⁰

In placing Taylor's anthropological thinking in an interwar context however, Strange makes a crucial distinction of which we must be mindful. While Taylor's more global perspective on race, and his opinions that white settlement and the White Australia Policy were ultimately futile goals were viewed by those of an 'insular nationalism' as 'transgressive', and he became an outsider in 1920s Australian public and intellectual discourse, a number of his ideas about anthropological methodology and racial difference, such as his belief in black inferiority were 'far from progressive'. Taking this into account, and as Strange adds, understanding that it is 'mistaken to identify Taylor as an early exponent of multiculturalism' despite his high opinions of East Asians, we can build a more nuanced picture of his career and the interwar environment he inhabited, but also, investigate why

¹⁸ For Taylor's relationship with the Institute of Pacific Relations and travels to Hawaii and Oceania, David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850-1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999), p.119

¹⁹ Carolyn Strange (2010) *Transgressive Transnationalism: Griffith Taylor and Global Thinking*, *Australian Historical Studies*, 41:1, 25-40

²⁰ See also discussions on how to build transnational histories in, Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake, eds., *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective* (Acton, ACT: ANU E Press, 2008).

some scientific conservatives such as Arthur Keith at Cambridge, were willing to listen to some of his views on miscegenation that may have seemed radical at a time when mainstream scientists were arguing against interracial marriage.

Early Career

Migrating with his family to New South Wales in 1893, Taylor began at the University of Sydney in 1899 as an arts student. However with a strong interest in the sciences, he quickly shifted to a bachelors in mining and metallurgy, completing this in 1905. Under the guidance of Professor Sir Edgeworth David, Taylor became proficient in mining engineering, but also in geology and as a lecturer in geography. As Powell notes, he was already networking with ‘internationally-known geographers’ by the time he was awarded the 1851 Exhibition scholarship to Emmanuel College, Cambridge in 1907 for a research degree, later getting elected in 1909 to the Geological Society of London. In 1911 he even had his own book, *Australia in its Physiographic and Economic Aspects* published by the OUP, gaining a position at the Commonwealth Weather Service when he returned to Australia as a result of his connections with Professor David.²¹ His early career as a geographer was gaining steady momentum.

At Oxford he had also developed professional friendships with Charles Wright, Frank Debenham and Sir Raymond Priestley, and along with this group Taylor was taken on board by Captain Robert Falcon Scott as the Commonwealth Weather Service’s representative on

²¹ J.M Powell, Taylor, Thomas Griffith (1880–1963), *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 12, Melbourne University Press, 1990. <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/taylor-thomas-griffith-8765>

For a more detailed history of the Bureau Taylor worked for, see, David Day, *The Weather Watchers: One Hundred Years of the Bureau of Meteorology* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 2007).

the Terra Nova expedition to the Antarctic (1910-1913). Representing Australian interests regarding the impact of Antarctic weather systems on the antipodean climate, and as the leader of the western expedition, he was well thought of, presiding over extensive topographical mapping. Despite the ill-fated end of the expedition with the death of Captain Scott, Taylor survived and was given the King's Polar medal (1913), later writing *With Scott: The Silver Lining* (1916), embarking on international lecture tours and talks on the expedition for the rest of his career, still being active on this in the late 1950s.²²

The contest between Scott and Amundsen became immortalised in the folklore of the British Empire. As Powell argues, supported by countless newspaper articles that covered his books, articles and lecture tours of his Antarctic experiences, '*the mystique of the Terra Nova episode assisted his early professional career*'.²³ Crucially it also gave him the celebrity platform as a hero of the Empire that allowed him to disseminate his scientific views candidly and widely in public and academic circles as his career in anthropology became more established during the 1920s. Furthermore his experiences of hardship left him a tough and outgoing character, which certainly came into play in weathering the rhetorical storms that his later expositions on climate, Asia and racial hybridity provoked, opinions that some white Australians found hard to accept.

Gaining his doctorate from the University of Sydney in 1916, Taylor was highly keen to further develop his academic career and support his new family. He stayed on and became a senior researcher at the Weather Service in the bureau of meteorology which had been established in 1908, and was administered by the Department for Home Affairs while the federal capital was still at Melbourne.²⁴ Taylor was prolific in researching and writing

²² Ibid

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.82

reports on meteorology, agriculture and the colonising capability of white bodies, for the departmental bulletins that were reproduced and housed in major libraries throughout the empire.²⁵

As a meteorologist he developed a scale called a 'climograph'. Using data gathered on monthly temperature averages, Taylor mapped out descriptions of whether the weather was, 'scorching', 'keen', 'muggy' or 'raw'.²⁶ He also attached to the climograph a, 'tentative scale of discomfort', an analytical tool of his own devising, and in his 1916 climograph claimed that Darwin and Brisbane were too humid and 'uncomfortable' for effective settlement by 'the average Britisher' whereas the more temperate climates around Sydney and Melbourne were more comfortable for the white settler.²⁷ Plotting the climograph on a world instead of a national map, 'he gave the problem of White Australia a transnational turn by substituting his own question: *'What are the experiences of whites in similar climates elsewhere?'*²⁸ Professor J.W Gregory at Glasgow was sceptical of the usefulness of the climograph scale, feeling that he had cast the whites as overly feeble, and the two would continue to publicly disagree in the 1920s about the properties of whiteness and climate.²⁹ It was at this point, the immediate post-war years, that the core points of his wartime estimates; that whites were not capable of mass colonisation of the tropics and deserts, and that the

²⁵ J.M Powell, Taylor, Thomas Griffith (1880–1963), *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 12, Melbourne University Press, 1990. <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/taylor-thomas-griffith-8765>

²⁶ Strange, p.34

²⁷ Griffith Taylor, *The Control of Settlement by Humidity and Temperature (with special reference to Australia and the Empire, an Introduction to Comparative Climatology*, Bulletin no. 14 (Melbourne: Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology, September 1916): 8, see also, *The control of settlement, with special reference to Australia and the Empire*, (1916)

²⁸ Griffith Taylor, 'The Settlement of Tropical Australia', *Geographical Review* 7 (1919): p.84, quoted in Strange, p.34

²⁹ Griffith Taylor Papers, National Library of Australia, MS1003, 9/1207 J. W. Gregory, Professor, Geology, University of Glasgow to Taylor, 02/04/1917, However in much of his later work, particularly *Environment and Race* (1927) Taylor cited Gregory frequently and referred to his work on Australian and global geography with marked deference and respect. The outbreak of the First World War changed the complexion and the imperatives of the service, a much needed relief for Taylor's self-confessed boredom. The research of the Weather Service was now geared towards military questions, as it was brought under the intelligence branch within the Department of Home Affairs, Taylor also conducting teaching for the war effort at the Commonwealth Flying School between 1914 and 1918.

Australia population would not climb above twenty million by the end of the century, began to land him in hot water as he stubbornly positioned himself at odds with the fantasy of 'Australia Unlimited'.

The Victorian writer and traveller Edwin James Brady had done much to help popularise this idea. As colonial rivalries such as the scramble for Africa had intensified in the late nineteenth century, empty spaces had increasingly become synonymous with power, prestige, and potential. Brady was a passionate exponent, and his calculations and research trips in the 1910s, covered by local and national newspapers, convinced him that hardy white settlers, armed with up to date scientific methods could terraform the Australian interior and sustain a population explosion.³⁰ Looking to help spark what he hoped would be an international settler rush to rival the gold rushes of the 1850s, Brady published *Australia Unlimited* in 1918, an exhaustive 1150 page account of the properties and what he saw as the great potentialities of the lands in all Australia states and Papua New Guinea, that was widely advertised and reviewed, even receiving endorsement from King George V.³¹ But such bombastic rhetoric disguised ongoing anxieties about the numerical inferiority of white settlers, and a seeming inability to effectively occupy tropical and desert spaces as 'teeming' Asian nations looked on. It was this nerve that Taylor so continuously struck.

Although such 'possibilists' often put together wildly over-optimistic and divergent estimates about Australia's population limit based on inconsistent topographical and climatic measurements, from 100 million to 500 million, they became a rallying point for a new kind of interwar racial-scientific nationalism.³² Rapheal Cilento director of the Institute of

³⁰ "Australia Unlimited" *Cairns Post (Qld. : 1909 - 1954)* 31 July 1913

³¹ Edwin James Brady, *Australia Unlimited*, (Melbourne : G. Robertson and Company, Propy. Ltd, 1918) <https://archive.org/details/australiaunlimit00bradrich> For more on E.J Brady and the 'Australia Unlimited' doctrine, see, Australian Dictionary of National Biography, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/brady-edwin-james-5335> see also, National Archives of Australia, A659 1943/1/3907, P.55

³² J.M Powell, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993), p.30

Tropical Medicine in Townsville, was a focal point for this thinking, convinced that the white man could thrive as a tropical race. In *The White Man in the Tropics* (1925) he claimed that his own research was bearing evidence of the emergence of a tropical type, ‘evolving’ in front of his eyes in North Queensland. He claimed that the mixing of the European races among the dock workers and other peoples that he studied, and the largely successful prohibition of the intermarriage and breeding between whites and non-whites, combined with new preventive medicines to cure tropical afflictions that had previously bedevilled colonisation of such spaces by Anglos, had created a positive hybrid, a ‘more virile white man north of Capricorn’, as Warwick Anderson puts it. Cilento described the type as,

Tall and rangy, with somewhat sharp features, and long legs and arms...inclined to be sparely built, he is not, however, lacking in muscular strength, while his endurance is equal in his own circumstances to that of the temperate dweller in his. This North Queenslander moves slowly, and conserves muscular heat producing energy in every possible way.³³

If this positive biological ‘Lamarckian’ changing process was occurring in Northern Queensland, then surely it could also be stimulated in the Northern Territory? As Bashford has argued, The Australian Medical Congress attempted to form a patriotic consensus on the ‘populate or perish’ question when it stated in 1920 that medically speaking there were no ‘insuperable obstacles’ to white settlement of tropical parts of Australasia.³⁴

³³ Warwick Anderson, “Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontiers of Australia and the Pacific between the Wars,” *Austral. Hist. Stud.*, 2009, 40:143–160.

³⁴ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.84

In critiquing the geographic and biological assumptions underpinning this ‘Australia Unlimited’ with his own thesis, ‘Useless Australia’, Taylor was quickly branded as unpatriotic and an environmental determinist by politicians, scientists, and settlement boosters.³⁵ His article, ‘Nature versus the Australian’ caused upset, and Taylor came to be labelled ‘Dr. Dismal’ in the press. He even lobbied the Federal Research Council bemoaning schemes such as the North-South continental railway and the political consensus toward future development of what he saw as useless arid land in the central regions.³⁶ Bashford argues this was not unlike when J.W Gregory provoked outrage when he wrote *The Dead Heart of Australia* (1906), although he changed his views and often disagreed with Taylor. Daisy Bates fought a battle with Taylor in the papers, arguing that his ideas showed he lacked the patriotism, masculine pride and daring of the nineteenth century British pioneers, which upset Taylor, as a career explorer and travel writer.³⁷

Australia is going to be forever British...whether yellow labour...tries to hinder, it will be British sinew and British grit and British money that will win out in the end, as surely as it was British grit that won out in the beginning.³⁸

³⁵ Ibid, p.119-122. For a broader discussion of settlement and climate debates, see, Alison Bashford, *Global Population: History, Geopolitics, and Life on Earth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014).

³⁶ Griffith Taylor Papers, National Library of Australia, MS1003, 9/658 – Taylor to Mr Cambage, Federal Research Council. One page, pencil copy. 16/03/1921.

³⁷ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.127

³⁸ Quoted in, J.M Powell, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993), p.26, see also, Daisy M. Bates, ‘A Protest: British Pioneers and Australia’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 1924 (n.d.), Taylor Papers, NLA MS 1003, Box 18, item 735.

Canadian Arctic explorer and anthropologist Vilhjalmur Stefansson also arrived in Australia and disagreed with Taylor, he was a possibilist, and the standoff between the two also played out in the newspapers.³⁹ However Taylor continued to weather the media mud-slinging, despite the advice of Harvard geographer Isaiah Bowman to stop and take a more positive, less confrontational approach. His ideas were taken seriously in official and academic circles, and he won some international recognition as a prominent geographer, a platform that later allowed him to talk about his racial views widely.

The University of Western Australia's governors in 1921 banned his book 'Australia' (1911) from the examination reading list because they were upset by his description of parts of the state as 'arid', accusations they felt could harm the state's image as a settler destination. He refused to tone down his language and increasingly saw himself as an embattled scientific prophet. He felt that geography and later anthropology should be used by governments in their construction of the nation, and saw his role as that of an educator seguing between the academic and public spheres, shaping and enlightening Australian opinion. According to Bashford, Taylor saw himself as a 'national planner'.

This confrontational and high handed approach didn't seem to stop his advancement, as he became associate Professor and the founding scholar of the brand new Geography department at the University of Sydney in 1920. His maverick outlook and profile, and his syllabus attracted students and Taylor designed his geography course to reflect his views but also dabble in racial thinking, continuing to publish prolifically. Even more controversially than daring to question the potential of Australia's open spaces, he publicly speculated that if whites couldn't colonise these spaces, then who could? Becoming more and more interested in race and hybridity, it was his scientific arguments about the superiority of Asians, their

³⁹ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.131

suitability as tropical colonists, and the inevitability and desirability of Asian-British intermarriage on the part of the grandchildren of the interwar generation, when he felt China would become a great power, that did most to upset the certainties of the White Australia Policy.⁴⁰

He was also influenced by Oxford geographer Andrew J. Herbertson's idea of 'systematic geography', dividing the globe into twelve sections of settlement, and from this he developed 'homoclimate maps to trace the limits of white migration'.⁴¹ Townsville he said had a similar climate to Calcutta, Brisbane was similar to Fuzhou, and Sydney was similar to Shanghai. Further north than Melbourne, which Taylor likened to Oporto, Australia's climate was mostly Asian. Only Hobart had what Taylor characterised as an 'English' climate. This directly contradicted the Randolph 'Bedfordism' and the overambitious 1920s dream of white 'race building' in the north.⁴² Taylor was felt to be a poor judge of climatology, and his contention that most of Australia's climate was Asian was, according to a number of his critics, particularly in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, based on his spending eleven years in the colder climate of England during his childhood and University studies.⁴³ Cold climates defined Taylor's geography career and his perceptions of racial difference. The British connection, rather than lending him national credibility, cast him in Australian eyes as an intellectual imposter and national sell out by characterising the continent as an

⁴⁰ J.M Powell, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993), p.27, see also, Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.91-97,106-107.

⁴¹ Strange, p.34

⁴² Randolph Bedford, the prolific writer and advocate of Australian White Nationalism, has been mentioned throughout the thesis, but for more on his career, racial and national ideas, see, Elizabeth Schafer, Susan Bradley Smith, Veronica Kelly eds. *Playing Australia: Australian Theatre and the International Stage*, (New York, 2003), and Boland, Rodney G., 'Bedford, George Randolph (1868 - 1941)', in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, vol. 7, *Melbourne University Press, Melbourne*, 1979, pp. 241-242, at <http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A070240b.htm>, and, Randolph Bedford Papers and Artefact, c. 1903 - c. 1941, OM64-29; John Oxley Library, Manuscripts and Business Records Collection, State Library of Queensland

⁴³ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850-1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999), p.119

Asian climate fit for Asian people, although the American Ellsworth Huntington approved of these ideas. Taylor's implication that the 'mulatto' of Brazil would make a better colonist for Queensland caused annoyance at his 1923 address to the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science in Wellington, as, 'these were hardly the sorts of immigrants to pass the dictation test.'⁴⁴

In opposition to 'possibilists' such as Brady and Cilento who were sanguine about the extent to which Australian society could use modern methods to adapt to the tropic environment, Taylor was a marginal 'environmental determinist', agreeing with Ellsworth Huntington in 'Climate and Civilisation' (1915). Before *Environment and Race*, Taylor had been talking about homoclimes and zones of comfort as 'potent factors in the spread of white civilisation' and other racial groups, the 'yellow race' could live 'within wider limits than the white race.'⁴⁵

Even nine years before *Environment and Race*, Taylor's determinism cast 'an Australia settled exclusively by Britishers as a pipe dream because it violated environmental laws' and heavily implied Asians were climatically more adaptable for filling these spaces.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Strange, p.35

⁴⁵ Griffith Taylor, 'The Climatic Factors Influencing Settlement in Australia', Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia, containing authoritative statistics for the period 1901_1917, vol. 11 (Melbourne: McCarron, Bird and Co., 1918): 1, 14, 3, 4, quoted in Strange, p.35

⁴⁶ Strange, p.35

From Clouds to Calipers: Taylor the Physical Anthropologist

If whites weren't suitable for mass tropical settlement, who was, and what could this mean for a racially homogenous White Australia? On nineteenth February 1919 Major General James Legge, Chief of the General Staff sent a letter to the Secretary at the Home and Territories Department, headed 'Asiatic Settlement in Tropical Countries'. It referred to an article in the Commonwealth Year Book which described investigations by an officer of the Weather Bureau into climatic conditions controlling settlement of the Northern Territory by the white race. Legge suggested that he would like to see similar inquiry in relation to the hypothetical settlement of the Chinese and Japanese in Australian and Southeast Asian tropical zones. It was Taylor who took up the study. Through this research, he began to codify and explore fascinations that he had had from his youth about racial types, racial difference, and the idea that broad theories could be constructed that linked geography, meteorology and race science.⁴⁷ He also became increasingly enthusiastic about the ideas that Asians were not only an older and therefore more developed race than the Nordics, but that they were physically and mentally more versatile as tropical colonists.

Strange however argues that Taylor's active interest in racial difference went as far back as 1905 and his first lecture entitled 'Antiquity of Man'.⁴⁸ As Strange also re-evaluates in contrast to other historians of his career, despite his discussion of hybridity he was no 'early exponent of multiculturalism'.⁴⁹ This is not to however to say that he was not

⁴⁷ Griffith Taylor Papers, National Library of Australia, MS1003,4/112 Chief of the General Staff to Secretary, 19/02/1919

⁴⁸ See, Walker, 'Climate, Civilization and Character in Australia', Australian Cultural History 16 (1997_98): p.77-95, and, see Taylor Papers for his lectures in 1905-1907, 9/554 the program for "Sydney University Extension Lectures, Tamworth, by T. Griffith Taylor, B.Sc., B.E." The first, 20/08/1906, is "Corals and Coral Islands". Others: "The Antiquity of Man" and "Coal and Gold". Also, printed outline for a GT Lantern Lecture on The Great Barrier Reef.

⁴⁹ Strange, p.38

fascinated by his travels to Asia, and his imagination of the wonders of the figurative ‘Orient’, about which he composed verses, arguably, along with his academic influences, shaped his interest in Eastern civilisations and cultures.⁵⁰ Strange and Bashford even note that as a boy he reminisced about his fascination at seeing a ‘Chinaman’ in London with long dark pigtail.⁵¹

In 1919 he was prolific in making enquiries and trying to draw on his contacts racial expertise in Australia and the United States. He was first referred to Dr. Currell in Kensington, Victoria, a scientist who was known to have had considerable experience among ‘Mongolians’. Asking questions about the impact of climate on race variation and the Mongolian type, Taylor noted his frustration that the letter was ‘not answered’.⁵² This did not deter him however, and he was able to gain advice on race, climate and the ice ages from his old protégé Professor Edgeworth David, who proved to be an important influence throughout.⁵³ He also wrote to Professor Laby, a physics Professor at the University of Melbourne with questions about race and geography.⁵⁴ Taylor was very keen to get his research on future white settlement published quickly and disseminated internationally. To help further these ambitions, he wrote to Bert Priestley at Leeds asking him to help pass on his manuscript on ‘the future of white settlement’ in White Australia to the American Geographic Society, as he speculated that the Royal Geographic Society would not publish the paper speedily enough.⁵⁵

⁵⁰ Taylor papers, 6/223-225, Box 12, 119 - To Bill, 14/12/1946. Taylor comments on a performance of *The Mikado*, a play he saw several times and enjoyed. Taylor Papers, 9/880 - 1907. Verses written by Taylor while at the University of Cambridge, entitled “Twilight Travels”, covered by a half-page note with some explanation of the circumstances of their composition. comedic verse written by Taylor in 1907 imagining himself travelling across the figurative orient on a magic carpet. Like Deakin and Higston the East fascinated this Australian.

⁵¹ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.104

⁵² Griffith Taylor Papers, National Library of Australia, MS1003, 4/127/69b, Taylor to Dr Currell, Kensington, Victoria. 16/01/1919.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 4/127/72b, To Prof. Edgeworth David.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 4/127/80b, To Pater. 01/08/1919.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 4/127/56b, To Bert Priestley, Leeds. 07/07/1919.

The study was a eureka-moment for Taylor, and he later scribbled a note on Legge's letter stating clearly, 'this letter started my anthropological research'.⁵⁶ From this point onwards he increasingly focused on building theories of racial distribution and hybridity, but also Asian superiority as the most advanced human type, and the inevitability of miscegenation and biological coalescence between Asians and Europeans. In the atmosphere of white chauvinism and anti-Asian anxiety in the 1920s, there was a futuristic cosmopolitanism and mischief to Taylor's scientific views and his argumentative persona that destabilised public and academic consensuses on racial hierarchy and racial exclusion. Taylor developed several theoretical tools in the 1920s in his efforts to 'educate' Australian public opinion, and persuade politicians and intellectuals that the White Australia Policy was misguided, Asians were at least 'our equals', and that hybridity was a past present and future fact of human evolution.

Taylor, unlike his interwar contemporaries, was keen to draw together his numerous academic interests in order to write interdisciplinary geo-racial deep histories. Although Strange argues that interdisciplinary approaches later became fashionable after the Second World War, in the 1920s they were not.⁵⁷ He brought 'Victorian racial science and environmental determinism' into the 1920s. His affinity for deep history paralleled the Annales School of historians driven by nineteenth century polymath and geographer Alexander von Humboldt, and later typified by Lucien Febvre and Fernand Braudel, who brought the analysis of long term geographic trends into the historical fold.⁵⁸ He was also

⁵⁶ 4/112, from Chief of the General Staff to Secretary nineteenth February, 1919, 'Asiatic Settlement in Tropical Countries'. Reference to article in the Commonwealth Year Book which regarding investigations into climatic conditions controlling white settlement of Tropical Australia Legge wanted to see similar inquiry in relation to settlement of the Chinese and Japanese races. Taylor noted, 'this letter started my Anthropological research'.

⁵⁷ On this, see recent approaches to Australia in terms of the history of the 'Anthropocene' period in, Alison Bashford, 'The Anthropocene is Modern History: Reflections on Climate and Australian Deep Time,' *Australian Historical Studies*, 44, 3 (2013): 341–49.

⁵⁸ For more on this, see, William H. McNeill, 'Fernand Braudel, Historian', *History and Theory*, 73, no. 1 (2001): p.133-46

heavily influenced by Halford Mackinder and Isiah Bowman. Mackinder in his famous article ‘The Geographical Pivot of History’ (1904) had argued that geography, human migration, global population growth, and the ability of different groups to inhabit different environments, much like Taylor had discussed on homoclimes, in fact had powerful geopolitical importance in shaping the future of the British Empire.⁵⁹ Taylor’s long-time friend Isiah Bowman was creating similar models, and Taylor as an increasingly ‘global forecaster’ contributed a chapter on Australia to Bowman’s book on global settlement.⁶⁰ Deep history in Taylor’s mind became combined with answering contemporary questions of immigration restriction, Asian exclusion and international rivalry.

In his further work on Zones and Strata and Migration zone theories, he was influenced by his interpretation of W.D Matthew’s *Climate and Evolution* (1915) which convinced him that Africa was not the epicentre for the migration of the human species. He believed in monogenesis, but argued Central Asia rather than sub Saharan Africa was the cradle of humanity, and that the oldest race was the Asiatic rather than the negro. The less evolved races were pushed out of Central Asia, while the Mongolian type, the most developed type, persisted there. This was at a time when other intellectuals such as Grafton Eliot Smith were positing alternative ideas, in his case ‘diffusionism’ from Egypt, that contradicted the Nordicism of popular race thinkers such as Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard who traced migrations from Sub Saharan Africa to Europe as the process by which the superiority of the Northern European races was constructed. The less evolved races were pushed out of Central Asia, while the Mongolian type, the most developed type, persisted there.⁶¹ Alpines, having spread out both eastwards and westwards in a wave of migration

⁵⁹ Halford J. Mackinder, ‘The Geographical Pivot of History’, *The Geographical Journal*, 23:4 (1904), 421-437.

⁶⁰ Griffith Taylor, ‘The Possibilities of Settlement in Australia,’ in *Limits of Land Settlement*, ed. Isiah Bowman (New York: Council of Foreign Relations, 1937), p.195-227, see also, Strange, p.38

⁶¹ Ross L. Jones and Anderson, “Wandering Anatomists and Itinerant Anthropologists: The Antipodean Sciences of Race in Inter-war Britain,” *British Journal for the History of Science*, FOCUS—ISIS, 105 : 4 (2014)

from the central Asian zone, were among the most developed types in Europe. As he argued in *Environment and Race*, horizontal rather than vertical distribution of human population over millennia meant that broadly Alpine Europeans and Mongolians were of the same evolutionary band.

One result of the study of the distribution of man is to lead the writer to the belief that the so-called 'yellow' or Mongolian typed man is a later product of human evolution than many western members of the so-called 'white' or European type...Eastern Asiatic is farther from the primitive anthropoid stock, while the negroid and West-European peoples are earlier, lower offshoots from the line of human evolution.⁶²

He had long been interested by race mixing and had made observations of aboriginal, pacific and Asian people. He felt that hybridity in humans was a reality, just as tropical and desert climates were a reality of Australia's ecology, and he wanted to prove this to the Australian public so that they could make more 'informed' choices about the national future. But as Gavin Long's later explained to Taylor when he wrote about how Asian immigration would upset 'race feeling' in White Australia, Taylor's lessons were not those that the public were likely to accept.⁶³

Taylor engaged initially in the early 1920s dabbled in both cultural and physical anthropology. He was often criticised however for his lack of rigour in his behavioural and linguistic observations of aboriginal and South East Asian people, spending days with these

⁶² Griffith Taylor, *Environment and Race: A Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), p.338

⁶³ Griffith Taylor Papers, National Library of Australia, MS1003, 9/956, Gavin Long to Taylor, 08/07/1928.

communities when experienced cultural anthropologists would have spent months. A.C Haddon after the Pan Pacific Science Congress in 1923 advised Taylor to move towards physical anthropology, although Taylor was still committed to making detailed linguistic studies in his field notes.⁶⁴ Taylor's use of cultural material to help flesh out his theses of migration and racial hybridity were often highly anecdotal and generalised. For instance he was given to argue that different peoples around the world, geographically far removed, had similar cultural practices based on their similar cephalic readings. By this logic, the Japanese and the Maori, both with a cephalic index of 78, also both practiced tattooing in their cultures, and therefore must have migrated from the same geographic zone at the same time.⁶⁵ By the mid-1920s he had woven together these haphazard ideas plucked from cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, ethnology and geography. While he was a keen believer in racial hybridity, he was still committed to ideas of fixed racial differences and root stocks, and black and aboriginal inferiority, believing that pure aboriginals were destined for extinction, and that the 'negro' was lowest on the evolutionary scale.⁶⁶

In the early 1920s physical anthropology and anthropometric measurement were the dominant methods used to measure human difference and assess the consequences of race mixture. Taylor used these kinds of methods, but although taking note of measurements such as leg length etc, he concentrated on the data for cephalic indices that he could gather.

Central to his racial thesis was that the larger the head was, the more intelligent the racial

⁶⁴ See, 9/733 Taylor to A. C. Haddon, whom Taylor called the "English Anthropologist". 14th February, 1923. Taylor had been a student at Cambridge when Haddon was Professor. Haddon criticised Taylor's zones and strata theory, and advised him to be more careful in how he made anthropological observations. Despite this and numerous criticisms Taylor received for inaccuracies, he was determined to have his anthropology and anthropometric work taken seriously.

⁶⁵ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.109

⁶⁶ Griffith Taylor, *Environment and Race: A Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*. London: Oxford University Press, 1927), p.338

‘type’. By extension he would argue, the brachycephalic or broad-headed ‘Mongolian’ was the most intelligent race.

By the time he came to publishing *Environment and Race* with the Oxford University Press (1927) he had firmly decided that through anthropometry, it could be proven that the broad headed ‘Alpine-Mongolian Asian as he classified them had the highest cephalic index, denoting a large brain, a superior racial type. Amalgamating with the long headed ‘Britisher’, he oft repeated in the newspapers to cross-societal outrage, would produce a stronger, intelligent ‘British-mongolian’ hybrid.⁶⁷ ‘Race Mixture, not dreadful’: His core claim centred round a critique of expositions about racial purity and Nordic superiority, which meant, as he stridently put, that, ‘our British race is a mixture of many strains of Nordic-Mediterranean and Alpine blood...Race mixture is inevitable’.⁶⁸ The idea that all peoples were products of race mixture was going to prove difficult to successfully articulate in an Australian nation in the 1920s that we have shown to be obsessed with ‘boosterist’ imperial nationalism and white supremacy and the purity of the British type.

Taylor was therefore using methods of anthropometry that were recognised as mainstream, or increasingly, archaic according to American cultural anthropologists such as Franz Boas, in 1920s racial science to come to radical conclusions, especially given prevalent consensuses in the country about segregation and racial purity. Keith Ward and H.G Wells were both sceptical about Taylor’s decision to concentrate on the cephalic index.⁶⁹ Furthermore, as has been previously discussed, Lothrop Stoddard, Madison Grant and many other race enthusiasts in the 1920s were fixated by the idea that the long headed Nordic type was superior and needed to be kept pure, so counter assertions that the broad headed Alpine

⁶⁷ Ibid, p.132-135

⁶⁸ Ibid, p.132

⁶⁹ Taylor Papers, 9/893 , H. G. Wells to Taylor, 07/07/1927. Wells was unsure if broad-headedness was a meaningful marker for superior intelligence.

or Mongolian type was superior was going against anthropometric orthodoxies that stretched from the Northern to the Southern Hemisphere.

Isaiah Bowman criticised Taylor for his lack of rigour and consistency. Some of the criticisms directed at Taylor were more to do with the lack of large sources of data and lack of more rigorous samples of anthropometrics on which he based sweeping conclusions. This contrasted with his more meticulous approach to geography, which had been his original profession and on which he had read far more widely. He was seen as somewhat of an amateur in this area, and his results were criticised for lacking thoroughness.

Taylor was very positive about the broad headed Chinese, but taking every opportunity to comment upon contemporary geopolitics, Taylor also harked back to the Edwardian Japanophiles when he sketched out a theory of racial similarity between the British and the people of Nippon. Both nations held ‘a close parallel...in race as in environment’. The bulk of both nations probably consists of tribes of the Iberian zone, conquered and governed by an aristocracy consisting of Nordic or Alpine races⁷⁰. While the Alpine Yamato had become a ruling group by subjugating the Mediterranean Iberian Kumaso, in Britain the Nordics had mixed heavily with the Alpine West Saxons and Brythonics. In view of this it was clear to Taylor that Britain and Japan were kindred empires forged through miscegenation, ‘which has produced the two most enterprising peoples of our times, it is folly to quote that dictum as to the ‘vices of the half-castes’ which we still hear on all sides!’⁷¹ By such scientific logic, white-Asian marriage, rather than being seen as a site of vice by the Britons of the global south could be enriching, and Asian-Australians had already demonstrated this.

⁷⁰ Griffith Taylor, *Environment and Race: A Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*. London: Oxford University Press, 1927), p.188

⁷¹ *Ibid*, p.188

Most educated Australians are acquainted with Anglo-Mongolian marriages which have been very successful, at any rate where the family lives in Australia...in my opinion many Chinese husbands are unusually kind to their wives, while Dr. Harvey Sutton informs me that their half-Chinese children are healthier and better cared for than the white children in the same environment with similar white mothers.⁷²

Harvey Sutton, whom Taylor corresponded with frequently, Chief Medical Officer to the Education Department of New South Wales, was more interested with public health and the feeble minded during the 1920s and 1930s. Priorities for society's trying to raise eugenic awareness were focused more on racial hygiene and the eradication of 'racial poisons' among the denizens of urban Sydney, with miscegenation less of an issue. It was 'the three great racial diseases or poisons are alcoholism, tuberculosis and venereal disease' that bedevilled urban Australians.⁷³ In the 1870s investigations of Sydney's urban poor had often been linked to problematizing hybridity by painting Anglo-Chinese families as mired in vice, dirt and poverty. Bagnall argues that by the 1920s this was changing, the Anglo-Chinese were increasingly being classed as more sober, clean and intelligent.⁷⁴

Race mixture had had positive results in the colonial setting. Taylor compared race mixture in Chile, and the intermarriage of the Spanish and the Amerind to create the 'mestizo' type, which he claimed was a higher type than the pure blood Spanish settlers. Really, it was the 'economic argument' that explained Australians and Greater Britons fear of

⁷² Ibid, p.339

⁷³ <https://www.records.nsw.gov.au/state...school-medical...in-nsw.../file>, see also, Dr Harvey Sutton, 'The teaching of hygiene in schools', *Medical Journal of Australia*, 7 May 1927.

⁷⁴ Kate Bagnall, 'Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915', (PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007), p.53

race mixture, that 'yellow peril' hordes of lower paid Asiatics would drive down the wages of whites. As a solution, he referred to 'Gulick's Plan'.⁷⁵ American missionary and prolific writer on the Japanese Sidney Gulick had throughout his career campaigned in favour of fair treatment, assimilation, and the establishment of equitable racial relations between whites and Japanese in California, opposing the 1924 Johnson Immigration Act which now entirely excluded Japanese migrants, and was seen by advocates for white labour as a major victory.⁷⁶ In 'An immigration policy' in the *Journal of Heredity* in 1916, among other writings, Gulick had posited a system of limited East Asian immigration could benefit California, going against the grain of growing anti-Asian sentiment. Taylor felt limited Chinese immigration would provide the biological raw material for tropical settlement in Australia to work. Accepting limited competition with Chinese, and acknowledging race similarity and the benefits of Alpine-Mongolian miscegenation could invigorate Australia, while smoothing political relations.

Taylor claimed that state structures of immigration restriction and racial exclusion were the biggest global problem, and that 'apart from the Negroes' most races could mingle. In place of segregation, in the name of world peace and stability, and the softening of 'national jealousy', eugenics rather than nationalism should determine the nature of population movement and intermarriage. This was a very radical piece of internationalist thesis which implied American and Australian biopolitical regimes that had built frameworks for Asian exclusion were guilty of 'ethnological ignorance', and that they and the public were in need of education. Such a strident critique that was guaranteed to offend ethnic

⁷⁵ Sidney Lewis Gulick, *The American Japanese problem; a study of the racial relations of the East and the West*, (New York, C. Scribner's sons, 1914), p.284

⁷⁶ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.320

nationalists across the spectrum especially when Taylor claimed environmental variation, rather than biological factors dictated human evolution.⁷⁷

We should show China that we recognise her undoubted claim to racial equality...the writer has closely studied this race problem for many years. The whole trend of racial history in the past points to an amalgamation of peoples in the next few centuries on a scale never before accomplished. I can see nothing which is likely to prevent the ultimate mingling of the European and the Sino-Japanese types to produce a dominant race somewhat resembling the Slavs and Western Asiatics around the Caspian Sea; where indeed the same mixture has probably occurred through the ages...no folly can be greater than stifling scientific discussion of such problems.⁷⁸

In light of then PM Bill Hughes success in getting Japan's request for a racial equality clause in the League of Nations charter vetoed in 1919, and the positive fanfare with which this was greeted, admitting the equality of 'Sino-Japanese' types would be seen as an insult to those in favour of the White Australia consensus. But there were limits to Taylor's racial cosmopolitanism. As Collins agrees, while holding up a Eurasian future as a progressive trajectory, he cast a 'black Australia' as something to be avoided. According to his anthropometric, academic and anecdotal research he concluded that 'on every count' Negroes and aboriginals were on a 'lower plane' than the types of Europe and the Mongolian, and 'racial mixture with them may be a deterioration for other races'.⁷⁹ Even though they

⁷⁷ Ibid, p.341

⁷⁸ Griffith Taylor, *Environment and Race: A Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), p.340

⁷⁹ Ibid, p.7. For more discussion of the dangers of rehabilitating thinkers and scientists with highly controversial views just because of their transnational mobility, see Strange, and Stuart Macintyre, 'The Poor Relation:

disagreed about a number of issues, from environment and settlement to the extent to which any kind of race mixture was dangerous and degenerative, Taylor agreed with J.W Gregory on black inferiority, and even cited his conclusions in this area in *Environment and Race* and other work. Taylor left the negro race out of his vision of what hybridity should look like, although he suggested that negro 'half-caste's, being more capable than the pure negro, may one day merge with other populations which could result in a breeding out of the colour in the United States.⁸⁰ He was also of the opinion that the extended geographical isolation of the Australian aboriginal from mixture with other races rendered them an inferior type. In these senses he did slot in to scientific and public orthodoxies of the 1920s.

While some scientists were disagreeing with the way in which he was using anthropometry in the early 1920s, by 1923 the Australian press were beginning to attack his conclusions about race mixture for being an unpatriotic betrayal of the British race in a southern hemisphere they felt was already fraught with competition between alien races.

The controversy centred around a lecture on his racial views that Taylor gave to the Sydney Millions Club on 19 June 1923. Press reactions to his statements throw light on public or populist views of whiteness, nation, and the perceived threat of Asians. Taylor's main premise in the lecture was that white intermarriage with 'cultured Mongolian' peoples would not be degenerative. 'Asiatic peoples are precisely the same race as ourselves...though the result of a union would be a 'half-caste' race, it would be in no way inferior to either of the parent races'. He also anticipated that the full-blood aboriginals of New South Wales would all be dead or absorb within 30 years. In agreement with Harvard anthropologist Roland Dixon, who had come to similar conclusion in *Races of Man* (1923), Taylor radically

Establishing the Social Sciences in Australia, 1940_1970', *Australian Historical Studies* 40 (2009), Neil Smith, *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization* (Berkeley:University of California Press 2003), p.226-33

⁸⁰ Ibid, p.340

claimed that half the people of Europe were of Asiatic or North Chinese origin. Applying this to the antipodes, he argued that similarities between the far flung peoples of New Britain and Old Britain showed, 'how widely racial stocks have been scattered over the world'.

He anticipated the consensus among physical anthropologists in Australia by another decade or so when he argued that that hybridity was so well advanced in Australia between a number of different stocks that regulating regimes of whitening would become both impossible and irrelevant. Such was the inevitable future for the nation, and this was natural rather than a 'calamity'⁸¹ In a swift rebuttal only the three days later in the *Sun* an angry commentator wrote that, 'ethnology may be on his side; race sentiment, which is, after all, the deciding factor, is against him', suggesting that race and white preference in Australia was something that went well beyond anthropological roots and explanations.⁸² But Taylor's comments even stoked annoyance in his own institution. The student magazine at the University of Sydney, *Hermes*, issued a strong protest against Taylor's idea that 'educated Orientals' could marry 'Australian girls', stating that such opinions being expressed by a well-travelled member of staff was a 'tragedy'.⁸³

The Public Backlash: 'Taylor Made' Gets Stitched Up

Taylor came in for detailed criticism in the 14 July 1923 edition of *Smith's Weekly*. An article entitled 'Counsel for the Yellow Streak: Australia's Taylor-made Future' was full of indignation for Taylor's outrageous idea to bring in a 'Mongolian strain' to a white man's

⁸¹ *Daily Telegraph*, 20 June 1923, 'Marriage with Asiatics-Professor asks 'Why Not?'-Striking Lecture', see also, *SMH*, 11 July 1923, 'Birth-Rate and Race Mixture, Letter to the Editor'.

⁸² *The Sun*, 22 June, 'To Smear Australia Yellow'

⁸³ *Sydney News*, 22 September, 1923, 'Our girls-marrying orientals-Professor's view—students protest', see also, *The Sun*, 22 June, 'To Smear Australia Yellow'.

country to create 'strong virile race-of yellow half castes' on the Australian continent. In a clear show that boundaries between the public and the academic were increasingly blurred when it came to racial sentiment, the article stated it would be a disaster if Taylor's 'doctrines should obtain credence or authority, backed as they are by the influence of his position as 'University lecturer in an Australian capital city'.⁸⁴ Academics it was felt could be dangerous when they went against the grain and threatened the purity of the nation.

Indeed there was a sense that Taylor's ideas were a foreign transatlantic import unsuitable for the global south. Misguided Taylor had been 'unfortunately bitten by the new fad of the American climatologists' who were producing work that was 'cursing hot climates as totally unfit for white men's habitation'.⁸⁵ Such American ideas were not welcome in Australia according to the paper. While admitting that perhaps it could be agreed with Taylor that the white-yellow hybrid was superior to the 'half-caste negro', part of Taylor's black inferiority thesis, the White Australian was 'the finest piebald human cocktail that a scientist can evolve out of any racial admixture', and although admitting that human history was marked by race mixture, the divergent types had now settled down and had very distinct qualities.⁸⁶

The *Sunday Times* in an article entitled 'Chow Chow planet' took the view that while a Eurasian future and Taylor's thesis of inevitable miscegenation may occur in the far future, such suggestions in the 1920s amounted to a fantastical and unhelpful form of science fiction that was at odds with the way that Australian populist opinion had aligned itself with the perceived stability of the White Australia Policy.

⁸⁴ *Smith's Weekly*, 14 July 1923, 'Counsel for the Yellow Streak: Australia's Taylor-made Future'

⁸⁵ *Ibid*

⁸⁶ *Ibid*

Given time, he says, and such high class races as the Northern Chinese and the British-Australians may mix, to produce satisfactory and progressive nations...Some thousands of years In the future, maybe, the whole earth will be of one race and of one speech. Philosophy can leap forward through those tens of centuries. Politics and daily life cannot...Our Australian anxiety Is not for the year 5023 A.D, but for the year 1923. At the later date a superman may be compounded of Manchu, Bantu and Wulumulu; but who wants to live in the home where the mixing begins?-Mary's swain in the parlor being a saffron beau, while John brings home a bride with a mouth like a split watermelon, and Hottentot curves.⁸⁷

Public letters to the editor in 1923 were often full of revulsion for Taylor. In the comment section of the *Barrier Miner*, one contributor felt that Taylor had given Asia and the 'Mongolians' an unsolicited 'generous invitation' to marry white women, a betrayal of the 'colour line' that clearly revolted the reader.⁸⁸ Bashford notes how positive pronouncements of white-Asian intermarriage and biological similarity between whites and Asians drew hysterical ridicule. Taylor she argues, had by 1923 gone further than ever before in steering a 'collision course into the heart of the new Australian identity' constructed around white nationalism buttressed by race science, the dissolution of indigeneity, and the exclusion and segregation of Asian bodies.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ *Sunday Times*, 24 June 1923, 'Chow-Chow Planet'

⁸⁸ *Barrier Miner, Broken Hill, NSW: 1888 - 1954*, 22 June 1923, 'NOTES AND COMMENTS: MIXED MARRIAGES'.

⁸⁹ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.133

In an arrogantly British young nation facing far more populous Asian nations to its north, Taylor's high estimation of Chinese and Japanese racial qualities were so contentious as to be outrageous, almost comical⁹⁰

So as the *Sun* had put it, Taylor had gone against the grain of 'race sentiment', which took to imply a White Australian suspicion over the importation of foreign influences and non-white bodies, both of which could threaten cultural and economic standards of living.⁹¹ Taylor kept up his interest in miscegenation.

By 1924 he was in danger of becoming more of a public enemy than a respected public academic and a prophetic educator of the Australian people as he saw himself. But Yale geographer Ellsworth Huntington noted that a number of academics in the British Empire and the United States were still on his side and interested in his ideas about hybridity and migration, and he and Taylor shared a close relationship.⁹² Taylor regularly attempted to circumvent his growing isolation, by discussing his developing conceptions of race with anthropologist and well known investigator and chief protector of the aboriginals Baldwin Spencer at the University of Melbourne. In exchanging ideas with Isaiah Bowman at Harvard, Taylor was keen to tell his American friend that Frederic Wood Jones, Professor of

⁹⁰ Ibid

⁹¹ *The Sun*, 22 June, 'To Smear Australia Yellow'

⁹² See numerous correspondence and mutual encouragement between the two, Taylor Papers NLA - 4/127/2e2 Taylor to Ellsworth Huntington 23/06/1920. Thanks for a kindly letter about GT's "Climate Cycles". 4/441 Ellsworth Huntington to Taylor. Review of *Environment and Race*. From *Saturday Review*, 01/10/1927 - 9/1580 Ellsworth Huntington, from Yale, 12/10/1933. Re their publications on Race - 9/1202 Ellsworth Huntington, 19/01/1917. Comments on Taylor's Bulletin, *The Control of Settlement by Humidity and Temperature* - Ellsworth Huntington. Yale, Dept of Geological Sciences. "The leading geographer in US" as Taylor notes, 15/05/1928. Thanks Taylor for *Environment and Race*, for which he wrote three reviews. Also thanks for new edition of Taylor's book on Australia. Huntington thought work on Australian environment was his most convincing piece of investigation. - 9/803, 804, Taylor to Ellsworth Huntington. One page, carbon. 27/05/1925. Refers to the abuse he is getting from newspapers such as the *Sun*. 9/804

Zoology, University of Adelaide and Arthur Keith among others had all been writing him flattering letters about his racial research.⁹³

James Murdoch was appointed to the first lectureship in Oriental studies at the University of Sydney in 1917, with the understanding that Australia needed to learn more about China and Japan, bemoaning the fact that close proximity to East Asia had failed to stimulate positive engagement. According to David Walker, Taylor's appointment as Associate Professor of Geography in 1921 was part of Sydney's attempt to move its intellectual centre of gravity towards East Asia and Pacific issues.⁹⁴ Taylor's earlier travel writing in the Dutch East Indies in 1920, covered by the *Sun*, with his observations of culture, climate and racial type, had enabled him to use his experiences to controversially discuss the limits of white settlement, while urging antipodean physical and cultural anthropologists to conduct more field studies of the secrets of Pacific peoples.

Through interactions with forums that tried to bring together academic voices of the Pacific rim, such as the Pan-Pacific Union, set up in 1917, which put together the Pan-Pacific Science Congress in 1920 in Honolulu, 'Taylor belonged to a growing community of international scientists with Asia-Pacific interests', and Taylor's ideas about White-Asian hybridity became part of this crossroads.⁹⁵ Taylor was present at the second Pan-Pacific Science Congress 1923 in Melbourne and Sydney along with Ellsworth Huntington, who published 'East of the Pacific' in 1925 which dealt with climate, settlement and race as Pacific issues.⁹⁶ Huntington's approach and his encouragement inspired Taylor on the road towards the publication of *Environment and Race* in 1927. In 1923 Taylor had rubbed shoulders with Japanese scientists, and it was the increasingly encouraged presence of

⁹³ Taylor Papers, Bowman to Taylor, 28 April, 1921, MS1003/9/668, also Taylor to Bowman, 22 May 1923

⁹⁴ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850-1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999), p.217

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.162

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.188

Japanese and Chinese anthropologists at these conferences that, it was hoped by Taylor and others, would at least encourage intellectual if not biological cross pollination, persuading Australians that they were a Pacific people.⁹⁷

Taylor was also involved with the Institute of Pacific Relations, an American driven forum set up after the First World War to apply internationalism to the Pacific setting, holding its first conference in Honolulu in 1925. He became the chairman of the New South Wales branch of the organisation, accompanied by Persia Campbell, Honorary Secretary, who had written prolifically on Chinese migration. At the IPR meeting in Honolulu in 1925, Australian delegate S.H Roberts argued that Chinese intermarriage had been very much a positive development, reversing depopulation in the Pacific islands and creating a strong hybrid.⁹⁸

Keen to utilise the expertise of these groups to advance his own race crossing research, Taylor wrote to Alexander Hume Ford, Honolulu director of the PPU, who put him in touch with Merle Davis and American Professor Stanley Porteus, 'the best student of psychology and race mixture we can refer you to'.⁹⁹ Hume was convinced that Asian hybridity worked, and encouraged Taylor to research crosses in Honolulu.

Personally I believe Hawaii is the best place in the world for mixtures to live. No one looks askance. Some of the best Hawaiian women have married commercial leaders here in former days, women with wealth, and they are among the best families in town. There is a small group of Anglo-Saxons

⁹⁷ Ibid, p.220

⁹⁸ PACIFIC RELATIONS. (1925, July 8). *The West Australian (Perth, WA : 1879 - 1954)*

⁹⁹ Taylor Papers, MS1003/9/817, The Pan-Pacific Union, Alexander Hume Ford, Honolulu director, To Taylor, 16 June, 1925

who refuse to mix with them. But in general the social status of all mixtures is good. The Chinese and Hawaiians make a very sturdy intelligent mixture...We hope that you will be able to come to the next Pan-Pacific Conference and study conditions at first hand.¹⁰⁰

In October 1926 Taylor travelled aboard the Japanese ship *Mishima Maru* to the 3rd Pan-Pacific Science Congress in Tokyo. He documented his travels and experiences of the conference in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, and spoke positively about the Japanese, Chinese and Australian delegates he rubbed shoulders with.¹⁰¹ His ‘orientalist’ fascination in touring South East Asia and writing for newspapers, also gave him chance to sketch and observe the peoples he saw.¹⁰² Like Alfred Deakin before him he was part of a tradition on the part of Australian travellers and thinkers who became entranced with the ancient civilisations of the ‘orient’. Among many other articles, in ‘The Far East: Hong Kong’ for the *Sydney Morning Herald*, Taylor wrote about his travels across the South China Sea. He talked about the racial qualities of the South and North Chinese, and how the Southerners were a product of racial mixing with the aboriginals. He claimed that the South Chinese had migrated from Turkestan when it became too arid, they bred with aborigines but also ‘peoples akin to the West Europeans’, who were then displaced into the Pacific islands.¹⁰³ In this sense Taylor’s travel writing as much as his scientific articles and lectures became venues for the public development and assimilation of his views of the widespread and inevitable nature of Asian hybridity.

¹⁰⁰ Taylor Papers, MS1003/9/817, The Pan-Pacific Union, Alexander Hume Ford, Honolulu director, To Taylor, 16 June, 1925

¹⁰¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 December 1926, ‘The Far East, We Cross the Line’

¹⁰² Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.103

¹⁰³ Taylor Papers, MS1003/9/855. Taylor was travelling and writing prolifically in China and Japan. The two country’s clearly fascinated him, see also, MS1003/9/876

Taylor was always publicly painting positive pictures of the Asia-Pacific region, the peoples he encountered, and emphasising the need for greater understanding and integration between Australia and its southern hemisphere neighbours. In doing so he played a part in the IPR's at times difficult mission to challenge the racial parochialism of interwar Australia. He was in touch with IPR chairman Merle Davis and approved of the latter's desire to promote internationalism. Davies letter to Taylor in 1928 suggests that the institute was doing its best to liaise with the Japanese and keep them informed of events in Europe.¹⁰⁴ Figures like Davis continued to argue for engagement with Asia in the 1930s.¹⁰⁵ Efforts at understanding and co-existing with Asians in the Pacific and the hybrid populations of Oceania contrasted sharply with the whitening policies of aboriginal absorption that also sought to segregate and in time remove Asian ancestry from Australia's demographics.

Environment and Race (1927)

In publishing *Environment and Race* (1927), Taylor not only wanted to codify all his racial-geographic theories and repeat his thesis on hybridity, but he also wanted to break out of the nasty insularity of the Australian press controversy and gain notice from transnational academics and public. The book was reviewed extensively internationally, and arguably Taylor was more of a transnational agent of change in miscegenation thinking than has previously been appreciated by historians such as Bashford, who have concentrated on his connections with American geographers. In his preface, Taylor thanked Arthur Keith for

¹⁰⁴ Taylor Papers, 9/989-Merle Davis, General Secretary, Institute of Pacific Relations, Hawaii. 27/11/1928. "Visited Sydney lectured on peace." Tells Taylor of the part played by the Institute in bringing to the attention of the Japanese Government the Kellogg-Brand Treaty providing for the renunciation of war as an instrument of policy.

¹⁰⁵ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850-1939*, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1999), p.188

getting *Environment and Race* published in Britain, ‘a matter of great difficulty to a writer living in the antipodes’.¹⁰⁶ He also thanked Sir Harry Johnston for ethnological photographs he sent to him for the final publication and demonstration of racial types.¹⁰⁷

Oxford University Press reprinted the book five times, and it was translated into French, Spanish, Chinese and Japanese. Taylor republished it twice, in 1937 as *Environment, Race and Migration*, and in 1945 to include the research on Canada that Taylor had conducted after he moved to Toronto.¹⁰⁸ Especially in the 1920s, the transnational circulation of this book meant that Taylor’s theories on hybridity were widely digested in academic circles in the United States, Britain, and Germany and beyond. As Powell has also argued, international scholars at least found the ambitious nature of his narrative refreshing, if at times contentious, with Bowman taking issue with some ‘slippage’ in Taylor’s anthropometric and anthropological terminology.¹⁰⁹ Taylor’s book had spoken highly of the Japanese as both a racial ‘type’ and a civilisation, drawing comparisons with the British. Eisuke Tokushige at the Niigata College at the Laboratory of Geography and Geology was particularly flattering of Taylor and anxious to get the work translated into Japanese.¹¹⁰

In Australia, the journalist David G. Stead wrote a very positive review of the book entitled, ‘The Crowded Earth and Australia’s Empty Spaces’ in the *Sydney Mail* on 16 November 1927. Stead remarked that the book was not only an informative scientific

¹⁰⁶ Griffith Taylor, *Environment and Race: A Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), p.vii

¹⁰⁷ Ibid

¹⁰⁸ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.113

¹⁰⁹ J.M Powell, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993), p.27

¹¹⁰ Taylor Papers - 9/1315 - Professor Watanabe, from Ann Arbor, Michigan. 13/12/1930, regarding the likely translation of Taylor’s book into Japanese. 9/1378, Eisuke Tokushige, Niigata High School, Laboratory of Geography and Geology, Japan., 07/10/1930. Seeks permission to translate *Environment and Race* into Japanese. Taylor replies positively, . 30/12/1930. He agreed and was willing to forego any royalties. 9/1315, Professor Watanabe. 13/12/1930, refers - 9/1384 - Eisuke Tokushige, College of Niigata, Japan. 08/02/1931. Wrote regarding the Japanese edition of *Environment and Race*.

overview of ‘man’s evolution’, comparing the global position of the ‘so-called Nordic race, as compare with that of the so-called yellow race’, but also contained geographical insights surrounding viability of future migration and ‘world settlement’. Particularly when it came to the Australians, ‘whose problems of migration and settlement are so extraordinarily complicated’, Stead felt that the book would prove highly instructive in persuading the public that white or Nordic superiority was a biological myth, and that global white supremacy was rather more an accident of the industrial revolution. Echoing Taylor’s sentiments, Stead noted that ‘orientals do not regard themselves as being of any breed inferior to ours’, and hoped that in future Eastern and Western people would be able to work together to re-distribute populations and harness the resources and spaces of the planet effectively.¹¹¹

Few reviews were so warm in their acceptance of Taylor’s views of an inevitable occidental-oriental convergence. But a number did admit grudgingly that Taylor, in the tradition of Charles Pearson in *The National Life and Character* (1893) may have had a compelling point, that the eventual ascendancy of Asia and the decline of white power would be proven science fact rather than science fiction, and that Australia should adjust through rapprochement with the pacific nations.

Further afield in Britain, a number of geographers and anthropologists took interest. H.J Fleure also reviewed the book, taking some issue with Taylor’s central idea that Asians were the oldest and most developed racial type, and questioned the exact parameters of some of the migration zones in central Asia that he talked about. Taylor responded in somewhat of a hurt fashion. He clearly respected Fleure greatly, describing him as a ‘leading British

¹¹¹ Taylor Papers, 9/917, David G. Stead, *Sydney Mail*, 16/11/1927. “The Crowded Earth and Australia’s Empty Spaces. A study of Professor Griffith Taylor’s great book, *Environment and Race*.”

geographer', but objected to his perceived criticism, and attached a copy of a more 'sympathetic' review by Ellsworth Huntington in the American geographical review.¹¹²

A.C Haddon had advised Taylor to be careful in his research and application of anthropological ideas when the two met in 1923, before Taylor had embarked on fieldwork to study race mixture and linguistic patterns in the Kamilaroi tribe of New South Wales. Although respecting the ambition and scope of *Environment and Race*, Haddon, in his review of the book for *Nature* on 7 April 1928, had levelled a number of criticisms, arguing against the idea that measuring cephalic indexes was a meaningful measure of Asian superiority based on their larger heads.¹¹³ In a letter written to *Nature* in May 1928 headed "Racial Zones and Head Indices", Taylor responded to Haddon's points and attempted to defend his ideas. The Cambridge anthropologist found Taylor's broad geographical insights useful though, and later in 1935 asked to 'borrow' blocks from *Environment and Race* for his writing up of a report into the Torres Straits peoples.¹¹⁴

Disagreement with British academics appeared to be good natured though, as they found his theories to be interesting, a breath of fresh air from the global south.¹¹⁵ Arthur Keith, the 'Famous Anthropologist in London' as Taylor called him, expressed his appreciation at receiving a copy of *Environment and Race*. There were a number of points in which his interpretation and Taylor's differed, but that, thought Keith, was a minor matter, as he felt the work had stimulated European interest in Australian opinion and the White Australia Policy. The two remained in contact, and later, in 1930, Keith thanked Taylor for keeping him updated with his two most recent articles on racial migration.¹¹⁶

¹¹² Taylor Papers, 9/923, To H. J. Fleure, "Leading British Geographer". 19/01/1928, 9/924 - H. J. Fleure to Taylor. 05/03/1928.

¹¹³ Taylor Papers, 9/932 - Draft letter to *Nature*, 16/05/1928. Headed "Racial Zones and Head Indices". Responds to review of *Environment and Race* by Haddon in *Nature* of 07/04/1928.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, 9/1710, Haddon to Taylor.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, 9/892, Arthur Keith, 'Famous Anthropologist in London', to Taylor, 08/07/1927.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 9/1271 - Sir Arthur Keith to Taylor, 22/04/1930.

The position of Keith in 1927 tells us several things about the state of play in racial science. Although Taylor was attempting to turn interwar consensus about racial hierarchy on their heads when he talked about Asian superiority and hybridity as inevitable, he stuck to accepting the reality of biological difference between different human 'types'. As a result British conservative race scientists like Keith were happy to accept and indulge the 'more advanced uncertainties' of migration zone and hybridity theory, because they felt such ideas contributed to the transnational debate without attacking their beliefs in fixed racial difference directly. As has been argued in the investigations of British racial science, it was around the time of the 1934 race and culture conference at the Royal Anthropological Institute that conservatives like Keith and Reginald Gates were publicly attacked by Hogben and others, and attempts were made to dismantle biological determinist racial thinking. As Warwick Anderson has explored, these transatlantic intellectual currents took longer to impact the global south, and Australian racial perspectives.

When it came to the opinions of American scholars, whom Taylor himself admitted he would upset with his conclusions in *Environment and Race*, but also whose approval he was courting in the hopes of an academic job, he bemoaned that their reception was 'far harsher than he'd hoped.'¹¹⁷ Roland Dixon, anthropologist, who wrote *The Racial History of Man* (1923) praised Taylor's work as 'the first to articulate a scientific causal explanation for both racial origins and development'.¹¹⁸ However at the same time he was somewhat critical of *Environment and Race*, disagreed with the slippage in Taylor's description of 'primitive' and advanced peoples, and disputed the idea that a region as arid as Central Asia could have been the centre of human evolution. By extension East Asians could not be the most

¹¹⁷ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.111

¹¹⁸ Roland Burrage Dixon, *The Racial History of Man*, (New York, Scribner and Son, 1923), quoted from Strange, p.28

developed type.¹¹⁹ Bernard J. Stern at Columbia suggested that anthropology clearly wasn't a strongpoint of Taylor's, that he clearly wasn't sufficiently well read, and that he should go back to geography.¹²⁰ However Huntington and Bowman, his friends for a number of years, while sceptical about the statistical basis of some of Taylor's claims about racial typing and Asian superiority, appreciated the interdisciplinary scope and ambition of the book. Taylor's approach to anthropology swam against the current of methodological developments in the 1920s and 30s. Cultural anthropologists such as the American Franz Boaz were attacking and debunking assumptions that race was 'geographically and biologically determined'.¹²¹

Karl Haushofer, a geographer at the University of Munich was highly interested in, and arguably the most complimentary in his review of *Environment and Race*. A former pupil of Ratzel, he reviewed Taylor's book in the journal *Volk und Rasse* in 1928. Haushofer claimed that scientists based in the Pacific such as Taylor were much better placed than their northern hemisphere counterparts to understand the geopolitical impact that race, climate and geography could have on each other. Agreeing with Taylor's opposition to the White Australia Policy, advocating what he called 'pan Pacific justice to race', Haushofer saw Taylor's ideas about climate and settlement as the Pacific incarnation of the concept of *lebensraum*.¹²²

Taylor had a complex and contradictory relationship with German anthropology in the 1920s and 1930s. He was deeply and vocally opposed to the Nordicism of many racial scientists in the 1920s, and disagreed with Baron von Eickstedt's work on 'Teuto-Nordics', however despite this he was very happy to correspond with Haushofer, and was flattered by

¹¹⁹ Ibid, P.111

¹²⁰ Ibid, P.112

¹²¹ Strange, p.35. Franz Boas was a German-American anthropologist at Columbia University. By the 1920s he was making connections between race, culture and history. His work, *The Mind of Primitive Man* published in 1911 delved into 'cultural relativism' and critiqued the modes of anthropometry through which racial hierarchy and Immigration Restriction legislation was conducted in the United States. See also, George Stocking, ed. *A Franz Boas Reader: The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911*, (New York, 1974)

¹²² Ibid, 9/918, Karl Haushofer, Review of *Environment and Race* in 'Volk und Rasse', Munich. 03/09/1928.

the attention and interest that German anthropologists had in his anthropological work.

Taylor was offered an associate editorship of *Zeitschrift für Rassenkunde* by Eickstedt, which he accepted.¹²³ However he later had to distance himself from Haushofer in the mid-1930s as his ideas were taken up by Nazi policymakers.¹²⁴

Taylor eventually became suffocated by the aggression and insularity of the Australian debates and entrenched interwar opposition to miscegenation. As Anderson has also argued, 1920s Taylor had proven to be a thorn in the side of those such as E.J Brady and Raphael Cilento who had energetically sought to ‘simplify and normalise whiteness’, and in this he was an early outrider by several decades for scientific and political developments that, by the 1940s called the whole edifice of classifying fixed human difference, and whether seeking to engineer white purity was any longer a useful goal, into question.¹²⁵ Compounded by his consistent arguments that the white body was unsuited for Australia’s more extreme environments, into which he sprinkled the argument that East Asians or white-East Asian hybrids would be better suited to this type of settlement, he was somewhat of a prescient pariah in anticipating the eventual climb down from environmental ethnic nationalist ideas of ‘Australia Unlimited’.¹²⁶

His American academic friends, Ellsworth Huntington and Isaiah Bowman were able to offer him an exit strategy, helping him get a position at the University of Chicago geography department in 1928. Taylor enjoyed working in a larger and more diverse faculty, but later moved to a post in Toronto, where he published another major work, *Environment*

¹²³ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.162

¹²⁴ Ibid, p.112. For a more detailed of the relationship between Haushofer and Taylor’s theories, see, Alison Bashford, ‘Karl Haushofer’s Geopolitics of the Pacific Ocean’, in Kate Fullager (ed.) *The Atlantic World in a Pacific Field: Effects and Transformation since the Eighteenth Century* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars’ Press, 2012), 120–43.

¹²⁵ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.257

¹²⁶ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850-1939*, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1999), p.230

and Nation (1936).¹²⁷ In 1948 Taylor was invited back as a research consultant for the Australian National University at Canberra, where he was surprised to receive a warm reception from a country that had once vilified him. While he had been gone, the discourse on miscegenation thinking and cultural perceptions of Australia's proximity to Asia had shifted markedly, and in this light his positive views about Asians and the efficacy of hybrid populations were no longer seen as quite so outrageous.¹²⁸

While Taylor acknowledged himself as British, at the same time, as his 1958 autobiography, 'Journeyman Taylor' attested, his lifetime of travelling and commitment to global geographic theory that paid no heed to national borders, he was by the late 1920s and his move to Canada an international Briton, traversing from temperate to tropics, an enthusiastic internationalist by the time of his death in 1963.¹²⁹

The Harvard-Adelaide race crossing study (1938) had marked a turning point. E.A Tindale of Adelaide and J.B Birdsell of Harvard conducted anthropological studies of aboriginal 'hybrids' throughout Australia. However when Birdsell came to write up his anthropometric data after the Second World War, he, like other race thinkers, realised that the sheer variety of different 'proliferating hybridities' he had observed rendered attempts to identify concrete racial types meaningless by the 1950s, and he segued instead into studying genetics. The post-war work of Sydney anthropologist Professor A.P Elkin and his proteges such as Marie Reay in studying and understanding aboriginals and mixed race peoples and policies towards them through the lense of social rather than physical anthropology, was

¹²⁷ Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008), p.158

¹²⁸ Taken from, Robert Brown, "'Yellow Peril' or golden future? Locating Australian anthropology and miscegenation thinking in the Global South in Griffith Taylor's *Environment and Race* (1927)", paper given at, *Modern British Studies: A Collaborative Workshop The Newberry Library*, Chicago 8 April, 2016, http://caxton.press.illinois.edu/epub/BRIDGE_workshop/

¹²⁹ For more detailed treatment of his travels, see, Griffith Taylor, *Journeyman Taylor, the Education of a Scientist*, (London: Hale, 1958)

symptomatic of a changing emphasis toward either assimilating or accepting hybrid cultures and hybrid traditions rather than forcibly re-shaping hybrid bodies in the name of constructing whiteness over generations.¹³⁰

It was not in Taylor's methodology for measuring racial difference that he was particularly unique. The idea that miscegenation thinking and physical anthropology of the interwar mould could inform and validate the post-war White Australia Policy had largely been discredited by the time he returned. Arguably Taylor's methods had been no different to Tindale and Birdsell's. His anthropometry had been an early interwar product of what he had hastily learned from the advice of more senior scientists like Huntingdon and Haddon, and textbooks such as those he had used to study the Kamilaroi.¹³¹

He had also reflected broad nineteenth century prejudices when he cited the example of Caucasian-Negro intermarriage in the United States to argue that negroes should be left out of any move towards racially mixed societies. However Taylor had been important because he, like Adolphus Elkin anticipated the inevitable and necessary destabilisation of consensus regarding the perception of Asians as a biological threat and contaminant, assumptions that harked back to nineteenth century narratives of Chinese gold rush migrant competition and "yellow peril" invasion anxieties. As a race scientist in the British global south, he was one of a prescient few in understanding that White Australians needed to engage with Asian nations and shed their fears of interracial marriage in order to become fully-fledged pacific partners rather than an anxious white man's country. To an extent intellectual and cultural rapprochement had borne fruit through the Colombo plan exchange programme for Asian students in Australia in the 1950s. But contradictorily the 'great white walls' of the White Australia Policy that barred permanent Asian settlement were not fully

¹³⁰ Ibid

¹³¹ Ibid

demolished until the Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act in 1975, necessitated by the need to accommodate refugees fleeing the Vietnam war.¹³²

From Adelaide to Auschwitz: Racial Thinking in the North Atlantic

Miscegenation thinking in British and transatlantic intellectual currents had, due to the immediacy of the challenge of Nazi eugenics in the 1930s, with its calls to Nordic supremacy and its endorsement of ‘hard’ racial typologies and anti-Semitism, climbed down from a fixation with purity and hierarchy more rapidly than in Australia. At a ‘Race and Culture’ conference that was hosted by the Institute of Sociology and the Royal Anthropological Society in London in 1934, conservative anti-miscegenationists such as Reginald Gates were attacked by scientists from across the political and disciplinary spectrum such as Raymond Firth and J.B.S Haldane who contended that ideas of race, population segregation and the encouragement of race prejudice perpetuated by methods driven by the assumptions of 1920s anti-immigration politics were now unhelpful.¹³³ Following this up, Julian Huxley and A. C. Haddon, *We Europeans: A Survey of ‘Racial’ Problems* (London: Cape, 1935) codified the British intellectual community’s rallying against Nazi scientific racism, and introduced a powerful moral inflection into anthropology that would help shape the post-war environment.¹³⁴

¹³² Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*, (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.230

¹³³ Gavin Schaffer (2007). “‘Scientific’ Racism Again?”: Reginald Gates, the Mankind Quarterly and the Question of “Race” in Science after the Second World War, *Journal of American Studies*, 41, pp 253-278

¹³⁴ Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930-62*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), see also, Schaffer, G., “‘Like a Baby with a Box of Matches’: British Scientists and the Concept of “Race” in the Interwar Period’, *British Journal for the History of Science* (2005), 38: 3, 307–24.

Schaffer and Kushner have both questioned the biologist Huxley's climb down from his beliefs in racial difference he held in the 1920s, and the extent to which other scientists privately held on to racial thinking.¹³⁵ However at the annual Galton Lecture in 1936, Huxley once again signalled publicly which way the wind was blowing in British thinking about racial mixing. 'The alleged inferiority of half-castes' he stated in his address, was 'much more likely to be due to the unfavourable social conditions in which they grew up than to any effect ... of their mixed heredity'. Such outdated assumptions that underpinned the work of Reginald Gates, Charles Davenport and many other physical anthropologists stemmed from a 'confusion of genetic factors with cultural ones'.¹³⁶

But arguably scientific currents were also flowing in from the antipodes and other academic institutions of the empire to influence British racial science in 1920s. Grafton Eliot Smith was an Australian Professor of Anatomy at University College London, who had done much of his training and research at the University of Sydney, and Frederic Wood Jones who had been a Professor of Anatomy at the University of Adelaide, worked at a number of Universities such as Melbourne, Hawaii, and the Royal College of surgeons in London.¹³⁷ Eliot Smith was committed to the idea of 'diffusionism', and moving away from less flexible categorisations of race that characterised Gates and Keith, Smith went for a more 'plastic' perspective. In his book *Evolution of the Dragon* (1919), he synthesised together history, cultural anthropology, and Lamarckian theories of human evolution.¹³⁸ As Smith put it, 'The study of biology is in this sense essentially a discipline of history'.¹³⁹ He broadly felt that

¹³⁵ Ibid, see also, Tony Kushner, H. J. Fleure: a paradigm for inter-war race thinking in Britain, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 2008, 42:2, 151-166

¹³⁶ Published as, Julian Huxley, 'Eugenics and Society', *Eugenics Review*, 28, 1 (April 1936), p.18

¹³⁷ Ross L. Jones and Anderson, "Wandering Anatomists and Itinerant Anthropologists: The Antipodean Sciences of Race in Inter-war Britain," *British Journal for the History of Science*, FOCUS—ISIS, 105 : 4 (2014), p.1

¹³⁸ Grafton Eliot Smith, *Evolution of the Dragon*, (Manchester University Press, 1919), p.v

¹³⁹ Ross L. Jones and Anderson, "Wandering Anatomists and Itinerant Anthropologists: The Antipodean Sciences of Race in Inter-war Britain," *British Journal for the History of Science*, FOCUS—ISIS, 105 : 4 (2014), p.9, quoted from, Grafton Elliot Smith, *Human History*, (London: Jonathon Cape, 1930), p.11

Egyptian civilizational practices and ideas had organically been disseminated across the boundaries of Asia, which put him in opposition to Arthur Keith's contentions about the innate difference and antagonisms in human groups. Cultures, races and bodies were all fluidly hybridising and changing over time. He abhorred and attempted to offset the 'Nordicism' he encountered in Britain, Germany and the North Atlantic. As Jones and Anderson state, like Griffith Taylor, Smith the Australian also had 'global intellectual ambitions.'¹⁴⁰

Frederic Wood Jones also strongly disliked concrete 'racial typologies', a product of his life and academic training in Australia, and he frequently argued against the subordination of aboriginal peoples. As he argued in 1943 while president of the Anatomical Society Great Britain and Ireland, the ideas of Darwin and Spencer had been horribly misrepresented, both in the northern hemisphere through Nazi eugenics, and in the south through genocidal policies towards aboriginals and Asians.¹⁴¹ As Jones and Anderson argues in his attempts to complicate histories of imperial academic networks and imperial anthropology, these two Australians were part of a broader transnational circulation that, 'helped to rechannel British anthropology during the early decades of the twentieth century'.¹⁴²

Changing political claims about race and hybridity were also very much intertwined with methodological advancements or changes in measuring difference after the 1920s. Fleming and Fleure's field work on Anglo-Chinese race crossing had come at a methodological crossroads period in Britain, where anthropometric measurement was gradually being replaced in the 1930s by social anthropological fieldwork, loosely mirroring the approach of A.P Elkin at Sydney University who studied aboriginal tribes, and psychometric and IQ testing. Dr P.C Hu of the Department of Psychology at University

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, p.12

¹⁴¹ Ibid, p.8

¹⁴² Ibid, P.3

College London in 1938 was part of this psychometric moment, previously slow to move from the US to the UK, testing the intelligence of Anglo-Chinese children in London and Liverpool, finding mix-raced Chinese children to be of higher academic attainment than their ‘English’ counterparts.¹⁴³ At the same time Kenneth Little, who had been very much a physical anthropologist, who in 1940 and 1941 published studies of Anglo-Negroid, Anglo-Asian and more broadly miscegenation in the wider British Empire, as Bland and Banton concur became disenchanted with anthropometry as a meaningful approach to understanding human difference, and later segued into cultural explanations of racial discrimination and hybridity.¹⁴⁴

After her report in 1927, Fleming doesn’t appear to have been researching prolifically on race crossing, or among the Anglo-Chinese community of Liverpool and Cardiff of whom she’d recommended further investigations, apart from another article in 1939, by which time British biometrics was in steep decline.¹⁴⁵ It was clear in the article ‘Human Hybrids: Racial Crosses in Various Parts of the World’, written in 1930 that Fleming was becoming concerned by what she saw as the toxic political implications of continuing to construct human ‘separateness’ in ‘racial biology’.¹⁴⁶ Politics was serving to drive and ‘darken’ the study of anthropology, and in intertwined fashion the two discourses were perpetuating myths of European superiority and privilege in both the colonial setting and in attitudes toward non-white immigration in metropolitan space. Echoing the thrust of Griffith Taylor’s then controversial thoughts in the early 1920s, Fleming felt that scientists and politicians finally

¹⁴³ P. C. Hu, UCL, A study of the intelligence of Anglo-Chinese children, *Eugenics Review*, Vol 30, Number 2 (July 1938) p. 109-119

¹⁴⁴ K.L. Little, ‘Racial Mixture in Great Britain: some Anthropological Characteristics of the Anglo-Negroid Cross’, *Eugenics Review*, 33 (Jan 1942), see also, K.L. Little, “The Study of Racial Mixture in the British Commonwealth: Some Anthropological Preliminaries.” *The Eugenics Review* 32.4 (1941): 114–120. Print.

¹⁴⁵ R.M. Fleming, ‘Physical Heredity in Human Hybrids’, *Annals of Eugenics*, IX (1939): p.60

¹⁴⁶ R.M. Fleming, ‘Human Hybrids: Racial Crosses in Various Parts of the World’, *Eugenics Review*, January 1930: p.257

needed to accept that, 'humanity to-day is the result of long racial crossing; it is difficult to apply the term "pure" to any physical type'.¹⁴⁷

In the case of the East Asians in the British Empire, narratives of labour competition, stories of invasion and a determination to preserve preference for the white working class at home and in the colonies had been spun into laws of heredity shaped by colour prejudice and hostility to intermarriage. In turn this translated into a 'social stigma' that, as both Fleming and Fletcher lamented in their investigations, prevented young Anglo-Chinese men and women from gaining employment and assimilating fully into British society. She hoped that Fletcher's work in Liverpool would be integral in identifying and rectifying these issues, and that changing and more tolerant approaches to hybridity could mean more space and acceptance for the Anglo-Chinese community. Although somewhat ambiguously stating that the Anglo-Chinese were the 'weakest of our people' and that interracial marriage might be curtailed in future, she was keen to see other coastal cities aside from Liverpool and Cardiff have local authorities or local research institutions engage in 'scientific research into a serious problem' of prejudice against Eurasians.¹⁴⁸ Fleming also made pacific comparisons to back up her claims, interfacing with the studies of Dunn and Tozzer on Hawaiian hybridity that had been a significant influence on Griffith Taylor and A.P Elkin.¹⁴⁹

As Bland also speculates, that the next wave of anthropological investigation of the Anglo-Chinese in Britain never fully materialised was most probably due to a segue on the part of Fleming, as had happened to J.B Birdsell after the Harvard-Adelaide study, towards mendelian genetics and away from biometric study of race crossing. As Auerbach also adds, after the peak of miscegenation panics between 1919 and 1923, by the 1930s the East Asian population of London in particular had shrunk, press stories fell off, the Limehouse district in

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, p.258

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, p.260

¹⁴⁹ Ibid, p.260, see also, Warwick Anderson, "Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontiers of Australia and the Pacific between the Wars," *Austral. Hist. Stud.*, 2009, 40:143–160.

which most of Chinese vice was thought to occur would soon be demolished, and the Japanese population never climbed over 1000.¹⁵⁰ Therefore despite the pessimistic conclusions of Fletcher from her social anthropological perspective, the idea that proliferating Eurasian populations could be a social menace in Britain was dissipating. Judgements about East Asians and those of mixed race between 1900 and 1950 in Britain had transitioned from popular assumption based on fictions of the orientalist and 'yellow peril' tropes, to an area of deep scientific and geopolitical scrutiny, and back to popular and social assumptions based on appearance and behaviour.

The Transnational Treatment: Cedric Dover and the Eurasians of the British Empire

Looking to other colonial scholars of racial thinking, the Anglo-Indian intellectual Cedric Dover, while not entirely disowning principles of racial difference, was prolific in the 1930s and 1940s in projecting more positivist understandings of the Eurasian 'half-caste' communities throughout the world. Identifying and refuting old stereotypes of 'yellow' and Asian perils, he deconstructed the miscegenation panics that had dogged perceptions of the Eurasians in the 1920s, admitting that Lothrop Stoddard's work had been an integral part of the 'prodigal literature' from many sources that had described the Eurasian 'half-caste' as morally and physically abhorrent to the global white community.

Dover gave a paper at the Third International Congress of Eugenics in New York in 1932, a conference also attended by the vehement opponent of race mixture, Reginald Gates.

¹⁵⁰ Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and 'Race Crossing': a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on 'Eugenics Old and New', *New Formations*, (2007), 60, Bland gives a synopsis of Dovers career, he 'had grown up in Calcutta, had won a scholarship to Edinburgh University, had worked on the Zoological Survey of India, and then subsequently had come back to England as a natural historian.', p.66

Dover detailed a number of the negative characteristics that scientists, colonial officials and writers alike ascribed to the 'Eurasian', and went on to rebut them, claiming that despite having the odds of social convention and environmental difficulty stacked against them, Eurasian offspring possessed a 'hybrid vigour'.¹⁵¹ Eurasians were therefore held back by repression, mistreatment, and neglect by colonial authorities, but at the same time Dover felt that such communities displayed 'potentialities that deserve to be encouraged'. By citing the work of Harry Shapiro (1929), Dover claimed that a cluster of researchers had found 'no evidence of hybrid inferiority'.¹⁵² Indeed the main thrust of Dover's paper appears to have centred around his enthusiasm to expand this cluster of pro-hybridity scholarship through the conduct of more ambitious studies, and he focused in particular on Eurasians, arguing that, 'For such a people there must be a bright future, but they stand in need to-day of dispassionate study and constructive assistance.'¹⁵³

In order to conduct a eugenic survey of Eurasian communities throughout the major towns and cities of India, South East Asia, China and Japan, and prove his thesis of Eurasian physical and intellectual vigour, Dover recommended several methods for measuring their physiological and psychological characteristics.¹⁵⁴ Although such a study was never

¹⁵¹ Henry E. Roseboom and Cedric Dover, The Eurasian Community as a Eugenic Problem, 'A DECADE of PROGRESS IN EUGENICS', *Scientific Papers of the Third International Congress of Eugenics held at American Museum of Natural History New York*, August 21-23, 1932, (Baltimore, 1934), p.92

¹⁵² Ibid, p.93, on Harry Shapiro the American anthropologist, see, Warwick Anderson, Racial Hybridity, Physical Anthropology, and Human Biology in the Colonial Laboratories of the United States. *Current Anthropology*, (2012), 53(SUPPL. 5), S95-S107

¹⁵³ Ibid, p.94

¹⁵⁴ Ibid, p.95, Dover spoke enthusiastically that high literacy rates, and, 'an evident desire for self-improvement as partly shown by the growing strength of Eurasian associations in Indo-Malaya' meant that the response rate and the yield of useful data from the questionnaires would be high. To draw these studies together, and give them a contextual grounding through which the positive view of the Eurasian hybrid could be disseminated to a sceptical international scientific community and be digested by public opinion, Dover advocated a collation and codification of the 'history and achievements' of these colonial mixed race communities that had often been marginalised in the narratives of settler colonialism.

Direct behavioural observation of Eurasian group interaction would be supplemented by 'an extensive questionnaire' that the investigator would use to record the economic, social and religious positions of subjects, in addition to their educational attainment and political affiliations. Finally, evaluation of physical characteristics would be compared closely to the 'parent races', factoring in the influence of 'environment', and this data would be used positively to suggest to the Eurasian subjects, 'methods by which improvements may be effected'.¹⁵⁴ Although the study would be intensive and transnational in scope, Dover was optimistic that, With the assistance of their associations, and of biological institutions in the East, a year's earnest work, by two or

conducted, it points to the desire of some race thinkers, before the decline of racial studies, to treat Eurasian communities as a global diaspora, moving beyond and expanding on the local and national studies that had characterised the British, Australian and Pacific efforts.

Lancelot Hogben's preface to Dover's book *Half Caste* (1938) neatly distilled the common scientific and popular negative stereotype of the hybrid that Dover sought to fight against.

The 'half-caste' appears in a prodigal literature. It presents him ... mostly as an undersized, scheming and entirely degenerate bastard. His father is a blackguard, his mother a whore ... But more than all this, he is a potential menace to Western Civilisation, to everything that is White and Sacred.¹⁵⁵

Hogben argued that the anti-miscegenation trope had become so accepted because a number of separate discourses had coalesced, including 'neo-literati' novelists, eugenicists, anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists and politicians, in constructing mixed race marriages as 'evil' in the eyes of the British public.¹⁵⁶

Dover also used the book to vigorously attack some of the main scientific offenders of the interwar period, whom he felt had propagated biased research in the name of preserving white supremacy. Among more well-known popular writers such as Lothrop Stoddard, this involved criticising lesser known figures such as the German Dr. Renato Kehl, who had written a piece on race crossing and described it as undesirable.¹⁵⁷ Dover countered such suggestions, claiming that on his visit to Berlin, when observing Germans he saw many

three investigators, in the principal towns of Japan, China, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, the Malay Peninsula, India, Burma and Ceylon, would complete the survey.'

¹⁵⁵ Cedric Dover, *Half-Caste*, (London, Martin Secker and Warburg, Ltd, 1937), p.13

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p.16

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p.96

examples of a Euro-Mongol 'mulatto' type, debunking in his view the idea that the two groups were exclusive and separate in European terms.¹⁵⁸

He went into a lengthy analysis of Eurasian communities in Ceylon, and the mixed race Anglo-Chinese communities in British Malaya, Penang and Hong Kong, describing them as vigorous and enterprising communities often suppressed and kept in squalor by the British authorities.¹⁵⁹ Discussing the migrations of Mongolian peoples into the Philippines and Oceanic territories, arguably the influx of large numbers of Chinese, rather than being a malevolent or degenerative process for the region, had led to a situation where the most successful 'crossbreeds of the Malay Peninsula are of Chinese origin'.¹⁶⁰ Speaking of this 'Mongol influence' in South East Asia, he scoffed at the reactionary sentiments of Legendre who had written about this 'worrying' growth of Chinese numbers, 'in the best post-Gobineau tradition'.¹⁶¹ The Japanese too were 'proud of their mongrelism' and had built a powerful and efficient empire. Dover concluded that western scientific racist discourse, with its obsession with racial hierarchy and the need for segregation, was not equipped to understand the development of Mongolian hybridity in not only Asia, but also historically in Europe. Resisting a hybrid future was futile in his eyes.

And so the destruction of racial frontiers goes on: 'the Mongol in our midst', the Negro and the 'Aryan' in the midst of the Mongol. One is overwhelmed by the feeling that 'Nought may endure but mutability'.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, P.104

¹⁵⁹ Ibid, p.164-178

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, P.177

¹⁶¹ Ibid, P.177

¹⁶² Ibid, P.178

Despite three decades of the White Australia policy, in which time the number of Chinese-Australian and aboriginal populations had declined considerably, Dover still felt that the antipodes were heavily marked by miscegenation, with not only a large number of instances of white-aboriginal crosses, but also some 'part-Chinese' hybrids, 3481 in 1933 he claimed.¹⁶³ This Mongolian presence was not a nuisance to national fitness and cohesion, and the Sino-Australians were well integrated, 'regarded...influenced by favourable reports...as socially satisfactory'.¹⁶⁴ However Dover also admitted that antipodean hybrids were another mysterious blind spot in the imperial archive, that, 'little is known of the Australian mixed breeds...it seems that they exhibit the same tendencies as other hybrid peoples'. Sino-Australian crosses tended to reside in urban areas and were culturally malleable, he argued, identifying with the culture that was dominant in a given neighbourhood. Jens Lyng, who worked for the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics wrote that it would be erroneous 'to visualise anything but a coloured population in Australia', and with this Dover heartily agreed.¹⁶⁵

Conclusion

Taylor founded geography as a serious discipline in Australia with through his research and course construction at the University of Sydney. But really he spent much of his education and academic career in Britain, Canada and the United States. In addition his fieldwork, travel writing and attendance of international conferences took him throughout the academic networks of the pacific nations, and the rest of the world. He addressed the issue of miscegenation in a far more global approach than many of his Australian contemporaries

¹⁶³ Ibid, p.179-181

¹⁶⁴ Ibid, P.180

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, P.180

such as Cecil Cook or Agar, who were more interested in state or national debates surrounding aboriginal miscegenation or the preservation of white bodies.

The chapter has argued that the reaction of the newspapers in 1923 after Taylor's address to the Pan Pacific Science Congress, hammering him for his views about Asian superiority, throw light on the great extent to which 1920s Australians had bought into the fantasy of white purity and a white future. The story of Taylor has proven to be a useful device through which to tell the story of the "yellow peril" trope and miscegenation thinking in white men's countries. A child when federation was enacted, Taylor came of age as a physiographer at the Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology in the 1910s who was consulted by government on settlement questions, and later a race thinker and physical anthropologist at a time when angst about declining geopolitical power and the limitations of settlement policy were reaching an hysterical and angst ridden pitch not only in Australia, but in other British colonies also. In this atmosphere, despite being more of a throwback Victorian polymath in his unsteady grasp of racial theory as an aside to his geography career, Taylor's prolific public utterances about encouraging Asian immigration were politically explosive. In his racial and climatic determinism he was more similar to Charles Pearson in 1893 than his interwar contemporaries, as both prophesised a post-colonial future where white supremacy was no longer the norm.

Bashford and Strange note that once Taylor left Australia for Chicago in 1928, as far as the history of Australian anthropology has been concerned, Taylor vanishes. But the fact that after working in the United States and Canada for several decades, publishing *Environment and Nation* (1936) and discussing white settlement in temperate Canada, Taylor returned to settle in Sydney in 1951 after a lecture tour of Britain in 1948, becoming president of the Institute of Australian geographers in 1959, now a firm internationalist, his calls for world peace and co-operation in the Pacific were received more warmly than they

had been in the 1920s and this tells us something. The contrast has given us insight into the gradually growing post-war acceptance that Australia's future was as a more engaged Asia-Pacific neighbour than an isolated white British country. Taylor and Gates were both in Australia in 1958, and so their stories both come together. They died within a year of each other, Gates in 1962 and Taylor in 1963.

The chapter has traced the way in which Taylor's travelling had given him a far more porous notion of national boundaries and boundaries between the British and non-British World than many interwar Australians were comfortable with, and this heavily influenced his racial thinking. As a man who had lived in England, Australia and later Canada and the United States, his identity as well as his intellectual influences straddled the North and South of the Anglosphere. Through the superimposing of Taylor's identity as a more international 'Britisher' onto much of his intellectual work on Australia, he became an outsider. In some senses a hybrid 'British' identity also characterised Reginald Gates, as an enthusiastic supporter of the British Empire who was in fact born in Nova Scotia, and spent much of his life in the United States. As Strange also argues, through responses to Taylor's casual attitude to national and racial boundaries, and the use of ideas that he had gleaned from British, American and Pacific works and transactions as well as Australian, in order to make big statements about using Asian immigration to improve the nation, upset nationalists. She agrees that, 'in post-federation Australia his transnational mode of conceiving problems beyond the framework of the nation and the national was transgressive'.¹⁶⁶

The chapter has also however delved into the complexity of Taylor's views and the views of a number of interwar theorists who contributed to miscegenation thinking debates. Taylor was not methodologically progressive, he largely rejected cultural anthropology. His

¹⁶⁶ Carolyn Strange (2010) *Transgressive Transnationalism: Griffith Taylor and Global Thinking*, *Australian Historical Studies*, 41:1, P.34

ideas about racial characteristics, and which race could inhabit which climate were incredibly deterministic. As Strange argues Taylor, in linking race and migration, had more in common with Charles Pickering in *The Races of Man and their Geographical Distribution* (1854) than the more minutiae focused anthropometric investigators of the 1920s. Taylor was by twenty first century standards no standard bearer of multiculturalism or the disavowal of racial hierarchy, as racist as many of those who criticised him, but by breaking the bounds of the Australian nationalist consensus about whiteness, and imagining the nation meeting settlement challenges by becoming a Eurasian country, he caused horror. This horror in itself was revealing as Taylor's career shone a reflective glare on the lingering fear of a 'yellow peril' that would manifest itself through miscegenation and destroy Australia's 'British' character, which it was still felt was as much a biological reality as it was cultural construct.

Chapter 4:

The research of Professor Reginald ‘Ruggles’ Gates in the global south in the 1950s

At polar opposites to the Asian and oceanic hybridity thesis developed by Griffith Taylor in the 1920s, conservative Nova Scotian racial scientist at Kings College London Reginald Gates, a segregationist vehemently opposed to racial mixing throughout his long career, also found himself marginalised and ridiculed by his British contemporaries as certainties on the fixed nature of biological human types began to destabilise in 1930s Britain.¹ By utilising the careers of these two racial scientists as a framework, we get a sense of not only how scientific miscegenation thinking, biopolitical regimes and public attitudes to the Eurasian changed over time, but we can also do more to pick apart differences between the transatlantic and the global south as they developed after the 1930s.

Griffith Taylor and Reginald Gates were two racial thinkers, for different reasons, because of the way they talked about Asians and intermarriage in the interwar period. In the 1950s, Taylor was welcomed back to Australia and publicly rehabilitated in light of changing Australian understandings that their white man’s country did at least politically, socially and culturally need to engage more closely with Asian nations and Asian peoples through

¹ Gavin Schaffer (2007). “‘Scientific’ Racism Again?”: Reginald Gates, the Mankind Quarterly and the Question of “Race” in Science after the Second World War, *Journal of American Studies*, 41, pp 253-278

initiatives such as the Colombo plan.² He was once again the old hero of Antarctic exploration who also authored big theories on climate, race and population.

But at the same time the provincialized plasticity of human categorisation that had always characterised the Australian and Pacific approach to race and the aboriginal question presented an opportunity for Gates as an outdated physical anthropologist. A loose change of direction from physical to social anthropology and genetics in Australia and other nations of the global south was less categorical and advanced than in Anglo-American currents, and far from the epicentre of the debates around Nazi eugenics that toxified ideas of fixed human difference.

Public attitudes to whiteness and migration were also at a crossroads. Uncertainty about whether to relax the White Australia policy after 1945 and allow Asian as well as southern European migration and settlement, and about how broad a biological church Australianness could encompass, persisted. Old anxieties about the death of a British Australia and the birth of a Eurasian country were still widely evident in the popular press, despite the growing abandonment of the science of whiteness. This complex and fluctuating discursive and political environment gave Gates the geographical and methodological space that he wanted in order to circumvent transatlantic criticisms of his racist brand of anti-miscegenation physical anthropology, carry out race crossing fieldwork and advance his marginal challenge to UNESCO, his idea of 'racial genetics' that in Japan particularly received an enthusiastic hearing. He found in Australia that mainstream intellectuals of many different methods and persuasions were willing to aid his fieldwork and discuss his conclusions.

² For a more detailed look at the significance of the plan, see, Daniel Oakman, *Facing Asia: A History of the Colombo Plan*, (Australian National University Press, 2010)

But Gates was fascinated by Asians and aboriginals. He not only had relatively high estimations of the Chinese and Japanese as racial ‘types’, something that was echoed in several articles about East Asian’s high IQ in the *Mankind Quarterly*, but he also saw similarities between the Japanese and the Caucasian, claiming from some of his fieldwork, Japanese war children and Australian field work, that Japanese-Caucasian crosses were some of the more harmonious between divergent races.³ His Australian fieldwork in the outback and on the coast became the site on which Gates refined his views on hybridity before his death in 1962, and the changing place of yellowness and East Asian bodies played an integral part in this.

Early career

Born in Nova Scotia, Gates was very much a man of the transatlantic, a great admirer of the British Empire and the Anglosphere, but at the same time very much at home in the United States where he lived for much of his career.⁴ Gates became a member of the Eugenics Society in London in 1921, the same year as he gained his chair in botany at Kings College London. He was soon elected to the ‘Consultative Council’ of the Eugenics Society. With Cora Hodson, who had been heavily involved in organising Fleming and Fleure’s race crossing study in 1927, as Honorary General Secretary, Gates became the Chairman of the Bureau of Human Heredity in 1936.⁵

³ For more on the formation of the *Mankind Quarterly* journal and the key figures who founded and financed it, see, Gavin Schaffer (2007). “‘Scientific’ Racism Again?”: Reginald Gates, the *Mankind Quarterly* and the Question of “Race” in Science after the Second World War, *Journal of American Studies*, 41, pp 253-278

⁴ See, Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the Two World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992)

⁵ *The Atlantic Advocate*, November 1960, p.62

He had studied Mongolian crosses early in his career. In an expedition in Alaska in 1928, down the MacKenzie River, Gates examined ‘crosses between an Eskimo woman in Alaska and a Dane with the Nordic blue eyes and fair hair...The F1 children were intermediate, as is generally true in racial hybrids’⁶ He concluded in this case that Nordic-Mongolian crossing had produced a regressive type.

In an article entitled *Heredity and Eugenics* in the *Eugenics Review* in 1920, later expanded into a book in 1923, Gates laid out his core philosophy regarding race mixture, stating that, ‘miscegenation commonly results in disharmony of physical, mental and temperamental qualities...leading to disharmony with the environment...A hybridised people will tend to be restless, dissatisfied and ineffectual’.⁷ As a polygenist, he believed throughout his career that different races and populations could be so different that in fact they were different species of animal that had originated and evolved separately, and in the East Asian context this extended to his belief in the existence of an East Asian sinanthropus or ‘Pekin man’ as it was referred to in the paper, as a separate human type.⁸

As Bland argues, Gates reference to terms such as ‘disharmony’ as he framed the evils of miscegenation, were part of the conscious lip service he paid to the work of biometrician Charles Davenport. As we have noted Davenport was not only vehemently opposed to miscegenation, but he conducted a race crossing study in Australia in 1915, and his work served as one of the most consistent reference points for Australian intellectuals such as Wilfred Agar, who used negative conclusions about mixed race societies to argue in favour of the White Australia Policy. Gates views were not considered particularly radical in

⁶ Gates MSS, Liddell Hart Archive, King’s College London, Box K/PP65 – 4/89: ‘Heredity in the races of man’, by R.Ruggles Gates, typescript, for his paper given to the ‘first Acharya Jagadish Chandra Bose Endowment Lecture at the Bose Research Institute in Calcutta’ (1959).

⁷ R. R. Gates, *Heredity and Eugenics*, (London: Constable, 1923), 232., quoted in, Lucy Bland, British Eugenics and ‘Race Crossing’: a Study of an Interwar Investigation. In Special Issue on ‘Eugenics Old and New’, *New Formations*, (2007), 60, p.68

⁸ R.R Gates, *Human Ancestry*, (1947)

the 1920s, and though polygenism was being discredited by the late nineteenth century, views on black inferiority and the need to segregate against intermarriage between Europeans and non-Europeans chimed in with those of Arthur Keith and Leonard Darwin.⁹ While he was always very clear that he thought whites were more intelligent than blacks, Gates views on Asians were much more ambiguous, as he wasn't conducting anthropometric fieldwork or writing articles that dealt with 'Mongolian' groups directly. It was only in the 1950s that he eagerly seized on the opportunity to study Asian race mixture in Cuba, Japan and Australia.

As Schaffer notes, Gates went from being a mainstream biologist, invited onto the editorial board of the *British Journal of Experimental Biology* in 1923, to having his views on miscegenation and racial difference heavily contested by Grafton Eliot Smith from Adelaide and a number of others at the 'Race and Culture' conference held at the Institute of Sociology and the Royal Anthropological Society in 1934.¹⁰ Two things changed by the outbreak of the Second World War that ruined Gates career and turned him into a marginal miscegenation thinker. Firstly, the changing political atmosphere in the Anglo-American world brought about by the rise of Nazi eugenics made explicit statements about fixed human difference and racial hierarchies unpalatable. At least publicly, race thinkers such as his long-time friend H.J. Fleure thought it wise to move away from the issue of 'race', lest they be seen to implicitly endorse Nazi politics.¹¹ Julian Huxley and A. C. Haddon's, *We Europeans: A Survey of "Racial" Problems* (London: Cape, 1935) typified the intellectual call to arms against 'Hitlerism'.¹² Gates, notoriously and consistently anti-semitic and pro-segregation,

⁹ For a closer look at competing discourses on race in the interwar years, see, Tony Kushner (2008) H. J. Fleure: a paradigm for inter-war race thinking in Britain, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 42:2, 151-166

¹⁰ 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* (2007), 41: 2, 253-78.

¹¹ Tony Kushner (2008) H. J. Fleure: a paradigm for inter-war race thinking in Britain, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 42:2, p.155

¹² *Ibid*, p.155

never got over what he saw as an anti-scientific, politically motivated movement to discredit his pursuit of biological ‘facts’.¹³

On top of this he fell afoul of the transition from the biometric measurement of racial and population characteristics, to Mendelian genetics, and a growing acceptance that the secrets of heredity were more than skin deep. In addition to the greater sophistication of genetics, investigations of behavioural differences between populations were increasingly being led by social scientists and cultural rather than anthropologists by the late 1940s, enshrined in the UNESCO statements of 1950 and 1952, and Gates either failed or refused to keep abreast of these methodological shifts.¹⁴ This was often evidenced in the 1950s in the rejection letters from journals and funding bodies such as the Wenner Gren foundation, and in disagreements Gates had with the department of anthropology at McGill University throughout 1954.¹⁵ Gates found himself angry, bemused and isolated, but stuck to the framework of physical anthropology he used in the 1920s, losing his chair at KCL in 1942. He was kicked out of his post at Howard University in 1948 for his staunch views about black inferiority and Jewish conspiracy.¹⁶ After this he was able to continue as a research fellow at Harvard in the biology department from 1950 to 1954, and after that at the Peabody Museum in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

He kept his attachment to polygenism. The *Dayton Ohio News*, 26 January 1948, reviewed Gates latest book *Human Ancestry*, which was also reviewed in the *New York World Tribune* on 26 January 1948. Gates had divided humanity into several different species of ‘man’, claiming that East Asians were derived from *Sinanthropus* or ‘Pekin

¹³ Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930-62*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p.150

¹⁴ *Ibid*, p.150

¹⁵ Reginald Gates MSS, J.W Boyes, Chairman of the Department of Genetics, McGill University, Montreal, to Reginald Gates, 13 December, 1954

¹⁶ 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* (2007), 41: 2, 253–78.

man'.¹⁷ Appraisals of Gates polygenist theory of difference, and his appeal against miscegenation also found their way into the Australian press, where the *Daily Mercury* gave a flattering appraisal of his book, taking seriously Gates claims, now decades wide of the scientific consensus, that different, 'human species once...were as different as lions and tigers'.¹⁸ The reviews digested Gates bombastic claim that Caucasians may exterminate themselves in future through interbreeding and low birth rate.¹⁹ Arguably this was Gates very own Pearsonian prophecy about the geopolitical impact of miscegenation on white supremacy after World War Two. While Pearson and Taylor had both seen such a future as inevitable, and Taylor had even welcomed the prospect of racial mixing with Asians, Gates held to his long time views that different racial types, Sinanthropus included, had to be kept separate at all costs.

Gates attachment to polygenism and anthropometry, scientific methods and theses which, as Schaffer agrees, were considered in the North Atlantic scientific mainstream to be decades out of date, racist and dangerous, meant his pleas to have his research published were being consistently ignored or rejected by mainstream scientific organisations and publications, heightening Gates frustration. In *Nature* in 1952 he complained bitterly about the UNESCO statements disavowing the biological reality of race in light of Nazism in, 'Disadvantages of Race Mixture'.²⁰ So race was in the hands of social scientists in the 1950s. However Gates continued fascination with his ideas of 'racial biology', polygenism, and race crossing fieldwork led him to continue travelling, conducting anthropometric studies of

¹⁷ *Dayton Ohio News*, 26 January 1948, 'Coloured race may replace Caucasians'

¹⁸ *Daily Mercury (Mackay, Qld. : 1906 - 1954)* 28 February 1948, "NEW EVOLUTION THEORIES ON HUMAN ANCESTRY"

¹⁹ *Ibid*

²⁰ *Nature*, 22 November, 1952, 'Disadvantages of Race Mixture'

mixed race communities in Cuba, Japan, South Africa and Australia. He also wasn't quite as intellectually isolated as we might think.²¹

Gates was not the only post-war intellectual determined to resist or circumvent the 'anti-race' campaign codified by UNESCO in 1951 and deploy scientific research for fighting transnational political battles against desegregation and racial mixing. As Francesco Cassata argues, the 'scientific' nature of UNESCO meant that a constellation of racists, pro-segregation interests and scientific racists could 'camouflage' themselves through appeals to scientific legitimacy.²² Their marginal rear-guard action against UNESCO was prosecuted through the foundation of the *International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics (IAAEE)*, and a new scientific journal, *The Mankind Quarterly* to act as an international academic mouthpiece in 1960. Schaffer has explored how Gates, Robert Gayre and Henry Garrett were involved with setting up the *Mankind Quarterly*.²³

Some of the articles that would be published in the *Mankind Quarterly* between the 1960s and 1990s exhibited a racial positivism towards Asians, especially in terms of IQ. Robert Gayre, Richard Lynn, Ethelred Nevin and William Cruickshank all wrote that 'Mongolians' were a high type, either nearing or surpassing Caucasians in terms of intelligence.²⁴ In the vein of late Victorian and Edwardian writers Nevin also speculated that the future of China would be marked by expansion and colonisation of tropical regions. While categorically decrying black-white mixture, white-Asian miscegenation, while still

²¹ Gates MSS, Box 4/82/1, typescript of lecture given by Gates to the 4th International Conference of Anthropology, Vienna, titled, 'The origin of the Mongolian race', 1952

²² Francesco Cassata, *Building the New Man : Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth-Century Italy*. (Nouvelle édition [en ligne]. Budapest : Central European University Press, 2011), (généré le 26 avril 2016). Disponible sur Internet : <<http://books.openedition.org/ceup/697>>.

²³ 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* (2007), 41: 2, 253–78.

²⁴ Ethelred Nevin, Galton on a Chinese Africa, *Mankind Quarterly*, April, 1965, p.4-5, Robert Gayre, Miscegenation and Racial Improvement, *Mankind Quarterly*, October, 1970, Richard Lynn, Will China Become the Next Hegemonic Superpower, *Mankind Quarterly*, September 2002, pp. 107-110, Richard Lynn, The Intelligence of the Chinese and Malays in Singapore, *Mankind Quarterly*, October 1977, pp. 125-128, Richard Lynn, National and Racial Differences in Anxiety, *Mankind Quarterly*, April 1971, pp. 205-214, William S. Cruickshank, Japan's solution of her living space problem, *Mankind Quarterly*, Issue 1, July 1960, p.47-50.

degenerative, would be slightly less biologically and socially corrosive in the eyes of Gayre. Richard Lynne argued that mongoloids were slightly more intelligent than Caucasoids. However Pearson argued that Caucasian IQ had been depressed in Britain due to non-white and 'Eurasian' immigration.²⁵ Pearson argued the highest levels of Mongolian intelligence were measured in areas where there had been intermarriage with 'Caucasoid Indo-Europeans' such as, he claimed, in the Japanese aristocracy. This could be proven because of the clearly visible 'caucasian' features of higher class Japanese, unlike the lower classes who resembled the 'Filipino'.²⁶ In his research in Japan and Australia, Gates contributed to trying to answer these questions about the place of Mongolians posed by scientific racists.

But the Quarterly did not publish its first issue until 1960. Gates correspondence make clear that he was highly impatient to study Asian and aboriginal crossing, and study populations in the southern hemisphere, both activities that he felt that, despite his prolific emphasis on anthropological fieldwork throughout his career, he had neglected. Perhaps studies of sinthropus, the aborigines of Australia and Ainu people of Japan and their intermixtures held the key for his re-legitimisation of biometrics as a discipline that could measure racial inheritance and racial hierarchy. But in the mid-1950s, before the establishment of the Quarterly, he needed money, and to get this he would have to go to several sources.

A number of scientific racists who would later write for the Quarterly or seek the patronage and support of Wycliffe Draper were interested in how to categorise East Asian peoples, and whether the ancient civilisations of China and Japan had been formed through race mixture. Wycliffe Preston Draper, a textiles tycoon, set up the Pioneer fund, in 1937, through which the racist, pro-segregation journal, *Mankind Quarterly* was funded.²⁷ Draper

²⁵ R. Pearson, *Mankind Quarterly* 32, (1991) p.181-188, referred to in, William Tucker, *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wycliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002)

²⁶ Ibid, p.181

²⁷ Ibid, p.4

believed that black Americans should be sent back to Africa. The American Earnest Sevier Cox was obsessed with race, terrified by miscegenation, and advocated the repatriation of blacks to Africa. He gained the attention of Wycliffe Draper at the Pioneer fund in the late 1930s, and Draper gave him funds to continue articulating his ideas of racial purity. Cox became a point of reference for the anti-black, pro-segregation scholarship of the *Mankind Quarterly*. He was also terrified of ‘mongrelisation’ and the growth of a ‘mulatto’ population in the United States.²⁸

Cox argued the ancient advanced civilisations of East Asia developed due to a ‘caucasian influence’.²⁹ In Japan, as Pearson later argued, Cox claimed that the early aristocrats and leaders of Japan had been of ‘an undoubted white strain...the most truly Caucasian people in eastern Asia’. Similarly in China he felt there was proof that ‘blond tribes’ had been early rulers there and birthed ‘Chinese higher culture’.³⁰ So the idea of a caucasian strain in the East Asian ‘type’ had some history with those interwar scientific racists and Wycliffe Draper, whose views were marginalised by the end of the Second World War. In describing his research in Japan in similar terms of trying to unravel the state of the East Asian races, Gates was able to gain some funding and attention from Wycliffe Draper. However in return for helping fund Gates expedition to Japan and his collaboration with Japanese geneticists, Draper in 1954 enlisted Gates to make enquiries about attitudes towards physical anthropology and miscegenation in English speaking universities, clearly with a view to gauging how many scientific institutions and scientists could be persuaded to endorse or conduct research which came to anti-miscegenation conclusions.³¹ Gates race crossing work in East Asia was bound up with this drive to oppose or circumvent the UNESCO

²⁸ Earnest Sevier Cox, *White America*, (Richmond, White America Society, 1923), p.300, 299

²⁹ William Tucker, *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), p.12

³⁰ Quoted in *ibid*, p.13

³¹ Reginald Gates papers, K/PP65-7/22/1, Wycliffe Draper to Reginald Gates, 2 November, 1954, and Reginald Gates to Wycliffe Draper, 9 November, 1954

consensus that human difference was a social phenomenon that couldn't be meaningfully measured with the naked eye.

Gates had even played a role in trying to negotiate collaboration between Draper and the *Eugenics Society* in Britain. The General Secretary of the Society G.C.L Bertram wrote a pamphlet voicing concern about West Indian Commonwealth immigration and miscegenation in post-war Britain.³² With Gates mediation and correspondence between the two, Draper eventually agreed to provide some funds to the society, which Bertram used to commission a race crossing study in Liverpool.³³ Despite his exile from the scientific mainstream, Gates appeared internationally well connected with those uneasy about miscegenation.

Additionally in charting the connections that were formed through this marginal rear-guard action against UNESCO, American and South African desegregation, and how they played into Gates ability to disseminate his research on Asian race crossing, his friendship and co-operation with the Italian race scientist Luigi Gedda becomes significant. Professor Luigi Gedda was a physician, and director of the 'Gregorio Mendel' Institute based in Rome, who had before the Second World War, as he expressed in the catholic publication *Vita e Pensiero* in 1938, argued that interbreeding between widely divergent races produced degenerative results, supporting a new set of laws against miscegenation passed in Fascist Italy.³⁴

Much like Gates, his more hard-line negative attitudes to miscegenation survived the fall of European fascism in the Second World War, Gedda and other Italian race scientists

³² Bertram, 'West Indian Immigration', *Eugenics Society Broadsheet*, 1 (1958)

³³ Eugenics Society MSS, D104, 'A study of the genetics of quantitatively varying human interpopulation differences' (1963), published as, G.A Harrison, J.J.T Owen, 'Studies on the inheritance of human skin colour', *Annals of Human Genetics*, Volume 28, Issue 1-3, (September 1964) pp.27-37. Discussed in Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930-62*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p.149-153

³⁴ Francesco Cassata, *Building the New Man : Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth-Century Italy*. (Nouvelle édition [en ligne]. Budapest : Central European University Press, 2011), (généré le 26 avril 2016). Disponible sur Internet : <<http://books.openedition.org/ceup/697>>, p.328

also choosing to brush off UNESCO's statements, and it was through Gates that he gained a place on the advisory board of the *Mankind Quarterly*. Gedda, Gates and the Quarterly also collaborated over a work that Gedda and the Gregorio Mendel Institute published in 1960 on Italian war mulattoes (*Il meticciato di guerra e altri casi, The hybrids of war*).³⁵ Gates even wrote the preface for the book, in which he lauded Gedda's work as chiming in with and advancing the cause of his own ideas of 'racial genetics', and in his review of Gedda's book for the second issue of the *Mankind Quarterly*, he offered a glowing synopsis of the work, arguing Gedda's approach to measuring miscegenation was a fruitful 'model for studies on the hybrids of war...for anyone involved with the study of races'.³⁶ He stated in his preface that,

The studies on interracial breeding are presently assuming a new meaning. From the occasional or systematic studies conducted in many parts of the world, a science of Racial Genetics is slowly but steadily stemming, the fundamental principles of which are already visible."³⁷

So Gedda's research and the Gregorio Mendel Institute were seen by Gates as important ingredients for him to make his approach to race crossing fieldwork, and his challenge to UNESCO, ever more transnational.

But Gates had also been a source of advice and materials for Gedda's race crossing work. In a letter sent by Gedda to Gates on 23 September 1959, the Italian mentioned that 'I am still working hard to further improve our work on War Mulattoes in Italy, and in review

³⁵ Ibid, p.323

³⁶ Francesco Cassata, *Building the New Man : Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth-Century Italy*. (Nouvelle édition [en ligne]. Budapest : Central European University Press, 2011), (généré le 26 avril 2016). Disponible sur Internet : <<http://books.openedition.org/ceup/697>>, p.328

³⁷ Ibid, p.328

of the literature there I would like to publish one of your pictures of War Mulattoes in Japan'. He was referring to Gates article on Japanese hybrid war children published in 1958 in *Zeitschrift fur Morphologie und Anthropologie*, and he got Gates to send one of his original ethnographic research photographs of his subjects. Reciprocating Gates help, Gedda got Gates race crossing research published in the journal he was editor of, the *Acta geneticae medicae et gemellologiae*.³⁸ Gedda wrote to Gates on 22 September, 1959. He enclosed the 'proofs of the illustrations' for Gates research and publication on aboriginals and Asian hybrids in Australia. He also lamented that delays had meant that Gates article 'studies in race crossing IX', detailing his fieldwork on hybrids in Australia could not be published in Gedda's journal, *Acta geneticae medicae et gemellologiae*, until January 1960. He also included the proofs of this article, which was eventually published in 1960.³⁹ At the Second International Congress of Human Genetics, held in Rome in 1961, and which Gedda largely organised and chaired, Gates paper which collated his career achievements and views on inheritance and race mixture was warmly received. Gedda even wrote an obituary for Gates in 1963.⁴⁰

He also published prolifically in the Stuttgart journal, *Zeitschrift fur Morphologie und Anthropologie*, a broad based journal that published work on 'Earth and environmental sciences, aquatic ecology, anthropology, medicine, zoology and plant science' who appear to have accepted many of his articles submitted during the 1950s.⁴¹ The journal published some of Eugen Fischer's articles, a deeply anti-miscegenationist scientist. Founded by Gustav Schwalbe in 1899, the journal was discontinued between 1945 and 1949, but then was

³⁸ MSS Box K/PP65 – 7/27/2, Luigi Gedda to Gates, 23rd September 1959

³⁹ MSS Box K/PP65 – 7/27/2, Luigi Gedda to Gates, 22nd Sept, 1959

⁴⁰ Luigi Gedda, "Prof. R. Ruggles Gates (in memoriam)," *Acta geneticae medicae et gemellologiae* 12, no. 1 (January 1963): 95, quoted in Cassata, p.320

⁴¹ For a description of the journal and a list of its contents, see, <https://www.jstor.org/journal/zeitmorpanth>

restarted as West German academia was reorganised.⁴² Judging by the fact that the June 1957 edition of the journal contained an article by Eugen Fischer, the physical anthropologist who had written *The Bastards of the Rhine* (1913), describing European-African intermarriage as degenerate, and had been part of the Nazi eugenics movement, the journal was happy to accommodate those race scientists now frowned upon by UNESCO.⁴³

Schaffer and Barkan have already explored in some detail Gates position as part of Anglo-American and transatlantic scientific racist networks and conversations. But crucially, and what has been less explored, is his race crossing fieldwork and activities in the global south in the 1950s, where he was finally able to indulge his fascination with East Asians and aboriginal peoples by conducting studies of people in Cuba, Japan and Australia. Through networks of contacts, expertise and sympathetic benefactors that he was able to build up, through Gates interest in Asians and aboriginals he entered into conversations about mixed race futures and the future of anthropology in Japan, Australia and the Pacific that were rather different to those going on in the North Atlantic. Gates encountered a discursively 'plastic' environment in which his views and methods were given far more space, and at times, endorsement from Japanese and Australian intellectuals considered more mainstream in their own national disciplines. Both racial and discursive frameworks in general proved to be more 'plastic' in the global south, as Warwick Anderson has also suggested.⁴⁴

⁴² Nicholas Marquez-Grant, Linda Fibiger, eds, *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeological Human Remains and Legislation: An International Guide to Laws and Practice in the Excavation and Treatment of Archaeological Human Remains*, (Routledge, 2011), p.168

⁴³ Eugen Fischer, "Postmortale Knochenschumpfung Und Sudecksche Knochendystrophie: Zur Lösung Der Frage Nach Den Gebeinen Herzog Heinrichs." *Zeitschrift Für Morphologie Und Anthropologie* 48, no. 2 (1957): 113-25. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25753386>.

⁴⁴ Warwick Anderson, Racial Conceptions in the Global South, *Isis*, Vol. 105, No. 4 (December 2014), pp. 782-792

Anthropometric Studies in Cuba, 1952

In 1952 Gates had gone to South and Central America to conduct race crossing research paid for by a grant from the Wenner-Gren foundation for Research in Anthropology, known until 1951 as the Viking fund/foundation. The subjects were families in the Eastern region of Cuba who comprised a 'Negro mother and a Chinese father' and their hybrid offspring.⁴⁵ He was assisted by the Universidad de Oriente in Santiago de Cuba who 'secured the indispensable' co-operation of the Chinese-Negroid families to have their photographs taken and have their anthropometric measurements taken.

Gates in this study decided to look for, 'quantitative' range and difference in the hybrid children, such as significant differences in the cephalic indices, paying particular attention to instances of brachycephaly (broad headedness), rather than qualitative features and differences such as 'skin colour, eyefolds and hair character', unlike in some of his later studies where skin colour became far more important. He claimed that his work here was speaking to and building on the work of J.C Trevor, who had also looked at race crossing and published 'Race crossing in man: The analysis of Metrical Characters' (1953).⁴⁶

Gates concluded firstly that the flatness of nose exhibited by Negro-Mongolian hybrids needed to be further investigated as an evolutionary marker, especially in relation to the Caucasian narrow nose. Secondly he maintained his career-long assumptions about hybrid degeneracy, stating in his article draft notes that, 'the average for a crossed population always tends to lie between those of the parental populations where the latter differ significantly'. In this case it was the 'negro' ancestry in Gates view that made this particular

⁴⁵ MSS Box 4/82/4, Manuscript article by Reginald Ruggles Gates '*A study of Chinese X Negro and its bearing on racial relationships*', 1955, see also, Ruggles Gates, *The Emergence of Racial Genetics*, (1960), p.11

⁴⁶ J.C Trevor, 'Race crossing in man. The analysis of Metrical Characters', *Eugen.Lab.Mem.*36.1953, in *Ibid*

miscegenation inadvisable, and he also saw 'no statistically significant evidence of hybrid vigour is found in these race crosses.' Although he appeared to have gotten on well with his subjects, he didn't have high hopes for the future quality of life of hybrid families.⁴⁷

Therefore we can discern two principles which were key to Gates in creating his brand of what he called 'racial genetics' for measuring inheritance and race. Firstly, that in hybrids 'dominance does not occur in regard to physical or anthropological characters' and so F1 hybrids were 'intermediate' between the two parent stocks.' Secondly, 'physical characters' such as skin colour etc were determined by a small number of genes that could be ascribed to specific racial ancestries.⁴⁸

Lectures with the Emperor: Travels, Studies and Scientific Networks in Japan, 1954

He was also greatly interested by aboriginality in both the Ainu of Japan, and the Indigenous of Australia, and the ways in which Asians and aboriginals had interbred. He went to Japan in 1954 to study Ainu archaeology, but also take anthropometric measurements and skin colour readings of samples of the Japanese. He was welcomed by Japanese geneticists who read his work avidly, and this suggests that Japanese scientists themselves had a different interpretation of the usefulness of biometrics alongside genetics in trying to unravel the

⁴⁷ MSS Box 4/82/4, Manuscript article by Reginald Ruggles Gates '*A study of Chinese X Negro and its bearing on racial relationships*', 1955. Gates had also reported to the Wenner Gren foundation about Chinese crosses on 28 March 1952: He claimed that he was in agreement with Carleton Coon, that the Chinese were originally a separate species, that they had their origins in what he called Sinanthropus or 'Pekin man'.

⁴⁸ MSS Box K/PP65, Ruggles Gates, Studies in Race Crossing VIII. Japanese War children, *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie*, June 1958

mysteries of hybridity and heredity in their own populations. Gates even remarked that one scientist was using a similar skin colour chart to himself. His results from examining Japanese peoples suggests that he felt they were a high racial type, with some similarities with Caucasians, and links to the Ainu aboriginals. He was using his brand of biometrics, outdated in the transatlantic, but still taken seriously by Japanese scientists, to come to positivist conclusions about the Japanese.

As the *Nippon Times* reported, after setting out from San Francisco on 1 March 1954, the passenger ship 'President Wilson' travelled to Yokohama via Hawaii with 743 passengers, arriving in Yokohama on 15 March. However it also mentioned that Ruggles Gates, 'professor emeritus of London University' who was also at the time a visiting/guest professor at Harvard, was among the passengers, having been 'invited by the Japan Genetics Society to study the Ainu race and mixed blood babies.'⁴⁹

He spent several months moving throughout Japan. He initially engaged in a lecture tour of Japanese Universities, including a lantern slide lecture about race crossing and racial genetics that he gave to the Emperor of Japan in April 1954.⁵⁰ But Gates was, as always, greatly fascinated by ancestry and racial crossing, and being greatly interested in the Ainu aboriginal peoples of Hokkaido he delved into both archaeology and anthropology. He examined prehistoric Jomon skulls housed in the Department of Pathology at Kyoto, claiming some skulls showed 'a combination of Ainu dolichocephaly with a Mongolian flat nose', perhaps an ancient hybrid ancestor to the modern Japanese. He examined Kamakura skulls at Yokohama.⁵¹ In Hokkaido, with Dr. S.Kodama, Gates visited Ainu villages, measuring the cephalic indices of 140 Ainu, and 'hair samples for study by Dr. Mildred Trotter'. Gates

⁴⁹*Nippon Times*, 16 March, 1954

⁵⁰ Gates MSS Box 2/5, diary, sketches and notes of Gates travels, interviews and anthropological investigations in Japan, 1954

⁵¹ *Ibid*

found that, ‘Some Ainu were of mixed descent and some first crosses, Ainu X Japanese, were obtained’, seeming excited that he had come upon a biological treasure trove with much, ‘material for coordination and study’ in future.⁵² But his trip expanded into anthropometric studies of the modern Japanese, measurements of their skin colour using Gates own self-devised colour charts. Later in 1954 Gates, ‘examined and made records and photographs of 100 war children at a private school in Oiso’ in a miscegenation study of ‘Japanese war children’ who were the offspring of Japanese mothers and white or black American servicemen, that would get published in the *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie* in 1958.⁵³

When he disembarked he was met by four botanists, among them Dr. Sinoto from Tokyo international Christian university, Dr. Hara and Professor Sudar, and they paid for his hotel. Gates was then interviewed by journalists who he claimed in his diary ‘told me I am famous in Japan’. The interviewer asked him to write a 200 word article on population, ‘which I told him was Japan’s greatest problem’. This suggests that although he may have been exaggerating his reception, claiming from another interview that in Japan, ‘I am regarded as one of the famous biologists of the time’, he was clearly getting publicly involved in debates about Japan’s post-war demographic issues, and racial and archaeological questions surrounding difference and hybridity in the Ainu of Hokkaido and the wider Japanese population.⁵⁴

At the University of Tokyo in March Gates observed Professor Sudar examining 1000 Ainu skulls from Hokkaido. Gates suggested these Ainu were mostly Mongoloid with a flat nose, but also felt, as he would explain repeatedly in his future articles, that the Ainu were in

⁵² Ibid

⁵³ Gates MSS Box 2/5, diary, sketches and notes of Gates travels, interviews and anthropological investigations in Japan, 1954

⁵⁴ Ibid

fact an archaic Caucasoid people who had bred with the Mongoloid Japanese to create a hybrid.⁵⁵ Gates was painting a picture of miscegenation in the Far East, arguing he could prove that segregate racial traits could still be observed in these pacific populations, and Japan, like twentieth century Australia, was a part aboriginal-caucasoid hybrid nation.

The Ainu resembles Caucasians in their long head, white skin and wavy hair. In their heavy brow ridges and sunken orbits they resemble the Australian aborigines as well as archaic Europeans.⁵⁶

To Gates, the skin colour of the Japanese was ambiguous and a source of great interest, and before he conducted more race crossing research, he was keen to examine pigmentation on his travels. On 19 March at Tokyo University Hospital, Dr. K Yanagi accompanied Gates through the hospital wards, and Gates used this opportunity to record the skin colour of the patients, using his own skin colour scale that he had developed in 1949.⁵⁷ Gates looked at 84 people on this visit, mainly patients, but also some of the medical students. The results he recorded in his notes for his subjects were: colour 7 = 10 (most dark), 7.5=40, 8=27, 9=4 (least dark), with the average being 'anything between 7 and 8'. He was very keen to present similarities between the skin colour of some Japanese subjects and white Caucasians, stating, 'the 27 recorded as 8 have 'white' European skin, often with pink or red cheeks. Perhaps only one (variable?) gene formation in Japanese'. In his notes he sketched out a rough article, never published, with the heading 'skin colour of Japanese'.⁵⁸ This comprised a broad summary of Gates documenting and measurements of Japanese people during his tour. Concluding Japanese women had whiter skin than men, women studied who

⁵⁵ Ibid

⁵⁶ Ibid, P.4

⁵⁷ Ibid, p.4

⁵⁸ Ibid, p.5

were 'pure white' were 'probably at least as frequent in Tokyo as in 'Niigata'. However, women tended to darken from 6 to 7-7.5 as they aged, possibly 'due to menopause'.⁵⁹

Gates commented in his diary that intellectually he was of the, 'impression Japs suffer from isolation...Their knowledge seems generally rather narrow and defective'. But highly ironically, Professor Kaneko at Nippon Medical School, Department of Anatomy had unwittingly devised an elaborate 'system of recording skin colour' in 1949 that was similar to Gates own colour chart. Expressing surprise, Gates noted that, 'his ideas evidently resemble mine'.⁶⁰ In fact Gates found he had to refer to the Kaneko chart in order to classify the lighter skins of East Asian 'hybrids' because,

My colours, made from Negro-White, do not always fit these hybrids, in which the father was White or Negro, and the mother jap. Many Jap women and some men have European skin colour. When father white the children generally have straight hair. Eyefolds generally present but sometimes slight. Mongolian spot absent in practically all. ⁶¹

Claiming the absence of the 'Mongolian blue spot' suggests that Gates was building evidence to claim that the Japanese were not entirely part of Mongolian type or East Asian racial groupings, but that their skin was more 'European' denoting Caucasian ancestry, possibly he thought as a product of interbreeding with the Ainu. Gates was appropriating Japanese methods to make cases in Euro-American marginal networks and journals.

On 23 April 1954 at Tokyo Gates met the Emperor of Japan, and proceeded to give a lecture to Emperor and a small audience with lantern slides, entitled 'Race crossing and racial

⁵⁹ Ibid, p.5

⁶⁰ Ibid

⁶¹ MSS Box 2/5, diary, sketches and notes of Gates travels, interviews and anthropological investigations in Japan, 1954

relationships'. The lecture focused on the story of human evolution, 'Australopithiscines' and 'race crossing in Cuba and elsewhere'. The Emperor was fascinated, asked many questions, and gave Gates some cigarettes. Gates said the Emperor was 'friendly', but had a 'peculiar habit of fidgeting', describing his physical appearance as, 'skin fairly dark, partial eyefolds'.⁶²

In his reports in December 1954 to the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research regarding the Japan trip, Gates listed his research activities⁶³ in summer 1953, as he'd studied families of Indian and Negro crosses in Yanga and Mataclara, Southern Mexico. He apologised for his lack of reports and publications on Japan. Although it took him four years, Gates eventually published the results of his study of Japanese hybrid war children, fathered by American troops during the occupation'.⁶⁴ He was invited to Oiso on March 23 1954, a small town between Tokyo and Kyoto, and the Elizabeth Sanders Home for war children, affiliated with Christian Children's fund, Richmond Virginia'.⁶⁵ Such hybridity research was already being conducted in the country, and therefore invitation and assistance came from several scientists, Professor Akiyoshi Suda, Professor of Anthropology in the University of Tokyo and Professor T.Furuhata, Dean of the Tokyo Medical and Dental University'. While Professor Suda was collating anthropometric data and 'growth records', these other scientists were also making 'dental impressions' as well as 'psychological measurements'.⁶⁶ As has previously been mentioned, Professor Ushinosuke Kaneko from the Department of Anatomy in the Nippon Medical School of Tokyo was also using his own

⁶² Ibid, 'special one to the Emperor, and a public lecture in Tokyo to an audience of 1200'

⁶³ MSS Box 4/9, and manuscript and typescript 'Report of African expedition', Jan 1956.

⁶⁴ MSS Box K/PP65, Ruggles Gates, Studies in Race Crossing VIII. Japanese War children, *Zeitschrift fur Morphologie und Anthropologie*, June 1958

⁶⁵ Ibid, P.129

⁶⁶ Ibid, P.129

‘elaborate system’ of skin colour measurement, very similar to Gates methods, to discern pigmentation in the children.⁶⁷

About 122 children were studied. The fathers, American white and black servicemen, were unknown, ‘but the children easily fell into two groups, according to whether the father was Negroid or Europoid’.⁶⁸ The children were mostly born between 1946 and 1952, and aged between 3-7.5 years. Gates was assisted by Dr Kangi Gotoh of the National Institute of Genetics at Misima, Dr. Komatsa of the Sacred Heart Hospital in Tokyo. The mothers of the children were all Japanese. ‘Each child had name, age, eye colour (using Martin’s Augenfärbentafel), skin colour of the face and neck (using the Gates skin colour chart), the eyefolds, hair form and colour’.⁶⁹ Gates recorded of the 45 male children of white fathers, noting that the skin of these subjects was ‘essentially white or with very little colour’. On the other hand he noted that ‘negroid’ crosses were easily distinguished by their ‘woolly hair’.⁷⁰ Gates referred to a study by Kirchner in 1952 of 44 war children, aged 1-6 years with German mothers and Negro fathers in West Berlin, and agreed with his conclusions. Kirchner claimed that male crosses developed slower than females, and that those of any ‘negro ancestry’ were more prone to ‘respiratory diseases’. It was concluded that, ‘the precocious development will continue until puberty, which will probably make more difficult the later psychological development. The writer finds that race crossing disturbs the stabilised racial types which have been arrived at through natural selection in the parental races.’⁷¹ Drawing his results together, it was summarised that the 122 F1 children with Japanese mothers showed, as a population, ‘as wide a range of variations as the means of the three races of

⁶⁷ Ibid, P.129, According to Gates, ‘Professor Ushinosuke Kaneko of the Department of Anatomy in the Nippon Medical School of Tokyo was making record of skin colour in these children, using an elaborate system of his own invention’ (Kaneko 1953)

⁶⁸ Ibid, P.130

⁶⁹ Ibid, P.130

⁷⁰ Ibid, p.140

⁷¹ Ibid, P.144

which they are composed.⁷² ‘Considerable independent segregation’ in features from the different races was visible in the hybrid children, and that the ‘true phenomena of dominance do not occur in these racial crosses.’⁷³ Gates self-consciously drew upon and attempted to contribute to East Asian scholarship on Asian miscegenation and physical anthropology. He had the work of F. Ishihara, 1954: ‘Anthropometric study of mixed-blooded children between Japanese and White or Negro races’ in the Japanese journal *Zinruigaku Zassi* translated into English, along with Yun-Kuel Tao, 1935: ‘Chinesen-Europearinnen-Kreuzung’, in the *Zeitschrift fur Morphologie und Anthropologie*.⁷⁴

Paul Fejos at the Wenner Gren foundation however declined to publish Gates articles on Japan. While they were willing to give him small segments of funding, evidently promoting the revival of physical anthropology was not top of their agenda. Gates received numerous enthusiastic letters of introduction and request for copies of his research materials and article on Japanese war children after its publication in 1958.⁷⁵ While Gates was at the Peabody Museum in Massachusetts, Hiroshi Hoshi at the Department of Anatomy at the University of Tokyo sent him a letter on 28 April 1959. Hoshi was conducting a ‘growth study of the Japanese-American hybrids for several years...directed by Professor Akiyoshi Suda.’ A report on this study, Hoshi went on was now in print, and he sought Gates advice. He also asked that Gates send him reprints of his ‘voluminous works’, mainly his ‘studies in race crossing’ for the *Zeitschrift*, and also his work on ‘Ainu and early Japanese skulls’.⁷⁶

It seemed that Gates had been popular among the Japanese scientists, and after the publication of his article on Japan his correspondence are littered with letters from them. H.

⁷² Ibid, P.142

⁷³ Ibid, P.146

⁷⁴ F. Ishihara, 1954: Anthropometric study of mixed-blooded children between Japanese and White or Negro races, *Zinruigaku Zassi* 63, 121-127 and Yun-Kuel Tao, 1935: Chinesen-Europearinnen-Kreuzung, *Zeitschrift fur Morphologie und Anthropologie*. 33, 349-408

⁷⁵ Gates MSS, K/PP65-7/26/2, Paul Fejos to Gates, 24 April, 1958

⁷⁶ Hiroshi Hoshi to Gates, 28 April 1959

Hattori of the Biology laboratory of the Imperial Household in Tokyo also sent a letter to Gates on 19 February 1959, acknowledging receipt of three of Gates 'valuable' recent articles, on 'Japanese War Children', 'The African Pygmies' and 'Forms of Hair in South African Races'. Hattori had, 'delivered the papers promptly to His Majesty and He received them with great interests', suggesting that the Emperor Hirohito had clearly been impressed by Gates lectures on race crossing that he gave to him five years previously. H. Kihara from the National Institute of Genetics at Misima, Sizuoka-Ken also received Gates article on war children.⁷⁷

Taku Komai writing on 27 July 1959, from Kyoto, Gates friend since 1924 when they met in London, congratulated him on his accomplishments in the 'genetics of human racial distribution'. Hearing that Gates and his wife were coming back to Japan in Spring 1960, Komai wrote that he was going to be conducting his own race crossing study of the Japanese, with some American geneticists, headed by Dr. A.J.V Neel studying children in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, while Komai looked at the 'school children of Shignaka' and consanguineous unions? Clearly there was enthusiasm from a community of Japanese scientists for Gates methods and approaches to race crossing, and interest in investigating East Asian miscegenation. This group appear to have been relatively unconcerned by the move away from physical anthropological approaches hybridity in transatlantic science, happily conducting field studies and human measurement methodologies that would not have looked out of place in the 1920s.⁷⁸

Gates lecturing and articles created space for more positive constructions of East Asians. While his methods and arguments about the importance of skin colour were marginal scientific pursuits in the post-war transatlantic, he was not seen as marginal in Japan. Gates

⁷⁷ Hattori to Gates, 19 February, 1959

⁷⁸ Komai to Gates, 20 February, 1959

argued that white-Japanese crosses were some of the more harmonious of those between widely divergent races, certainly in his view less dangerous than 'Negro' crosses. He claimed that in many instances, especially in terms of skin colour, the Japanese were similar to the European. His enjoyment of Japan itself, the travelling, the hospitality and the positive reception he received from Japanese anthropologists and geneticists influenced Gates view of Japan as civilised, and the Japanese as a high 'type'. While he made light of the insularity of Japanese racial science, in fact the approach of a number of mainstream Japanese scientists to physical anthropology and race crossing was remarkably similar to Gates, and indeed in 1959 he was invited back and asked to advise, as a small cottage industry of Asian race crossing fieldwork was developing in Japan at this point. As he would further refine in his race crossing fieldwork on the Australian aboriginal, Gates was developing the idea in Japan that the Ainu people and the Australian indigenes were archaic white Caucasians, and that by extension their history of intermarriage with the Japanese could be measured through his brand of racial genetics, and that he could increasingly prove that the people of Japan were in fact a hybrid Mongolian-Caucasian population, with implications for later intermarriage between whites and Asians in the Pacific.

Calipers and contacts: race crossing research in Australia, 1958

As the *McGill News* (Montreal) had noted, Gates had in the Spring of 1958 set sail from Montreal for Australia for a geographically sweeping tour of race crossing fieldwork across the Australian interior, coastal north and on to Papua New Guinea.⁷⁹ *The West Australia* noted Gates arrival on the liner 'Himalaya' for a three month stay. Accompanied by his

⁷⁹ *McGill News*, Montreal, Autumn 1958

Texan wife who was also an anthropologist, Gates then returned in the autumn to the Peabody department of anthropology Massachusetts, where he codified his Australian anthropometric research and published several articles continuing to espouse his doctrine of 'racial genetics', before in 1959 he and his wife embarked on another research and lecture tour encompassing Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and India.⁸⁰

Gates had been a segregationist throughout his career, and in the late 1950s was keen to interact with those opposed to racial equality who attached political value to pro-segregation research.⁸¹ He was able to gain funding and support from a few American pro-segregationists in the mid to late 1950s through his ability in his correspondence to tailor his Japanese and Australian race crossing work to providing a global picture of why stopping miscegenation was scientifically justified, and getting this to chime into the domestic, anti-black concerns of his American benefactors such as Wycliffe Draper.

As Schaffer has discovered, the American '*pro-segregation businessman*', Edward Benjamin partly funded Gates's travel to and fieldwork in Australia.⁸² Benjamin was a wealthy businessman from New Orleans. He had written an article entitled 'What it's all about' in which he claimed that 'desegregation' in the United States was doomed to failure because whites had a natural 'psycho-physical' antipathy to the 'negro' that could not be explained through political or economic narratives. Benjamin lamented to Gates on 13 January 1958 that it was 'appalling' that magazines such as *Harper's* and *Readers Digest* had refused to publish the article, or indeed anything 'unfavourable to integration', looked for journal suggestions from Gates, and praised Gates anti-miscegenation methodology.

Benjamin's indignant claim that mainstream American magazines such as *Readers Digest* had been publishing literature that was as entirely favourable towards the lifting of

⁸⁰ *Atlantic Advocate*, November 1960, p.92

⁸¹ Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930-62*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p.142

⁸² Gates MSS, Box 1/19, Benjamin to Gates, 14/2/58, from, Schaffer, p.208

segregation in the 1950s, is not at all borne out by the analysis of Carol Polsgrove in *Divided Minds: Intellectuals and the Civil Rights Movement* (2001).⁸³ For instance Hodding Carter, who was the editor of the *Delta Democrat Times* based in Greenville, Mississippi, wrote ‘The Court’s Decision and the South’ in the September 1954 issue of *Reader’s Digest* in which he gave his verdict on the Brown vs Board of Education ruling, which had ruled that the segregation of school in Alabama was unconstitutional. Patronising in its apologies for white racism and the suggestion of negative qualities among African Americans in the South, Kenneth Clark, who had helped the NAACP case during the *Brown* trial, criticised Carter for his claims that the ‘negro’ was of low morality and often illiterate.⁸⁴ But Carter wasn’t the only white southerner who despite liberal credentials, wasn’t entirely enthusiastic about the prospect of the immediate desegregation of southern states. *Harper’s* magazine in January 1956 had an article published by a South Carolina journalist, Thomas R. Waring, in which he ascribed to African-American men the vices of crime, inferior intellectual ability to whites, and a prevalence for broken homes and sexually transmitted diseases.⁸⁵ As Polsgrove notes, although *Harper’s* was seen as a more liberal publication, they nevertheless allowed an article to go to print that was at best highly ambivalent about the benefits of desegregation and increased interracial contact.⁸⁶ Arguably then the embattled Benjamin wasn’t exactly swimming against the tide of opinion in the late 1950s, but rather inhabited an uncomfortable space fraught with racial tension, conservatism and competing interests. That his article was rejected in this climate is perhaps a testament to the extremity of his racist views.

Gates responded on 9 January 1958 having read a typescript of Benjamin’s piece, that he agreed strongly with his sentiments, and that it was the fault of the North during the

⁸³ Carol Posgrove, *Divided Minds: Intellectuals and the Civil Rights Movement*, (W.W. Norton, 2001)

⁸⁴ Peter Daniel, *Lost Revolutions: The South in the 1950s*, (University of North Carolina Press, 2000), p.189

⁸⁵ Carol Posgrove, *Divided Minds: Intellectuals and the Civil Rights Movement*, (W.W. Norton, 2001), p.53

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, p.55

American civil war for not keeping white and 'Negro' effectively segregated, the ill effects of which he had long elucidated from a biological point of view. Eventually Benjamin agreed to provide some funds towards Gates trip to Australia in return for Gates continuing to produce work which supported the need for segregation throughout the world.

C.M Goethe was a nostalgic old businessman at the Crocker-Anglo Bank in Sacramento, California, who also owned a number of ranches. Goethe and his wife financed the Eugenics Society of Northern California and launched Human Genetics Magazine.⁸⁷ They were very concerned with advocating birth control, worrying that in the United States, 'morons always breed like rabbits', that family planning centres should be compulsory, and that there should be a eugenic 'indexing' of all US citizens. On 29 January 1958, Goethe enclosed one of many cheques for Gates to fund his Australian expedition, suggesting he would be able to offer more funds in future, and was 'thrilled' that Gates intended to extend his race crossing work to Papua New Guinea. Being a segregationist like Benjamin, Goethe also had a nostalgic connection to Australia in that his father had been born there, and he had spent 'two years in the Never-Never with the family's blackfellow servants'.⁸⁸ He was also fascinated by Japan, and had helped finance Gates race crossing work there. On 2 June 1958, Goethe expressed his continuing approval of Gates research trip, nostalgically stating that Gates work on the Ainu, 'recalled our own contacts with them at the century's turn while there still was the old Japan'. However Paul Fejos and the Wenner Gren foundation eventually decided to stop funding Gates projects, and refused his application for money for the Australian race crossing work. On 18 September 1958, Paul Fejos, Director of Research at the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research wrote to Gates to tell him that

⁸⁷ Goethe to Gates, 30 March, 1958

⁸⁸ Goethe to Gates, 16 March, 1958

his application for funding for his Australian race crossing project had been rejected, although he did invite him to resubmit.⁸⁹

Gates stepped into an Australia with its attitudes to immigration, racial issues, skin colour and anthropology in the throes of flux and contradictory impulses. The 1950s saw the Colombo plan, a component of which involved an exchange programme between Australian and Asian universities. As Vijay Prashad also argues, the Bandung conference in 1956 represented the symbolic awakening of colonial and post-colonial Asian nations as a Third World project.⁹⁰ According to David Walker Australian ministers and writers from the 1930s onwards increasingly understood that cultural and political rapprochement with Asia would be crucial in future as Asian powers grew in influence.

In the 1930s, communist movements and African and Asian nationalisms had become more assertive, and 'at the same time anthropologists and biologists began to undermine the central concepts of racial thought which had dominated European thought for the last decades'. But this was a transatlantic phenomenon, how far did it happen in the global south? In 1954, in a meeting of the Australian Institute of Political Science Summer School, Grenfell Price argued that 'the White Australia Policy must remain inviolate'.⁹¹ In the Republic of China, Chiang Kai-Shek tried to use the legacy of Japanese anti-white wartime propaganda to his advantage, and there were repeated calls for the Australian government to explain its long term restrictions on the Chinese. These complaints led to the establishment of the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council to consider the question. Glenda Tavan in *The Long Slow Death of White Australia* concurs with Lake that Australian officials were put under great political pressure to end Asian exclusion, but as Lake notes, the necessity of a

⁸⁹ Paul Fejos, Director of Research at the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, to Gates, 18 September 1958

⁹⁰ Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, (New Press, 2007)

⁹¹ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), P.353

drive towards a different kind of racial positivism or pacific cosmopolitanism was confused by the fact that 'Australia had pioneered the vision of a white man's country and was one of the most reluctant to change.'⁹² Calls in the 1950s to move away from racial thinking and racial exclusion clawed at the long held popular imaginary of a cultural, economic and biological inheritance marked by an absence of Asianness and a safe segregation from the Pacific, that Deakin had once felt White Australians would be able to pass on to their children for a thousand years.⁹³ Bill Hughes in 1950 published his fond reminiscences of defeating the Japanese racial equality clause at the Versailles Peace conference in 1919, and argued White Australia had to be upheld, mirroring the sentiments of the Melbourne eugenicist Wilfred Agar when interviewed in 1948.

In 1943 the United States Congress repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act. In 1944, New Zealand abolished poll tax and tonnage restrictions on Chinese coming to the country, which had been in place since the 1880s. In Australia, the conservative government of Robert Menzies made a series of legislative tweaks, abolishing the dictation test in 1958, and allowing a very limited admittance of highly qualified Asian workers, who could also now become naturalised.⁹⁴

The Colombo plan, an educational scheme involving partnerships and exchange programs with Universities throughout Asia, began in 1950. Asian students were welcomed into Australian towns to be hosted by local families, as *The Dubbo Liberal and Macquarie Advocate* noted in 1954 when the town warmly received several students from Malaya and the Philippines who were attached to the University of Sydney.⁹⁵ Asian and Australian students mixed and spent time together, and as they did so a new generation of intellectuals

⁹²Ibid, P.354

⁹³ Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe, 2005), p.22

⁹⁴ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), p.350

⁹⁵ 'Asian Students for Dubbo' (1954, February 25). *The Dubbo Liberal and Macquarie Advocate* (NSW: 1894 - 1954), p. 3. <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article132582826>

saw the White Australia Policy as an obstacle to fruitful pacific cross pollination. However as restrictions were relaxed throughout the decade, the government revealingly ‘chose not to publicise them for fear of a public backlash.’⁹⁶

In 1973 the Australian Labor Party supposedly ‘buried’ the White Australia Policy’ and formally moved towards a policy of multi-culturalism. Australia was nowhere near as anti-miscegenationist as post-war South Africa, which became even more extreme in its formalisation of racial segregation through the Mixed Marriage Act of 1949 and the Immorality Act of 1950 which forbid any kind of interracial sexual liaison.⁹⁷ But there was still an uneasy, ambiguous political and intellectual atmosphere, and the transition towards 1975 was patchy and slow, and while not wanting to be ostracised internationally like South Africa, Australian attitudes to Asians and a Eurasian future were in definite flux., and influenced still by the racial-historical narratives of “‘yellow peril” and fears of East Asia that had formed such an important part in the birth of federation.

In anthropological terms, Joseph Birdsell had stepped back from anthropometry after the Harvard-Adelaide study of the late 1930s, seguing into genetics. In his eyes too many ancestries over too many generations had combined to make the hybrid body unreadable to the physical anthropologist. Michael White from the University of Melbourne along with David Catcheside from the University of Adelaide were part of a movement towards the growing use of the science of genetics in Australian universities to measure population trends.⁹⁸ Sir Frank E. Macfarlane Burnet, an immunologist who was director of the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research based in Melbourne from 1944 to 1965, in *Migration and race mixture from the genetic angle*, an article that appeared in the *Eugenics*

⁹⁶ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), Ibid, P.353

⁹⁷ Ibid, p.354

⁹⁸ D. A. McCann and P. Batterham, "Australian genetics: A brief history, quoted in, Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.238

Review in 1959, used a genetic approach to re-visit Australian miscegenation thinking, arguing that there were ‘virtues’ to a hybrid Australian population brought about by Asian immigration.⁹⁹

A.P Elkin, professor of anthropology at Sydney, wrote the introduction to A.O Neville’s *Australia’s Coloured Minority* (1947). But paradoxically he had declared the pure white nation no longer viable in 1947 in ‘Is White Australia doomed?’ in ‘Australia’s Population Problem’ edited by W.D Borrie, a thesis he advanced in a number of his lectures covered by the Australian press.¹⁰⁰ Like Taylor he controversially argued that white Australians had failed to effectively colonise the tropics and deserts of the continent, and speculated whether the nation should ‘open our doors to an ethnic group more adapted to the conditions. If it come to this point, shall we turn to southern Europe or to the Orient?’¹⁰¹ While the Australian government was indeed moving to encourage settlers from southern Europe and the Balkans, some still found the prospect of Asian colonists dangerous.

The Sydney department of anthropology had been founded in 1926, and in the interwar period paid close attention to the questions of how to live alongside native populations, often informing colonial governance. As a social rather than a physical anthropologist, Elkin came to the conclusion by the mid-1930s that hybrid communities of Aboriginal, white and Asian ‘half-caste’s needed to become the subjects of less anthropometric measurement, and more anthropological fieldwork and cultural integration between tribal and European customs and forms of knowledge production. Elkin drove a

⁹⁹ Macfarlane Burnet, “Migration and Race Mixture from the Genetic Angle” *The Eugenics Review* 51.2 (1959) 93–97.

¹⁰⁰ Russell McGregor, *Indifferent Inclusion: Aboriginal People and the Australian Nation*, (Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, ACT, Australia, 2011), p.61

¹⁰¹ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), p.257

move away from biomedical approaches to hybridity of the 1930s Adelaide school, such as those of J.B Cleland.

Anderson notes that Elkin in the 1940s increasingly argued that ‘full-blood’, ‘half-caste’, or any other mixed race aboriginals continued to adhere to their ancient tribal practices and worldviews because of what, ‘seemed to derive from an education in traditional ways, not from any blood drive’.¹⁰² It was therefore up the social anthropologist to be able to deliver the lessons of ‘civilised culture’ and thereby shape an integration between the European and the indigene that was social rather than biological. In Elkin’s thinking regimes of biological absorption were unnecessary as methods to transform the indigenes, Asians and pacific peoples into Australian democratic citizens. As Anderson notes, Birdsell and Elkin both represented different sides of the growing acceptance of hybridity in post-war Australia. The intermixture of East Asians and pacific island people into the aboriginal populations, along with whites had created untraceable and ‘unpredictable’ biological specimens according to Birdsell. But Elkin’s trajectory was entirely different, suggesting that hybridity in culture was the important factor, and that Asian and aboriginal influences were ‘stable’ and independent, enriching and in harmony with rather than opposed to the national imaginary.¹⁰³ Anderson argues that in light of the work of Elkin, intellectuals, ‘began to scoff at fictions of racial and cultural purity or homogeneity...they predicted that Australia, biologically and socially, would come to take on a more variegated whiteness-if it remained white at all’, but this underplays continued ambiguity about a Eurasian future.¹⁰⁴

In an address to the Sydney labour club in 1945 he claimed that Australia’s outmoded attitudes to immigration and racial difference, still manifested in the Immigration restriction

¹⁰² Ibid, p.249

¹⁰³ Ibid, p.251

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p.251

acts, 'found its root mainly in fear and jealousy of Chinese in the gold-rush period.'¹⁰⁵ In 1946 as President of the Australia-India association Elkin suggested at a speech to the Institute of Political Science summer school in January 1946 that the White Australia policy should be replaced with a system of immigration that allowed limited Chinese and Indian settlement.¹⁰⁶ He was criticised by Davidson, Hayden and Roberts, who accused him of 'heresy' against the sound principles of the White Australia, and that his 'nauseating' statements could lead to instability and interracial conflict in the country.

Although he was rebuffed in the press, his sentiments coincided with the collapse in consensus about biologically shaping Australian demographics that had emerged in the 1930s, and a fragmentation of categories of whiteness, Asianness and aboriginality as hybrid genealogies emerged that baffled investigators and defied straightforward ethnic constructions. Previous frameworks of racial purity and selective miscegenation were by the late 1940s increasingly seen by scientists as unprovable fantasies, while immigration from southern Europe gathered pace. However the criticism that Elkin received when he talked of the possibility of future Asian migration reveals a continuing flux and ambiguity in the way that organisations, intellectuals and the public envisaged the nation's post-war complexion and future ethnic and cultural makeup. Continuing suspicion of the outcome of White-Asian intermarriage played a role in shaping this. There was a public interest in outside expertise in throwing light on interracial marriage. Dr Hagedoorn, a Dutch geneticist on a lecture tour of Australian Universities in 1949, was explicit that the White Australia Policy should be maintained, and that Chinese and Europeans would lose their unique genetic 'advantages' if they intermarried.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ *Morning Bulletin (Rockhampton, Qld. : 1878 - 1954)* Thursday 5 July 1945, 'Colour bar problem'

¹⁰⁶ *Daily Advertiser (Wagga Wagga, NSW : 1911 - 1954)* Wednesday 30 January 1946, see also, *The Canberra Times (ACT : 1926 - 1995)* Wednesday 30 January 1946, 'ASIATIC MIGRANTS OPPOSED SYDNEY'

¹⁰⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 May 1949, 'Expert On Danger Of Intermarriage'

Making a comparison between immigration policy towards Asians after the Second World War, and the White Australia acts of 1901, Peta Stephenson argues the years 1880-1940s saw 'biological determinism' in Australian race thinking, whereby whiteness dictated suitability for citizen. But after 1949, a greater variety of migrants were allowed into Australia. 'Whiteness' itself as a category had become more 'plastic', it became more of an umbrella for a shared European culture, with the acceptance of Eastern Europeans, Southern Europeans, and 'lower status' European groups not previously classed as Aryan by racial scientists, rather than being equated more narrowly with migrants from the British Isles, although there was also a post-war drive for British immigrants.¹⁰⁸ Post-war immigration plans saw a complicated transition from measurements of racial difference to measurements of cultural difference.

However this change was not by any means absolute, in the late 1950s Asians and non-whites still faced great difficulties in applying for and gaining Australian citizenship, 'Europeanness...still marked the boundary of respectability.'¹⁰⁹ The Colombo plan was an attempt at cultural exchange with Asian students, and an attempt to present an image of a colour blind and hospitable nation. Such attempts to demonstrate that Australia was now more tolerant of Asians masked the reality that they were excluded from settlement and citizenship, while biological absorption was still seen as an acceptable policy for assimilating aboriginals.

This is because some of the old anthropological attitudes to race mixture that had marked the 1930s Adelaide school persisted, along with the idea of the 'black Caucasian' that could be blended with Europeans but not Asians, following the ideas of A.O Neville in the

¹⁰⁸ Peta Stephenson, *Beyond black and white: Aborigines, Asian-Australians and the national imaginary*. PhD thesis, Faculty of Arts, The Australian Centre, University of Melbourne, 2003, p.224

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, p.121

1940s, persisted in state thinking after the Second World War.¹¹⁰ The country had not been affected by the move away from race as Europe had been in the wake of the condemnation of Nazism and the holocaust. In 1951 and 1952, when UNESCO's frontal assault on scientific racism was being digested internationally, the Australian government was still refusing to abide by the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and refused to sign up to any international 'declaration against racism' in light of continued practices of removing mixed race children from their parents.¹¹¹ Policies of aboriginal absorption and the biological dissolution of the indigenous population were continued or accelerated, and Asian settlement was still opposed lest it lead to miscegenation and the Asianisation of what was morphing into a white European rather than a white British nation.

Having said this, the UNESCO statements on race were reported upon in detail in 1952 and onward, and there was a growing public recognition in journalistic reporting and discussions that scientific validation behind the notion of an intrinsic biological pre-eminence of white Europeans was beginning to evaporate. By extension the arguments for maintaining a White Australia and decrying intermarriage with Asia-Pacific peoples were increasingly moving onto unsteady anthropological ground. In the *Sydney Morning Herald*, a report on the UNESCO booklet 'What is Race' accepted uncritically that, 'outside the scientist's laboratory the word 'race' has been misused to justify policies of economic and social discrimination' such as the pernicious Nazi myths of the superiority of the 'Aryan' type. Rather the anthropologists and social scientists who had compiled the booklet argued that an 'intermingling of genes' between Negroids, Mongoloids and Caucasoids over thousands of years meant that hybrid populations were the norm, and that there were no pure races. The

¹¹⁰ Heidi Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia: Herbert Basedow and the Black Caucasian*, (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2010), p.127

¹¹¹ *Ibid*, P.126

article was amenable to the idea that race didn't dictate intelligence and skill levels, since it scientifically validated the opening of Australia to skilled Asian workers.¹¹²

The *Adelaide Chronicle* had written an approving review in 1950 of the UNESCO pamphlet, 'A Statement on Race Problems' in which the panel of scientists concluded that 'extensive study yielded no evidence that race mixture produces biologically bad results'. Here was a major newspaper endorsing a full scale refutation of one of the central rationales, applied to intermarriage and mixing between white Europeans and East Asians as a "yellow peril" through hybrid degeneration, that had been used to create and subsequently justify the existence of the White Australia Policy.¹¹³ But Levi Strauss, who gave his advice to the report, critiqued the issue of white tropical settlement when he argued that race was not, and should not be seen as a factor in human ability to settle tropical climates.¹¹⁴ His comments signalled a move away from the brand of climatic determinism, and the notion that 'Mongoloids' were superior tropical colonists to whites, ideas that had characterised the research of Griffith Taylor.¹¹⁵

Dr. J.H Bell at the University of Sydney Department of Anthropology wrote to the *Sydney Morning Herald* in 1954 to complain about the use of the term 'race' on the national census, particularly the description of the Chinese as a race rather than simply a national-cultural group, arguing that the government should pay attention to UNESCO's call to drop the term in favour of 'ethnic groups'. But also Bell questioned the use of the term 'half-caste' in the census. Although it specified a 'half-caste' as a person with 'one parent of the European race', Bell pointed out that the other parent could in fact also be of mixed heritage, and with a varied proliferation of heritage going back often several generations, the fact that

¹¹² White "Racial Superiority" Denied By Scientists (1952, November 17). *The Sydney Morning Herald (NSW: 1842 - 1954)*, p. 2

¹¹³ RACIAL SUPERIORITY A MYTH (1950, August 3). *Chronicle (Adelaide, SA : 1895 - 1954)*, p. 26

¹¹⁴ *Ibid*

¹¹⁵ RACIAL SUPERIORITY A MYTH (1950, August 3). *Chronicle (Adelaide, SA : 1895 - 1954)*, p. 26

complex ancestries could be lumped together under one term made it ‘misleading and of little use in sociological and demographic research’. As Birdsell had also concluded, Bell was critical of the idea that measuring miscegenation, whether it be between whites and Asians, indigenes or any other group was a meaningful rather than divisive exercise in the conversations about population that were shaping post-war Australia.¹¹⁶

Racial tension was still publicly and politically rife. Arthur Calwell, the Australian immigration minister in 1949 under the Australian Labor Party government of Ben Chifley, had to re-invoke the ‘populate or perish’ rhetoric of the 1920s to justify admittance of groups such as Southern Italians and other Europeans who had previously been viewed with suspicion, and were still being viewed with great ‘antipathy’ by post-war Australians. He even invoked the spectre of potential Asian invasion to justify this policy, claiming Australia needed a larger European population to defend itself.¹¹⁷ Australian whiteness had therefore become considerably darker, but black and Asian bodies continued to be excluded, Calwell was anti-Asian and kept this up in the late 1940s. Calwell refused to allow Australian servicemen who had taken Japanese wives to bring them back to Australia after the Second World War, claiming they would ‘pollute’ Australia, and that memories of Japanese atrocities were too fresh. This attitude to East Asian admittance was reminiscent to pre-1901 stereotypes, and Calwell played upon long term ‘yellow peril’ invasion fears which had resurfaced during the Pacific war. The post-war decades saw an uneasy and faltering transition from ‘biological to cultural determinism’.¹¹⁸

Furthermore memories of the Pacific War, in which ‘yellow peril’ tropes and images had been disseminated in the popular press of Britain, Australia and the United States, which

¹¹⁶ "Race," "Caste" And The Census (1954, June 29). *The Sydney Morning Herald (NSW : 1842 - 1954)*, p. 2

¹¹⁷ Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia's Indigenous-Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007), p.126

¹¹⁸ *Ibid*, p.127

had further stoked racist vitriol and demonization of the Japanese, were still fresh.¹¹⁹ As Brawley has also argued however, Anglo-American anthropologists played a more complicated role in the Pacific war.¹²⁰

Griffith Taylor was once again embroiled in these debates about Asian immigration, Eurasian populations and Australia's future. On 21 January 1957, he wrote a letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* commenting on an article about Australian leadership of South East Asia written by a J.A Burton. Burton was extremely pessimistic about the role of Australia in the region and its lack of military muscle or manpower, coupled with its lack of industriousness. Taylor praised Burton for a 'realistic' portrayal of Australian weakness in the face of Asia. 'I have stated since 1920...I see no likelihood that we shall become a powerful nation...our future relations with China will be akin to what obtains in the case of Czecho-Slovakia or Poland and their great neighbour'. This long term perception about Australia's geopolitical weakness clearly had a profound influence on Taylor's intellectual output and his views on race.¹²¹ Taylor's views were then published in the SMH on 2 February 1957, but correspondent P.R Stephenson in the same issue rebutted Burton's view, stating that combined with New Zealand, Australia had an industrious white population of 12 million which could effectively resist any Asian invasion. J.E.S Knowles replied that Stephenson's comments about 'indolent' Asians 'smacked of 'racial prejudice' and concurred with Taylor's view.¹²² However, C. O'Brien, writing from Sydney, attacked Burton and

¹¹⁹ For more on links between the nineteenth century 'yellow peril' trope and the resurrection and dissemination of 'yellow peril' propaganda in Anglophone popular culture during the Second World War, see Jennifer Anne Gregory, *On the Home front : Western Australia and World War II*, (1996), p.186, Philip Charrier, 'The Evolution of a Stereotype: The Royal Navy and the Japanese, 'Martial Type', 1900-1945, *WAR & SOCIETY, Volume 19, Number 1* (May 2001), Anne Mellor, "Frankenstein, Racial Science, and the 'Yellow Peril.'" In *Romantic Science: The Literary Forms of Natural History*. Ed. Noah Heringmen. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), p. 173-196

¹²⁰ Sean Brawley and Chris Dixon, 'South Seas Lore: Anthropology, cultural determinism and the Pacific War', in, Christina Twomey, Ernest Koh eds. *The Pacific War: Aftermaths, Remembrance and Culture*, (Routledge, 2015)

¹²¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 January 1957

¹²² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 February, 1957

Taylor for underestimating the power and dynamism of Australia illustrated through schemes such as the Colombo plan, and accusingly concluded that ‘there is nothing worse than an un-Australian,’ be he new or old’, an insult Taylor had faced throughout his long career.¹²³ It was the idea that praising Asians or highlighting White Australian weakness was unpatriotic and geo-politically dangerous when coming from a senior academic that reoccurred in criticisms of Taylor even after the Second World War, but his debating of this in light of the anxious debate surrounding decline of British colonial power in South East Asia, anti-colonialism and the rise of Asian communism gave him continued relevance.

If Asians could prove that their work would be economically beneficial to Australia, they could be admitted temporarily on permits, much as had been the case after 1901. Much as happened in the opening decades of Asian exclusion as a national policy, those of White-Asian descent had to prove and perform a sufficient level of ‘whiteness’ to be allowed mobility and domicile, and there was a reluctance in the 1950s that those purely East Asian could ever be allowed to become permanent Australian citizens. As Stephenson and Markus argue, changes in legislation and public attitudes toward Asian immigration did not really gather pace until the early 1960s. Markus reveals that in 1964, guidelines that dictated Asian migrants of mixed heritage had to be 75 percent ‘white European’ with a European appearance, rules remarkably consistent to those surrounding the administration of the dictation test in the early twentieth century, were discontinued.¹²⁴ As Stephenson concludes, a less aggressive or anxious view of ‘the prospect of an Asian-Australian population was slowly occurring’ by the mid-1960s, but this was no overnight transition.¹²⁵ Although social anthropology and genetics were more ascendant in 1950s Australia than they had been in

¹²³ Ibid

¹²⁴ Andrew Markus, *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850–1901*, (Hale & Iremonger, 1979) p.178

¹²⁵ Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia’s Indigenous-Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007), p.143

previous decades, this was still accompanied by a lingering if nebulous continuation in the belief in racial difference. Furthermore with the aboriginal question and the investigations of Oceanic hybridity in New Guinea very much active, the belief in the importance, if not agreement about the means of measuring mixed ancestries and the offspring of interracial crossing lingered on.

It was this atmosphere of flux into which Gates stepped. Gates was welcomed into Australia in 1958-59 as a popular scientist who would help shed light on Australia's remaining race questions. He was described by *The West Australian*, in July 1958 as 'a world expert on genetics and anthropology' who had come to study the aboriginals and broader processes of race mixture. Additionally though, the paper also approvingly alluded to Gates consistent, stubborn, fanatical view that he was duty bound to describe human difference, and that segregation was for the universal good. 'He said the answer to world problems was not the interbreeding of all races. He preferred races to have enough self-respect to stay pure.'¹²⁶ That the paper, in representing Gates comments equated racial purity and 'self-respect' throws light on Australia's unresolved conceptions of what its future population might look like, whether the nation would hold to a pan-European white heritage, or whether Asiatic intermarriage would occur, and uneasiness at whether this would destabilise the biological and cultural identity of the nation for the worst.

Revealingly, Gates also received a substantial amount of advice, expertise and equipment from race scientists from across the spectrum all eager to help. Abbie, Elkin, Macintosh, Tindale and Birdsell were key in advising Gates and setting him up with equipment and contacts. Gates initially based himself at the University of Adelaide, one of the focal points for the development of Australian expertise in physical anthropology during the interwar years, and it was through the Department of Anatomy at the university that much

¹²⁶ *The West Australian*, 14 July, 1958

of his correspondence was routed. On 14 January 1958, anatomist Professor Abbie at Adelaide, who would be instrumental in putting Gates in touch with scientific contacts and helping him organise his research, wrote to Gates with arrangements for the ANZAAS Congress which he encouraged Gates to attend.¹²⁷ He also suggested Gates meet with the aboriginal protection board after the conference if he wanted to study more hybrid families after his pre-conference research expeditions, and also got him to write to Dr. Gilbert Archey, director of the Auckland Institute and Museum to set up a meeting and discussion of White-Maori and white Asian crosses.¹²⁸ He also advised him of the large mixed race communities around Adelaide 'in all degrees'. When it came to studying miscegenation in Darwin and Papua New Guinea, Abbie put Gates in touch with the great Sydney anthropologist A.P Elkin. On 28 January, 1958, Elkin replied to Gates letter of the 21st, stating that he was happy that Gates had travelled to study peoples of Australia and Papua New Guinea. 'I shall be only too pleased to help you map out a plan of work...if you so desire. I daresay Professor Abbie has given you some plan for South and Central Australia...Hybrids with whites can be examined in most parts of Australia'. He was full of logistical and travelling advice for Gates, adding,

There is a pocket of Melanesian aboriginal hybrid in the North-East of New South Wales and Chinese mixtures appear here and there. The Darwin area is probably as good as anywhere for this...with regard to New Guinea...blood group analysis carried out by the University of Sydney and Nuffield research team, with Dr. Walsh of Sydney collaborating...I am hoping...to be able to

¹²⁷ Abbie to Gates, 14 January, 1958

¹²⁸ Abbie to Gates, 24 February, 1958

publish Professor N.W.G Macintosh's report on the physical anthropology of the same region, namely, Wabag.¹²⁹

Elkin was enthusiastic about Gates studying the pigmy tribes of Queensland and Madang, offering information and advice about where to find 'tasmanoid' tribes on Palm Island near Cairns.¹³⁰ Writing to him later, on 22 August, 1958, Elkin was glad that Gates race crossing fieldwork in Alice Springs and Darwin had 'gone well'. Elkin and Macintosh were working together, and they and Gates were exchanging travel plans, advice, and Elkin was trying to get Gates on to the ANZAAS conference to deliver a paper, but regretted that the schedule made it difficult.¹³¹ Gates was exchanging research materials and skin samples on the hybrids of Australia and Papua New Guinea with N.W.G Macintosh who was using Sydney lab technicians to analyse them. The three men met in Sydney in early September 1958.¹³²

On 22 April 1958, Joseph Birdsell from the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of California, who had conducted the Harvard-Adelaide race crossing study two decades previously, wrote to Gates concerning his questions about 'Australian hybrids'.¹³³ He advised,

I think that you may well find northeast Queensland most satisfactory. I have not been there myself since 1939 but I think the area of Cairns, Cooktown, and perhaps some of the small towns of the interior, such as Laura, might well give you the best prospects for doing useful work. This is an area which contained

¹²⁹ Elkin to Gates, 28 January, 1958, and, Gates to Elkin, 21 January, 1958

¹³⁰ Elkin to Gates, 9 April, 1958

¹³¹ Elkin to Gates, 22 August, 1958

¹³² N.W Macintosh to Gates, 27th February, 1959

¹³³ Birdsell to Gates, 22 April, 1958

a large number of F-1 and F-2 European hybrids and also contained the largest number of Chinese hybrids that I have come in contact with. The latter originated from native contact with the coolie miners of the gold fields around Laura at the end of the nineteenth century and in my own series I have thirty or more Oriental F-1 hybrids among whom the Chinese hybrids are the most common.¹³⁴

Birdsell's reference to the Chinese 'hybrids' in Laura offered Gates the opportunity to get to the pre-federation biological roots of Chinese settlement and the race mixture that early journalists and investigators had observed. But Birdsell suggested that observing these Chinese-Australian families was getting increasingly difficult, 'I found the hybrid families totally unapproachable at the later time...due to their having become economically assimilated during the intervening decade and a half'.¹³⁵ This was perhaps also alluding to the development of hybrid cultures alongside hybrid bodies that Elkin was referring to in his work, and it seems clear that through faltering yet growing social cohesion, those of Asian and mixed ancestry increasingly resented being treated as test subjects rather than democratic citizens.

Norman Tindale had conducted the Harvard-Adelaide study with Birdsell, but where Birdsell had been convinced by the results to segue into the study of genetics, Tindale had held to physical anthropology. Being still at the South Australian Museum, where he had been researching race crossing since the 1930s, Tindale wrote to Gates on 1 May 1958, stating he looked forward to meeting him at the ANZAAS science congress. 'I will be only too pleased to help you with any information regarding the aboriginal hybrids. My own side

¹³⁴ Birdsell to Gates, 22 April, 1958

¹³⁵ Birdsell to Gates, 22 April, 1958

of the work has been largely that of a genealogist while Birdsell...is concerned himself with the genetic angle'.¹³⁶ Tindale advised that South Australia would be a rich source of data for Gates research 'there are many hybrid peoples in the vicinity of South Australia particularly at Point Pearce and Point McLeay...about one hundred miles from Adelaide. Some of the hybrids at these stations are now in the fourth and fifth generation of crossing'. He even allowed Gates to use six of the ethnographic photographs from his and Birdsell's study, and loaned Gates some observation equipment from the South Australian Museum.¹³⁷

R.L Gair of Gair manufacturing in Melbourne wrote to Gates on 11 April 1958, to offer him assistance from Pastor Albrecht at the Finke River Mission in Central Australia, and Dr. Donald Thomson, of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Melbourne who had studied and lived with the aboriginals around Cape York Peninsula.¹³⁸ Gates was still in touch with H.J Fleure, and the two had a history of friendship despite considerable disagreement on the importance of genetics versus observable traits in the measurement of race crossing. On 23 May, H.J Fleure wrote to Gates, discussing exchanges of work. Gates had sent Fleure a paper on 'Bantu-Indian' crosses, while Fleure mentioned he was getting a paper published on his research on the Welsh, and the development of the Seligman fund. Perhaps trying to smooth over differences of opinion, Fleure flattered Gates, 'Your efforts towards genetical anthropology are invaluable would that we knew more about genes'.¹³⁹ Writing to Gates again on 16 June 1958, Fleure gently disagreed with Gates emphasis on physical anthropology rather than genetics for measuring race crossing, but wished him well in his Australia journey. 'As you know I'm deeply convinced that genes and their

¹³⁶ Tindale to Gates, 1 May 1958

¹³⁷ Tindale to Gates, 1 May 1958

¹³⁸ R.L Gair to Gates, 11 April 1958

¹³⁹ Fleure to Gates, 23 May 1958

inconsistencies are a better line of biological investigation than the old one of subdividing humanity into big regional blocks of skin colour or hair, important as those are.’¹⁴⁰

On 14 March, 1958, Professor David Sinclair at the University of Western Australia replied to Gates letter asking to visit the University and give a lecture on his race crossing work, that unfortunately the only anthropologist they had in their department at that time, Dr Berndt, was a social rather than a physical anthropologist. Therefore, a lecture on anthropology would ‘command so little support both within the University and outside as to make it not worth your while’.¹⁴¹ Western Australia, against the backdrop of controversies about climate, settlement, the aboriginal population and the presence of Asians in the state, had previously been a site for physical anthropological study in the 1930s. The rebuttal of Gates here reflects that some Australian institutions had definitely changed their emphasis when it came to constructing race by the late 1950s toward social methodologies and away from purely biological ones.

Gates embarked on an anthropometric research tour of a variety of hybrid families, beginning in Alice Springs before travelling to Darwin, and then to Port Moresby and Mount Madang in Papua New Guinea. He published this research as *Studies in Race Crossing. Crosses of Australians and Papuans with Caucasians, Chinese, and the Other Races,*” in Gedda’s journal, *Acta geneticae medicae et gemellologiae* 9, no. 2 (April 1960). Linking his evolving approach to race crossing measurement to Gedda, Gates noted he felt that he had progressively refined his challenge to mainstream genetics over the past decade. Speaking initially in broad strokes, he claimed he had found some evidence that Asian intermarriage had left a visible mark that could be seen in the cephalic indices of Australia’s hybrid peoples, that, ‘racial crosses in which Chinese men are involved show the remarkably strong

¹⁴⁰ Fleure to Gates, 16 June 1958

¹⁴¹ Gates MSS, Sinclair to Gates, 14 March, 1958

inheritance of the Mongolian brachycephaly'¹⁴² (shorter head). Discussing crosses between Papuans and Caucasians, Gates stated that 'Papuan skin colour genetics is similar to that of the Australian aborigines'. Furthermore the Caucasian-Papuan cross F1 hybrid was 'surprisingly like the Caucasian type in many respects'. Having begun his case studies and anthropometric analyses around Alice Springs, enlisting the assistance of (names in the acknowledgements section), it was then onwards 1000 miles from Alice Springs to Darwin, which took a three day bus ride. At Port Darwin Gates stated with fascination that in the school he observed there, 'contained many children of mixed parentage involving a number of racial types. Indeed, there are few places where a wider range of racial mixtures can be found'.¹⁴³ Pacific and East Asian ancestries featured heavily in the subjects Gates observed.

Seven main families in the area in and surrounding Darwin were studied and discussed in race crossing IX. In some of the families Gates studied in Darwin, only children could be examined due to the absence of the parents. In family one, the mother was a 39 year old (III.1) aborigineXwhite. The husband (III.2) was a F1 of Chinese and aboriginal ancestry who contained, 'equal measures of aborigines and Chinese, being heterozygous for all the aboriginal and all the Chinese racial characters'.¹⁴⁴ Their seven children displayed the 'ingredients' of four races, with mixed Filipino, Malay, Spanish, Chinese. The second son had a 'broader face combined with high brachycephaly derived from his Chinese grandfather'. The eldest daughter had a 'top eyefold' inherited from a Chinese grandfather, Gates surmised. In analysing the group, Gates claimed that, 'each of these children is a mosaic of racial characters derived from white, aborigines or Chinese'.¹⁴⁵ The Filipino ancestry was less important to Gates anthropometric judgements as they were in his view a

¹⁴² Ruggles Gates, "Studies in Race Crossing. Crosses of Australians and Papuans with Caucasians, Chinese, and the Other Races," *Acta geneticae medicae et gemellologiae* 9, no. 2 (April 1960): 165–84, P.2

¹⁴³ Ibid, P.2

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, P.3

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, p.3

‘secondary race derived from Malay, Chinese and other elements’ and so could ‘hardly enter into this analysis’. So according to his observations, Chinese ancestry had left a very visible mark on Australia’s post-war population. Gates felt that he could use his approach he called ‘racial genetics’, and measure observable physical/facial characteristics to understand the bewildering proliferation of different ancestries and racial characters where anthropologists such as Birdsell had previously struggled.

In family two, the father was three-quarters Chinese and one quarter aboriginal, and his, ‘markedly Chinese appearance results from his broad face, black hair...eyefolds, broad head’. The mother was an AboriginalXWhite. The son, Gates remarked on closer inspection, lost many of the features of the Chinese father apart from being slightly brachycephalic’.¹⁴⁶ Gates was suggesting in this particular case that perhaps Chinese characteristics were slightly more recessive in crosses with aborigines, but also not quite so much of a threat to the physical and mental harmony and stability of hybrid offspring than previous observers of AboriginalXAsian or other Asian ‘infusions’ such as Cook and Neville had claimed in their analyses of previous decades.¹⁴⁷

In family five, the father was white and the mother Japanese. Two sons had ‘light brown, straight hair and yellowish skin colour. Both were brachycephalic...the girl had brown straight hair and practically white skin, with pretty features’. The sons had inherited an ‘absence of brow ridges’ from the Japanese mother. Gates concluded that the genetic characters of the white father were dominant over the characters of the mother, but also that White-Japanese crossing produced a relatively stable hybrid. This echoed his research in Japan in which he suggested through notes and studies that the Japanese were a high type, often with light, almost white skin, especially among the women, and that also many of them

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, p.5

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, p.7

had some form of Ainoid ancestry, a group who Gates continually claimed were an archaic Caucasoid/European type. These factors closed the biological gap, in Gates view, between white Europeans and the Japanese.¹⁴⁸

Examining family six, an F1 daughter of a Chinese father and aboriginal mother married a European and had two children, a boy and a girl. The offspring had the same eye and hair colour, but the son had a darker skin colour and was more brachycephalic, with a much wider head. Finally he travelled to Papua New Guinea, and among those he met he identified in Madang, North Coast of New Guinea, both parents F1 Papuan female X Chinese male.¹⁴⁹

In his overarching discussion of the wide range of subjects he examined, Gates concluded the Mongolian brachycephaly was very visible in the Mongolian crosses, but other characteristics such as the eyefolds less so down the generations of intermarriage.¹⁵⁰ 'In crosses with a Chinese or Japanese ancestor, as in family 1 and 5, the top eyefold generally appears but the epicanthic fold is seldom seen.'¹⁵¹

Massed statistics of racial crosses is of little value either to genetics or anthropology. The only way in which a real analysis of racial characters can be made is by a careful and intensive study of individual pedigrees where the original ancestors belonged to different races'.¹⁵²

It was, 'very surprising that scarcely any person (Pederson) the geneticist or anthropologist has attempted' what Gates felt was his intensive approach to race crossing fieldwork.¹⁵³ More studies were needed, 'involving all the races of mankind which are

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, p.8

¹⁴⁹ Ibid, P.16

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, P.10

¹⁵¹ Ibid, P.10

¹⁵² Ibid, P.19

¹⁵³ Ibid, P.19

sufficiently in contrast to produce hybrids'.¹⁵⁴ This he felt would require both genetic and anthropological knowledge attacking what he felt to be the skewed privileging of academic learning over fieldwork, a view he had consistently taken as he battled against the post-war transatlantic predominance of social science constructions of human difference.¹⁵⁵ He did admit that the sheer variety of intermarriage and crossing in the areas he studied did make it difficult to define segregate racial features at times, crosses appeared to be blended. But he still claimed his brand of racial genetics was effective in unravelling the ancestry of crosses. He went on to state enthusiastically that more of his types of studies should be conducted. On 8 October 1959, he reiterated these views, giving a lecture on 'genetical studies' of the Australian aborigines at the Royal Anthropological Institute in London.¹⁵⁶ He had somehow made it back on to the mainstream stage with this lecture.

In 'The Australian aborigines in a new setting' for the *Mankind Quarterly* (1960), Gates stated that the physical characteristics of the indigenous people he measured proved that they had a near evolutionary affinity with the Caucasoid race than 'formerly supposed'.¹⁵⁷ Although casting this as a fresh analysis, Gates was merely a transatlantic race scientist reiterating the conclusions that the Adelaide School of anthropologists had made in the 1930s, suggesting a degree of intellectual disconnection/isolation. Such work acts more of a personal commentary on Gates revelations regarding a 'racial group' that he had long wished to study. However more uniquely he traced commonality, notwithstanding his engagement with Birdsell's and others ideas that a number of different aboriginal 'types' inhabited different parts of Australia, between some of the indigenes and the Ainu of

¹⁵⁴ Ibid, P.20

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, P.19

¹⁵⁶ Gates MSS, K/PP65, 9/3, Ruggles Gates, *Genetical studies of The Australian Aborigines*, 8 October 1959, lecture given to the Royal Anthropological Institute, London. A month later Gates gave a similar paper on 2 November at the Chandra Bose Institute Endowment Lecture.

¹⁵⁷ Gates MSS Box, 4/89/2 [1960], Typescript draft article by Reginald Ruggles Gates 'The Australian aborigines in a new setting', for *Mankind Quarterly*, p.11, see also, Gates, 1959, The genetics of the Australian aborigines, *Acta Genet. Med. et Comello*.

Hokkaido. Both races were 'archaic' Caucasoids being absorbed into wider populations and national stocks, yet still displaying markers of their ancestry, especially in the Japanese 'hybrid'. Millennia of interbreeding with the Ainu had turned significant parts of the Japanese population into a Caucasian-Mongolian cross. Harking back to his archaeological interests, Gates felt it was 'probable that excavations in the Amur valley would throw further light on their origin and later history' of the Ainu aboriginal.

He rounded off his trip with the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of science, 33rd Congress, Adelaide, 20-27 August 1958. A.D Packer, secretary of the Anthropological section F, at the conference helped Gates make arrangements to participate, give an hour long address to the session and have a quarter of an hour discussion. Packer put him in touch with a number of notable anthropologists, W.E.H Stanner from ANU, Professor Barnes at Sydney, and, J.B Cleland at Adelaide, one of the best known exponents of aboriginal biological absorption.¹⁵⁸ The fact that Packer was happy to introduce Gates to the heart of the national anthropological establishment suggests he was far from an outcast, but also that Australian race scientists were keen to hear outsiders opinions on race crossing, Asians and pacific peoples, and the aboriginal question.

From the marks he made on his copy of the programme, Gates seems to have been particularly interested in papers dealing with the Australian aborigine. He also saw a paper titled, 'The Motu and their Masters. A Study in Race Relations in and around Port Moresby from 1873 to the Present', perhaps in preparation for his race crossing research ventures to Port Moresby and Mount Hagen. The conference played host to figures who had been writing about Australia's demographic and racial issues and how they related to the nations proximity to the pacific, and whether Australia could one day support Asian migrants and interracial marriage. In the Symposium, 'How many People can the World Support?'. One

¹⁵⁸ Gates MSS, Packer to Gates, 20 February, 1958

of the main speakers was Prof W.D Borrie at the Research School of Social Science, Canberra, who had written on Asians, the Chinese, and race crossing in Australia and the Pacific.¹⁵⁹ Borrie's paper was titled 'The Growth and Distribution of Australia's Population, 1947-1954', based around his book published in 1948. The 22nd August saw another symposium on 'The future of the Australian Aborigine' with one of the leading speakers being Mr. C.E Bartlett, Protector of Aborigines for South Australia, a man therefore closely involved with the administration of post war provincial population and racial issues.¹⁶⁰

Conclusion

As Ruggles Gates died in 1962, the White Australia Policy was beginning to slip out of existence. By the mid-1970s, measures of East Asian exclusion, white purity and the absorption or destruction of the racial hybrid had lost their scientific or medical legitimacy in the country. But there was still public and political uneasiness about the gradual move away from a nation built on the drive for 'British' homogeneity to an acceptance of more diverse ancestries, highlighted by the press rebuttal of Elkin when he publicly considered the positives of a future programme for Asian and East Asian settlement, as Taylor had been rebutted in the 1920s. It was this uncertainty and flux in scientific and popular circles that Reginald Gates tapped into when he visited Australia and other parts of the Southern hemisphere in the late 1950s, as the questions of hybridity and pacific proximities still stirred immense interest as the global south attempted to imagine its future population demographics.

¹⁵⁹ MSS Box 4/12, Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of science, 33rd Congress, Adelaide, 10-27 August 1958, programme.

¹⁶⁰ MSS Box 4/12, Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of science, 33rd Congress, Adelaide, 10-27 August 1958, programme.

Elkin, Abbie, Birdsell, Tindale and Macintosh all assisted Gates in carrying out his race crossing work. Elkin didn't mind at all that Gates was a physical rather than a social anthropologist, and there was enough discursive flux, space, but also a common interest in anthropological fieldwork in mixed race communities in the antipodes that meant different approaches to race could co-exist in the late 1950s mainstream antipodean discourse that was not as possible in a post-war transatlantic climate still morally and politically fixated by the crimes of Nazi eugenics. They were interested by Gates exploration of the aboriginal-Asian and Asian-white element, and the study of race crossing in Australia was diverse enough to allow a number of different approaches and samples.

The chapter also threw new light on the unwitting similarities between Gates and a number of Japanese scientist's methods of recording East Asian skin colour. The chapter argued that while Gates was opposed to miscegenation and funded by racists, at the same time through his studies of the Japanese in Japan, and Asian race crossing in Australia, that he held a high opinion of East Asians as both what he saw as a physical 'type', and as an ancient civilisation. Although there has been insufficient scope to investigate further, this was arguably echoed by other contributors to the *Mankind Quarterly* such as Richard Lynn. While categorical about racial difference and black inferiority, a number of post-war scientific racists held the 'Mongoloid' to be the most intelligent human type. Like the anthropologists of 1930s Adelaide he viewed the aboriginals as archaic Caucasians, but also the Ainu tribes of Japan, and through his research he drew up aboriginal-Asian interbreeding in Japan and Australia as a fact of the Pacific.

East Asians, Pacific peoples, whites and aboriginals had created a complex biological patchwork of inheritance, but where physical anthropologists such as Birdsell had given up meaningfully trying to categorise these ancestries and what they meant for the future of hybrid offspring, hybrid families and the hybrid nation through anthropometry, subsequently

gravitating towards population genetics, Gates kept his career long conviction that through 'racial genetics' he could unravel how Asian, Pacific and aboriginal 'infusions' had changed Australian bodies for better or worse. In doing this he was a marginal, transatlantic latecomer addressing the same Asian and aboriginal questions that had occupied global southerners since before the advent of federation and the project for a pure white Australia free of Asian blood.

Thesis conclusion

As Ben Mountford has argued in his work on the long term triangular relationship between Britain, Australia and China, by the time of the mid-1960s, ‘the lasting remnants of the Anglo-Saxonist ideal had become an ‘affront’ to efforts to forge a viable, multi-racial Commonwealth...The continuing use of race-based immigration policies in the former Dominions, wrote Derek Ingram in his *Commonwealth for a Colour-Blind World* (1965), might “become one of the Commonwealth’s most dangerous problems”.¹ Yet this also reflected the flux, ambivalence and even anxiety of the immediate post-war decades about not only the proximity of East Asia, which as David Walker argues had always been a defining question shaping Australian nationhood, but also about whether a Eurasian future would inevitably and harmoniously replace the drive towards whiteness, which had been such a powerful impulse in the creation of the federation. The collapse in physical anthropologists attempts to construct, regulate and propagate fantasies of white purity and aboriginal absorption contributed to the uncertainty of the post-war political landscape.² But arguably a Eurasian rather than a British future is now something of a reality for Australia, as by 2011 China overtook Britain as a source of migration to the country.³ There was perhaps a prescience to the words of P Just in the 1850s that it was a ‘golden future’ rather than a White Australia that would emerge in the Pacific out of the flowing currents of migration and time.⁴

¹ Benjamin Mountford, *The Open Door Swings Both Ways: Australia, China and the British World System, c.1770-1907*, DPhil Thesis, Exeter College, University of Oxford, 2012, p.341

² David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999)

³ ‘Trade and Investment’, *Australian Embassy, China* [website], <<http://www.china.embassy.gov.au/bjng/relations2.html>>

⁴ Kane Collins, *Imagining the Golden Race*, p.101, in, David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012)

This thesis has broadly considered the relationship between the work of a number of interwar Anglo-Australian anthropologists and their anthropometric studies of Anglo-Asian and European-aboriginal intermarried families, and late nineteenth century discourses of the “yellow peril” emerging from gold rush settlement. It has been argued that the momentum of increasing anti-East Asian sentiment drove the hardening of Anglo-Saxonist biological determinism on the road to the creation of the White Australia Policy in 1902. The thesis has also contributed to a more transnational understanding of the evolution and dissemination of the “yellow peril” trope between the south and north of the British World. The White Australia debates, and the antipodean colonies as a node of anxious contact between the British, Chinese and Japanese Empires, fed back into and informed growing Edwardian metropolitan anxieties about the very small yet increasingly noted and discussed Chinese and non-white immigration into British port cities.

The idea that gold rush encounters with Anglo-Chinese intermarriage created a unique form of biological determinism that drove the development of physical anthropology throughout the British World, and germinated “yellow peril” anxieties that drove scientific and political debates into a direction decidedly hostile to miscegenation and mixed race communities by the time of the 1919 race riots in British cities has often been underexplored. While scholars have instead chosen to focus on panics relating to black/white mixing, Anglo-Australian anthropology played an interconnected and underexplored role in responding to the “yellow peril”, Chinese question and the migration questions, issues that by the time of their discussion at the Imperial Conference of 1907, were coming to entwine and unsettle the entire empire, Anglosphere and white men’s countries. The “yellow peril” discourse through which Chinese migration and the rise of the Japanese Empire was constructed eventually pushed miscegenation thinking into anthropological conversations of the 1920s, a

significant departure from the observations of the Chinese and Japanese by travelling writers and race thinkers of the mid-nineteenth century, to whom the East Asian had been a benign curiosity.

The second section of the thesis broadly explored the waxing and waning of the authority of interwar Anglo-Australian physical anthropologists as they attempted to respond to and explain the proliferation of Asian intermarriage throughout the British World. In Australia this manifested itself in the growing interconnection between anthropologists construction of aboriginals as related to Caucasians, and Asian bodies as a continued ‘‘yellow peril’’, and a variety of official schemes to absorb aboriginality into the European settler population while limiting any Asian ‘infusion’. However by charting Australian anthropological history over several decades, the chapter revealed that the authority of physical anthropology and anthropometric documentation of mixed heritage children, and the ability of race scientists to influence government policy, was gradually undermined by the 1950s. The proliferation of intermarriage between Australian Asians in the Northern Territory from many parts of the pacific region with other groups such as the aboriginals made the teasing out of different heritages from the interracial melange an increasingly pointless exercise in the eyes of J.B Birdsell and others. By the 1950s authority for the understanding of Australisn heritage was passing to social anthropology and genetics.

The thesis has argued that ideas of racial difference were still the established framework through which interwar Australian anthropologists made their claims, but they interpreted racial types as more plastic and malleable than many of their counterparts in the North Atlantic. Miscegenation was accepted as a reality with which anthropologists and politicians needed to keep up, quantify and regulate, while at the same time the thesis has argued that the fantasy of whiteness in Australia was a lingering dream that in fragmented fashion survived the taint of Nazi eugenics in the global north.

The interracial violence between white men and ‘men of colour’ that characterised the 1919 riots in major British cities became a focal point for investigating evolving constructions of race and hybridity in Imperial Britain. Chapters two and three explored how approaches to solving the ‘Chinese Puzzle’, which encompassed anxieties about growing Chinese migrant populations in Britain by 1919, and fears of White-Asian miscegenation, segued from colonially constituted cultural stereotypes about immoral, lascivious Asians, to anthropological studies of mixed race minds and bodies in the metropole.

The interwar years were, as Lucy Bland argues, suffused with transatlantic prophecies of impending race war, fears that Britain had lost control over immigration, gender relations and the reconsolidation of whiteness after the First World War, and scientific assumptions that interracial sex produced inferior children. The Eugenics Society in Britain in 1924 commissioned race scientists H.J Fleure and Fleming to use their expertise in anthropology and anthropometry to assess the scope of this problem by studying mixed race Anglo-Chinese children in Liverpool.

Chapter two argued that through anthropometric measurements and questioning of these hybrid children, Fleming, rather than denouncing the Eurasian children as degenerate, was surprised to find that “‘yellow peril” stereotypes of crime, deviancy, and low morality were absent in favour of good behaviour and an emphasis on education. As a result she came to more complex conclusions about hybridity that problematized mainstream interwar imperatives to reconstitute the boundaries of Britishness through segregation and exclusion.

Chapter three of the thesis re-evaluated the anthropological work of Griffith Taylor in a more transnational light, at the height of early 1920s “‘yellow peril” anxiety. His negative views about the suitability of the climate of Northern, central and eastern Australia for white settlement, as has been explored by Powell, did much to contest and upset White Australia’s

biological sense of self. His estimation that East Asians were a more evolved strand of humanity than northern Europeans, that racial hybridity rather than purity was an established reality, and that White-Mongolian intermarriage was the likely and desirable future of the nation, struck hard at what many felt was the *raison d'être* of white men's countries and the British World system, the assumed superiority of the Northern European mind, body and civilisation.

Overall the thesis has gone further than previous scholarship to explore Taylor's projection of Australian race and settlement debates to a wider North Atlantic as well as Chinese and Japanese audience, ironically by decentering himself as a transnational scientist looking in on Australia as an insular white nation. But as settler frontiers were vanishing throughout British settler colonies and the United States after the late nineteenth century, and Asian restriction was coming into force, public and politicians were increasingly looking for expert opinions of anthropologists and geographers to explain the future of race and colonisation. Taylor makes us realise that Eurasian miscegenation and the 'yellow peril' were pieces of a global debate that entwined itself with national and regional parochialism. In Britain, Fleming's race crossing studies and the wrangling's of the 1919 Eugenics Congress, and scientists like Gates, Keith and Fleure reflected the same questions. What did the mobility of East Asians set off by the gold rushes, and the rising global agency of powers such as Japan mean for the demographic and geopolitical future of Anglophone civilisation and the British World?

In chapter four, the second major case study of the thesis sought to chart a more nuanced narrative of the decline of scientific racism and physical anthropology between the interwar and post-war worlds, by considering in detail the 1950s, the final decade of the career of botanist and 'racial biologist' Reginald Gates before his death in 1962. As Schaffer noted, the stubbornness with which Gates held onto his racist views and hostility towards

race mixture, offer an historical lens through which to view the gradual dissolution, in public at least, of mainstream scientific certainties about racial difference in 1930s Britain. Over the course of this decade Gates became a marginal outcast. After the Second World War however Gates was prolific as a travelling physical anthropologist, and expanding on the work of Schaffer and Tucker, the chapter shed light on the ability of Gates to cultivate support for continuing race crossing field research from segregationist benefactors in the United States such as Wycliffe Draper, but also European scientific racists such as Luigi Gedda.

But going further than existing studies of Gates career, the chapter utilised previously unused archival material to argue that, before the founding of the Anglo-American *Mankind Quarterly* journal to fight a rearguard action against UNESCO, Gates was already busy conducting a plethora of race crossing research on East Asians in the Pacific and the global south. The research has revealed that Cuba, Japan, but most importantly post-war Australia were all visited by Gates as research sites in which he could develop his underexplored fascination for the biological interaction between East Asian and aboriginal bodies through intermarriage. But such sites represented not only exciting opportunities for research and networking with Japanese and Australian anthropologists, but as fresh canvasses on which post-war racists such as himself could find new ways to make their claims that racial difference was fixed, that then fed back into attempts to re-invigorate transatlantic racism and justify segregation. The chapter argued that in the midst of a unique patchwork of political and scientific flux in the global south, far removed from the boardrooms of UNESCO and the camps at Auschwitz, biological determinism didn't entirely disappear in 1950s Australia and Japan. As a result Gates was a far less reviled figure among Japanese and Australian intellectuals who welcomed him and shared their own race crossing data, advice and expertise.

The chapter argued that the assertion that outside the Anglo-American scientific mainstream, biological ideas of race disappear after the Second World War, which had been advanced by historians such as Barkan, needs to be complicated significantly, and we need to use the anthropological transactions throughout the global south and Australia to further revisit the idea that race drops out of history by the 1950s. Gates was marginalised but not wiped out, and by charting the narratives of his and Taylor's career, as they followed on from nineteenth century Anglo-Australian "yellow peril" fears about being overrun by East Asian migration, bringing into focus the fragility of white settler colonialism and the birth pains of a multi-racial Britain, we get a more subtle history of race that supplements UNESCO narrative. In the 1950s, scientific racists still have ways and means to write, and their biological determinism didn't quite mean the same thing in Britain as it did in Australia.

By comparing and entwining the two case studies of Gates and Taylor's pronouncement on East Asian miscegenation, the thesis has constructed a more complicated and transnational narrative and spectrum of the wax and uncertain wane of racial thinking and the "yellow peril" trope in the first half of the twentieth century. Their careers have also given us an opportunity to create a dialogue between the travelling race scientists of the British World in both the North Atlantic and the global south by charting their travels, transactions and controversies as well as their research output. Gates and Taylor used similar methods of anthropometry to judge racial difference, and were educated to some degree in institutions in the North Atlantic. But through their views about East Asians and interracial mixing in Australia we get two contrasting views of the future of the British World. On the one hand an interwar fractious outsider who in a way looked in on Australia as a North Atlantic outsider, that saw race mixture as a future solution to Australia's isolation and challenges. On the other hand we saw a stubborn conservative North Atlantic scientific racist, holding to the abhorrence for miscegenation which he had at the time of the 1919 race

riots, and fascinated, horrified and alienated by the proliferation of multi-coloured humanity he encountered and the loss of authority of physical in favour of social anthropology. Both were outsiders for very different reasons. Overall the thesis has created an Anglo-Australian framework as one way of contributing to and bringing together histories of anthropology and the “yellow peril” trope in the British World in the twentieth century, and this research is in part a call for others to continue and expand this transnational and interdisciplinary approach.

APPENDIX

Griffith Taylor papers, National Library of Australia, 9/956: Gavin Long, 8th July 1928, to Taylor, Brighton, Victoria. "Boyhood friend, son of Bishop Long." 08/07/1928. His disagreement with some conclusions of *Environment and Race*. Problems of Asian immigration in view of racial prejudice.

Taylor hand wrote a note at the end of the letter: 'Sense of right clouded by sense of 'Right for me' Looking ahead unimportant to most people' 12/7/28

"When Mrs Taylor was in Melbourne last year I asked her if you would be bored if I wrote to you disputing some of the conclusions that you reach in 'Environment and Race'. She said that you would not...It appears to me that the factor that justifies our immigration policy (of restricting European migration and excluding Asiatics) is the race prejudice that exists in Australia as among all British people and in the United States. It may be a fact that mixed races are progressive and that the Chinese are our equals in mental capacity, but the incidents in Gippsland, Western Australia and North Queensland in which Australians have waged war with beer bottles on Italians invaders are no less facts. Anti-Chinese riots are not called for today but, if Chinese were admitted to the tropical parts of Australia, they would undoubtedly recur. One person in 1000 in Australia will admit that the exclusion of Chinese and Japanese is morally unjustifiable. This minority consists of interested employers seeking cheap labour, and disinterested scientists, moralists and Labour 'internationalists'. But who is going to set out to convince the immoral majority that they are equal if not inferior to 'chows' and 'dagoes'? The prejudice is a fact and cannot be disregarded. A mixed race could be produced in Australia, but not without internecine struggles that would make the guerrilla warfare between whites and coloured people in the United States look inconsiderable. You recommend for consideration a plan whereby foreigners would be admitted in small numbers and in proportion to their present place in the population of Australia. Would the admittance of a few hundred Japanese a year satisfy Japanese pride? I submit that it would not, but that it would increase race prejudice in Australia and in Japan. There would be 'incidents' like those which occurred in the gold rush and with Italians more recently. On the whole we are fond of the Chinese and not antagonistic to the Japanese who are in Australia. Once admittance of so many more of either race that they became serious competitors with 'whites' for employment would destroy this good feeling.

Do we not exaggerate the urgency of our need for population and the value of Australia as an outlet for other peoples 'excess population'? According to my own calculations, if we continue to increase at our present rate we will have a population of about 60,000,000 in about 120 years. When this has happened, you estimate Australia will be as heavily peopled as Europe is today. If Japan sent to Australia immigrants equal in number to her natural increase every year this 60,000,000 might be achieved in half the time. But then or a little later, Australia having been saturated, Japan and other countries would still have to face the problem they wish to postpone today. I submit that if Australia threw her doors wide open, the gain to nations with surplus population would be short lived and the damage done to Australia would be lasting. If for 120 years, say, we maintain our recent policy of filling Australia with our own particular kind of hybrid race the problem will no longer exist. An

Asiatic-British race might prove to be an improvement but is it worthwhile to make an experiment that would involve generations of hatred and race conflict within Australia. The vast majority of us despise the Asiatic and he despises us. If Australia became a common tilting ground lack of sympathy would turn to hatred. We live in two camps separated by some 1000s of mile. All is for the best in the best of all possible worlds.

The Conservative Australian, who wants unlimited immigration has the wrong motives and the wrong plan of action. The labour politician reached the right conclusion but he went there the wrong way. I think that you give good but not sufficient reasons for doing the wrong thing.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Material:

British Library:

Charles Wentworth Dilke Papers (BL/CWD)

National Archives, Kew:

Colonial Office CO

Foreign Office FO

Home Office HO

Liddell Hart Archive, Kings College London:

Reginald Ruggles Gates MSS

Liverpool Central Archive:

The Fletcher Report, 1930: 'Report on an Investigation into the Colour Problem in Liverpool and Other Ports' for the Liverpool Association for the Welfare of 'half-caste' Children.

London School of Economics Archive:

Charles Seligman MSS

Royal Anthropological Institute Archives, London

Andrew Arthur Abbie MSS

Royal College of Surgeons Archive:

Arthur Keith MSS

Frederic Wood Jones MSS

Aberystwyth University Archive:

H.J Fleure MSS

Bodleian Library:

Charles Pearson MSS

James Bryce MSS

Cadbury Research Library, Special Collections, University of Birmingham:

Joseph Chamberlain Papers (UB/JC)

Lancelot Hogben MSS

Edinburgh University Library:

Robert Knox MSS

University College London Archive:

Karl Pearson MSS

J.B.S Haldane MSS

Wellcome Library:

Eugenics Society MSS

Sir James Cantlie MSS

Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne:

Richard Berry MSS

Wilfred Agar MSS

Melbourne Performing Arts Centre:

Bland Holt MSS

National Archives of Australia (NAA)

Commonwealth Government Archives

National Library of Australia:

Griffith Taylor MSS

W.D Borrie MSS

Alfred Deakin MSS

State Library of Victoria

Charles Henry Pearson MSS

Digital Archives

Australian Dictionary of Biography (*ADB*):

<http://adb.anu.edu.au/>

British Newspaper Archive:

<http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/>

House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, Millbanks System: Hansard:

<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons>

MIT Visualising Cultures project

http://ocw.mit.edu/ans7870/21f/21f.027/home/vc01_about.html

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (*ODNB*):

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/>

Trove, Australian digitised newspapers:

<http://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/>

Print Newspapers

Britain

Daily Graphic

Daily Sketch

Punch

The Daily Express

The Daily Mail

The Daily Mirror

The Daily Telegraph

The London Illustrated News

The Manchester Guardian

The Times

Australia

Army News (Darwin, NT 1941-1946)

Barrier Miner (Broken Hill, NSW 1888-1954)
Cairns Post (Qld. 1909-1954)
Examiner (Launceston, Tas. 1900 - 1954)
Morning Bulletin (Rockhampton, Qld. 1878-1954)
Portland Guardian (Vic. 1876-1953)
Sunday Times (Perth, WA 1902-1954)
The Advertiser (Adelaide, SA 1931-1954)
The Argus (Melbourne, Vic. 1848-1954)
The Canberra Times (ACT 1926-1954)
The Courier-Mail (Brisbane, Qld. 1933-1954)
The Mail (Adelaide, SA 1912 - 1954)
The Mercury (Hobart, Tas. 1860-1954)
The Register (Adelaide, SA 1901-1929)
The Sydney Morning Herald (NSW 1842-1954)
The West Australian (Perth, WA 1879-1954)
Townsville Daily Bulletin (Qld. 1885-1954)
Western Mail (Perth, WA 1885-1954)

Periodicals

Anthropological Review
Boomerang
Journal of the Royal Anthropological institute of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
The Contemporary Review
The Eugenics Review
The Lone Hand
Man
Mankind Quarterly
Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London

Books and Articles

Stefanie Affeldt, 'A Paroxysm of Whiteness. 'White' Labour, 'White' Nation and 'White' Sugar in Australia', in: Wulf D. Hund, Jeremy Krikler, David Roediger, eds., *Wages of Whiteness & Racist Symbolic Capital* (Berlin, 2010)

Stefanie Affeldt, 'White Nation-White Angst. The Literary Invasion of Australia', in *Racism and Modernity* (Berlin, 2011)

K. Aikman, 'Race Mixture', *Eugenics Review* (1933), 25: 3, 161–6.

Anne Aly & David Walker, Veiled Threats: Recurrent Cultural Anxieties in Australia, *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* (2007), 27:2, 203-214

Sunil Amrith, *Crossing the Bay of Bengal: The Furies of Nature and the Fortunes of Migrants* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 2013)

Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003)

Warwick Anderson, 'Liberal Intellectuals as Pacific Supercargo: White Australian Masculinity and Racial Thought on the Boarder-Lands'. *Australian Historical Studies*, (2015), 46(3), 425-439.

Warwick Anderson, 'Making Global Health History: The Postcolonial Worldliness of Biomedicine'. *Social History of Medicine*, (2014), 27(2), 372-384.

Warwick Anderson, 'Racial Conceptions in the Global South', *Isis*, Vol. 105, No. 4 (December 2014), pp. 782-792

Warwick Anderson, 'The military spur to Australian medical research'. *Health and History*, (2013), 15(1), 80-103.

Warwick Anderson, "Racial Anthropology and Human Biology in the Island Laboratories of the United States," *Current Anthropology*, (2012), 53:S95–S107;

Warwick Anderson, 'Racial Hybridity, Physical Anthropology, and Human Biology in the Colonial Laboratories of the United States.' *Current Anthropology*, (2012), 53(SUPPL. 5), S95-S107

Warwick Anderson, 'Hybridity, Race, and Science: The Voyage of the *Zaca*, 1934–1935,' *Isis*, (2012), 103:229 –253.

Warwick Anderson, The Natures of Culture: Environment and Race in the Colonial Tropics. In Paul Greenough and Anna L. Tsing (Eds.), *Nature in the Global South: Environmental Projects in South and Southeast Asia*, pp. 29-46, (Durham and London, UK: Duke University Press, 2003)

Ross L. Jones and Warwick Anderson, 'Wandering Anatomists and Itinerant Anthropologists: The Antipodean Sciences of Race in Inter-war Britain,' *British Journal for the History of Science*, FOCUS—ISIS, 105 : 4 (2014)

Sascha Auerbach, *Race, law, and "The Chinese Puzzle" in Imperial Britain*, (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009)

Austin, Tony. 'Cecil Cook, scientific thought and 'half-castes.' *Aboriginal History* 14 (1990): 104-22

Kate Bagnall, 'Rewriting the History of Chinese Families in Nineteenth-Century Australia', *Australian Historical Studies*, (2011) 42:1, 62-77

Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

Alison Bashford, *Imperial Hygiene: A Critical History of Colonialism, Nationalism, and Public Health* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Alison Bashford, 'Quarantine and the Imagining of the Australian Nation,' *Health*, (1998), 2:387– 402

C.A Bayly, *Forgotten Armies Britain's Asian Empire & War with Japan* (Penguin, 2004)

Jeremy R. Beckett, ed., *Past and Present: The Construction of Aboriginality* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 1994)

James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000*, (Auckland: Lane, 2001)

Anthony Best, *British Intelligence and the Japanese Challenge in Asia, 1914-1941*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002)

Robert Bickers, *The Scramble for China: Foreign Devils in the Qing Empire 1832-1914*, (London: Penguin, 2012)

Robert Bickers, *The Boxers, China and the world*, (Manchester University Press, 2007)

Robert Bickers, *Empire made me: an Englishman adrift in Shanghai*, (Manchester University Press 2003)

Robert Bickers, *Britain in China: community, culture and colonialism 1900-1949*, (Manchester University Press, 1999)

Daniel Bivona, *British imperial literature, 1870-1940: Writing and the administration of Empire*, (Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Lucy Bland, 'White Women and Men of Colour: Miscegenation Fears in Britain after the Great War', *Gender & History*, Vol.17 No.1 April 2005, pp. 29–61.

Bland, Lucy and Laura Doan, (eds), *Sexology in Culture: labelling bodies and desires*, (University of Chicago Press, 1998)

Gregory Blue, 'Gobineau on China: Race Theory, the "yellow peril", and the Critique of Modernity', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Spring, 1999), pp. 93-139

Sugata Bose, *A Hundred Horizons: The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 2006)

Sean Brawley, *The white peril: foreign relations and Asian immigration to Australasia and North America 1919-78*, (University of New South Wales Press, 1995)

Nicholas Brown, 'Australian Intellectuals and the Image of Asia, 1920–1960', *Australian Cultural Studies*, 1990, 9:80 –92;

James Bryce 'The Relations of History and Geography', *Contemporary Review* 44, March 1886

James Bryce, 'Migration of the Races of Man', *Contemporary Review* 42, July 1892

Ailise Bulfin, Guy Boothby's 'Bid for Fortune': constructing an Anglo-Australian colonial identity for the fin-de-siecle London literary marketplace, in, Maggie Tonkin, Mandy Treagus, Madeleine Seys, Sharon Crozier-De Rosa. eds, *Changing the Victorian Subject*, (University of Adelaide Press, 2014)

Barbara Bush 'Colonial research and the social sciences at the end of empire: the West Indian Social Survey, 1944–57', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 41, 3 (2013), 451–74

Cyril Burt, 'The Inheritance of Mental Characters', *Eugenics Review*, 1912: 168-200

Crawford Campbell, *Chinese Coolie immigration to countries within the British Empire*, (London, 1923)

Francesco Cassata, *Building the New Man : Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth-Century Italy*. (Nouvelle édition [en ligne]. Budapest : Central European University Press, 2011), (généré le 26 avril 2016). Disponible sur Internet : <<http://books.openedition.org/ceup/697>>.

D. Chakrabarty, 'A Small History of Subaltern Studies,' in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. H. Schwarz and S. Ray (Carlton: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 467–85.

H. Chan, 'A Decade of Achievement and Future Directions in Research on the History of the Chinese in Australia,' in *Histories of the Chinese in Australasia and the South Pacific*, ed. P. Macgregor (Melbourne: Museum of Chinese Australian History, 1995), pp. 419–23.

Kenneth Chan, *Remade in Hollywood: The Global Chinese Presence in Transnational Cinemas*, (Hong King University Press, 2009)

C. Choi, *Chinese Migration and Settlement in Australia* (Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1975).

C. Choo, 'Inter-ethnic conflict in Broome, Western Australia: The riots of 1907, 1914 and 1920 between Japanese and other Asians', *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, (2011) 25, 4, pp. 465-477.

C. Choo, 'Eurasians: Celebrating Survival', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, (2007) 28, 1, pp. 129-141.

Raphael Cilento, *The White Man in the Tropics: With Especial Reference to Australia and its Dependencies*, (Commonwealth Department of Health Service Publication no.7, 1925)

Kane Collins, 'Imagining the golden race', in David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska eds., *Australia's Asia: From 'yellow peril' to Asian Century*, (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012), p.99-120.

Sophie Couchman, 'Making the 'last Chinaman': Photography and Chinese as a 'vanishing' people in Australia's rural local histories', *Australian Historical Studies*, 2001, 42:1, 78-91

Sophie Couchman, "'Oh I Would Like to See Maggie Moore Again': Selected Women of Melbourne's Chinatown," in *After the Rush: Regulation, Participation and Chinese Communities in Australia 1860–1940*, ed. S. Couchman, J. Fitzgerald and P. Macgregor (Melbourne: Otherland Press, 2004), pp. 171–90.

Sophie Couchman, Kate Bagnall. ed, *Chinese Australians: Politics, Engagement and Resistance*, (Brill, Leiden, 2015)

Couchman, Fitzgerald, and Macgregor, *After the Rush: Regulation, Participation and Chinese Communities in Australia 1860–1940* (Melbourne: Otherland Press, 2004).

Kathryn Cronin, 'Controlling immigration: Australian legislation and practice', *Australian Law Reform Commission Reform Journal* 6, Reform Issue 75 Spring 1999

D.P. Crook, *Darwinism, War and History: The Debate over the Biology of War from the 'Origin of Species' to the First World War*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Paul Crook, *Grafton Elliot Smith, Egypt and the Diffusion of Culture: A Biographical Perspective*, (Portland: University of Sussex Press, 2012)

Martin Crotty, John Germov and Grant Rodwell (eds), *'A Race for a Place': Eugenics, Darwinism and Social Thought and Practice in Australia*, (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Newcastle, 2000)

William S. Cruickshank, 'Japan's solution of her living space problem', *Mankind Quarterly*, Issue 1, July 1960, p.47-50

Ann Curthoys, 'An Uneasy Conversation: The Indigenous and the Multicultural', in *Race, Colour, and Identity in Australia and New Zealand*, ed. John Docker and Gerhard Fischer (Sydney: Univ. New South Wales Press, 2000), pp. 21–36.

Curthoys, and Markus, A. eds. *Who Are Our Enemies? Racism and the Australian Working Class* (Sydney: Hale & Ironmonger, in association with the Australian Society for the Study of Labour History, 1978).

Lord George Curzon, *Problems of the Far East*, (revised ed. New York, 1896)

J.W Cushman, 'A 'Colonial Casualty': The Chinese Community in Australian Historiography,' *Asian Studies Association of Australia Review* (1984) 7(3): 100–13.

C. W. Dilke, *Greater Britain: a Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries During 1866 and 1867*, (new edition, London, 1869)

Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial adventure: Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian popular fiction, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Cedric Dover, *Half-Caste*, (London, Martin Secker and Warburg, Ltd, 1937)

John Dower, *War without mercy: race and power in the pacific war*, (Pantheon Books, 1986)

John Langdon Down, Observations on an Ethnic Classification of Idiots. *Lond Hosp. Rep.* (1862) 3, p.259-262

W. E. B. DuBois, 'The Souls of White Folk', *Darkwater Voices from Within the Veil*, (New York, 1920)

Saul Dubow, 'Race, Civilization, and Culture: The Elaboration of Segregationist Discourse in the Inter-war Years,' in *The Politics of Race, Class, and Nationalism in South Africa*, ed. Shula Marks and Stanley Trapido (London: Longman, 1987), pp. 71–94;

Saul Dubow, *Scientific Racism in Modern South Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995)

Saul Dubow, *A Commonwealth of Knowledge: Science, Sensibility, and White South Africa, 1820–2000* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006)

Penelope Edmonds, "I Followed England Round the World': The Rise of Trans-imperial Anglo-Saxon Exceptionalism and the Spatial Narratives of Nineteenth-Century British Settler Colonies of the Pacific Rim," in *Reorienting Whiteness*, ed. Boucher *et al.* (cit. n. 16), pp. 99–117

C. Elder, "Invaders, Illegals and Aliens: Imagining Exclusion in a White Australia," *Law Text Culture* (2003) 7(1): 221–50.

C. Elder, "Immigration History," in *Australia's History: Themes and Debates*, ed. M. Lyons and P. Russell (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2005), pp. 98–115.

A.P. Elkin and N.W.G. MacIntosh (eds.), *Grafton Elliot Smith: The Man and His Work*, (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1974)

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Mixed Descent Indian Identity and Assimilation Policy," in Gregory D. Smithers, Brian D. Behnken, and Brooke N. Newman, *Native Diasporas: Indigenous Identities and Settler Colonialism in North America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014).

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Getting There," in *Searching for the American Dream: How a Sense of Place Shapes the Study of History*, ed. Glenn Moore (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013).

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Biological Absorption and Genocide: A Comparison of Indigenous Assimilation Policies in the United States and Australia," *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 4, no. 2 (April 2009): 59-79.

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Intimate Assimilation: White/Indigenous Inter-marriage in the United States and Australia, 1880s–1930s," in *Gender, Mobility and Intimacy in an Age of Empire*, ed. Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 211-228.

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Into the White Man's Kingdom: Whiteness and Indigenous Assimilation Policies in the United States and Australia, 1880s–1960s," in *Reorienting Whiteness*, ed. Leigh Boucher, Ellinghaus, and Jane Carey (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Katherine Ellinghaus, "The Benefits of Being Indian: Disputed Citizenship, Tribal Rolls and Allotment Policy on the White Earth Reservation, 1889-1920," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* 29, nos 2 & 3 (2008): 81-107.

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Indigenous Assimilation and Absorption in the United States and Australia," *Pacific Historical Review* 75, no. 4 (2006): 563-85.

Katherine Ellinghaus, *Taking Assimilation to Heart: Marriages of White Women and Indigenous Men in Australia and the United States, 1887-1937*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006).

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Absorbing the Aboriginal Problem: Controlling Marriage in Australia in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century," *Aboriginal History* 27 (2003): 185-209.

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Margins of Acceptability: Class, Education and Interracial Marriage in Australia and America," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* 3, no. 3 (2002): 55-75.

Katherine Ellinghaus, "Absorbing the 'Aboriginal problem': controlling interracial marriage in Australia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries," *ABORIGINAL HISTORY* (2003) VOL 27, pp.183-207.

Julie Evans, Patricia Grimshaw, David Phillips, and Shurlee Swain, *Equal Subjects, Unequal Rights: Indigenous People in British Settler Colonies, 1830–1910* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 2003);

Max Everest-Phillips, 'The Pre-War Fear of Japanese Espionage: Its Impact and Legacy', *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Apr., 2007)

Paul Farber, "Race-Mixing and Science in the United States," *Endeavour*, 2003, 27:168 –170

John Ferris, 'Worthy of Some Better Enemy?: The British Estimate of the Imperial Japanese Army, 1919-41, and the Fall of Singapore', *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire*, 28:2 (1993:Aug./août)

J. Fitzgerald, *Big White Lie: Chinese Australians in White Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2007).

S. Fitzgerald, *Red Tape, Gold Scissors: The Story of Sydney's Chinese* (Sydney: State Library of NSW Press, 1997).

R.M. Fleming, 'Anthropological Studies of Children', *Eugenics Review*, January 1927: p.294-301

R.M. Fleming, 'Human Hybrids: Racial Crosses in Various Parts of the World', *Eugenics Review*, January 1930: 257.

Ross G. Forman, *China and the Victorian Imagination: Empires Entwined*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Ross G. Forman, 'Peking Plots: Fictionalising the Boxer Rebellion of 1900', *Victorian Literature and Culture* (1999)

Michel Foucault, translated by David Macey, *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*, (Penguin, 2004)

George M. Fredrickson, *White Supremacy: A Comparative History of American and South African History*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982)

Frank Furedi, *The Silent War: Imperialism and the changing perception of Race*, (Rutgers University Press 1986)

Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius*, (London: Macmillan, 1869)

Francis Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*, (London: J.M. Dent & Co.1883)

Francis Galton, "Co-relations and their measurement, chiefly from anthropometric data," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 45, (1888): 135–145.

Wendy Gan. "Mr. Wu and the Rearticulation of "The 'yellow peril' ". *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920* 55, no. 4 (2012): 441-459

Stephen Garton, "Sound Minds and Healthy Bodies: Re-considering Eugenics in Australia, 1914–1940," *Australian Historical Studies*, 1994, 26:163–179

Robert Gayre, 'Miscegenation and Racial Improvement', *Mankind Quarterly*, October, 1970

Marco Gerbig-Fabel 'Photographic artefacts of war 1904–1905: the Russo-Japanese war as transnational media event', *European Review of History: Revue europeenne d'histoire*, (2008)15:6, 629-642

Patricia Grimshaw, "Interracial Marriages and Colonial Regimes in Victoria and Aotearoa/New Zealand," *Frontiers*, 2002, 23:12–28

Sidney Lewis Gulick, *The American Japanese problem; a study of the racial relations of the East and the West*, (New York, C. Scribner's sons, 1914)

John R. Haddad, The Wild West Turns East: Audience, Ritual, and Regeneration in Buffalo Bill's Boxer Uprising, *American Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 3/4 (Fall/Winter 2008), pp. 5-38

A.C Haddon, *The Races of Man* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924).

D. Heath, 'Literary Censorship, Imperialism and the White Australia Policy'. In M. Lyons, & J. Arnold (Eds.), *A History of the Book in Australia 1891-1945: Towards a National Culture in a Colonized Market, 1890-1945*, (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2001), pp.69-82

D. Heath, 'Comparative Colonialism, Moral Censorship and Governmentality'. In D. Kennedy, D. Ghosh, D. Kennedy, & D. Ghosh (Eds.), *Decentering Empire: Britain, India and the Transcolonial World*, pp. 213-242, (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2006)

D. Heath, *Purifying Empire: Obscenity and the Politics of Moral Regulation in Britain, India and Australia*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

James L Hevia, *English Lessons: The Pedagogy of Imperialism in nineteenth century China*, (Duke University Press, 2003)

Isabel Hofmeyr and Michelle Williams, eds., *South Africa and India: Shaping the Global South*, (Johannesburg: Wits Univ. Press, 2011)

M. Ip, 'From Gold Mountain Women to Astronauts' Wives: Challenges to New Zealand Chinese Women,' in *Histories of the Chinese in Australasia and the South Pacific*, ed. P. Macgregor (Melbourne: Museum of Chinese Australian History, 1995), pp. 274–86.

M. Ip, 'Redefining Chinese Female Migration: From Exclusion to Transnationalism,' in *Shifting Centres: Women and Migration in New Zealand History*, ed. L. Fraser and K. Pickles (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2002), pp. 149–65.

Heidi J. Holder, "Melodrama, Realism and Empire on the British Stage," in *Acts of Supremacy: The British Empire and the Stage, 1790–1930*, J. S. Bratton, et al., eds. (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1991)

Colin Holmes and A. H. Ion, *Bushidō and the Samurai: Images in British Public Opinion, 1894-1914*, *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (1980), pp. 309-329

Bill Hornadge, *The 'yellow peril': a squint at some Australian attitudes towards Orientals*, (Dubbo: Review Publications, 1976)

Gerald Horne, *Race war: White supremacy and the Japanese attack on the British Empire*, (NYUP, 2004)

Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: the Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*, (Cambridge, 1981)

A.G. Hughes, 'Jews and Gentiles: Their intellectual and temperamental differences,' *Eugenics Review*, vol.20, no.2, 1928, 89-94

Keiko Itoh, *The Japanese community in pre-war Britain : from integration to disintegration*, (Curzon Press, 2001)

Patricia Jacobs, "Science and Veiled Assumptions: Miscegenation in W.A., 1930–1937," *Austral. Aboriginal Stud.*, 1986, 2:15–23;

Jacqueline Jenkinson, 'The 1919 Riots', in Panikos Panayi (ed.), *Racial Violence in Britain in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1996), pp. 92–111

Ross L. Jones, *Humanity's Mirror: 150 Years of Anatomy in Melbourne* (Melbourne: Haddington, 2007).

Jones, Ross L., 'The Master Potter and the Rejected Pots: Eugenic Legislation in Victoria 1918–1939', *Historical Studies*, 113 (1999): 319–42.

Frederic Wood Jones, 'The non-metrical morphological characters of the skull as criteria for racial diagnosis. Part 1: General discussion of the morphological characters employed in racial diagnosis', *Journal of Anatomy* (1931) 65, pp. 179–195

James Jupp, *From White Australia to Woomera: The Story of Australian Immigration*, (Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Alanna Kamp, Chinese Australian Women in White Australia: Utilising Available Sources to Overcome the Challenge of "Invisibility", *Chinese Southern Diaspora Studies*, Volume Six, 2013, p.75-101

Michael Keevak, *Becoming Yellow: A Short History of Racial Thinking*, (Princeton University Press, 2011)

Keith, A., 'The Evolution of the Human Races', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* (1925), 58: 306–21.

Arthur Keith, *The Place of Prejudice in Modern Civilisation: (Prejudice and Politics)* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1931).

Veronica Kelly, *The Empire Actors: Stars of Australasian Costume Drama 1890s-1920s*, (Currency House, 2010)

- S. B. Kemish, *The Japanese empire: its physical political and social condition and history with details of the late American and British expeditions*, (London, 1860)
- A.J Kershen, A. J. "Preface," in *Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in Post-War Britain*, ed. L. Ryan and W. Webster (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008) pp. xi–xii.
- Daniel J. Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (1986; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1995)
- Marek Kohn, *Dope Girls: The Birth of the British Drugs Underground*, (Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1992)
- Marek Kohn, *The Race Gallery: The Return of Racial Science* (London: Cape, 1995).
- Rotem Kowner, 'Lighter than Yellow, but not Enough': Western Discourse on the Japanese 'Race', 1854-1904, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Mar., 2000), pp. 103-131
- Henrika Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885–1945*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Tony Kushner, H. J. Fleure: a paradigm for inter-war race thinking in Britain, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 2008, 42:2, 151-166
- Zoe Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections, 1815–45: Patronage, the Information Revolution, and Colonial Government* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 2005)
- Marilyn Lake, 'The Day Will Come': Charles H Pearson's National Life and Character: A Forecast, in, *Ten Books that Shaped the British Empire: Creating an Imperial Commons*, (Routledge, 2014)
- Marilyn Lake, The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White, *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 58, Autumn 2004, pp. 41-62
- Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008).
- Tong Lam, Policing the Imperial Nation: Sovereignty, International Law, and the Civilizing Mission in Late Qing China, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 2010;52(4):881–908.
- David Lambert and Lester, eds., *Colonial Lives across the British Empire: Imperial Career in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006)
- J. Lamprey, A Contribution to the Ethnology of the Chinese, *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, Vol. 6 (1868), pp. 101-108
- Tom Lawson, *The Last Man: a British Genocide in Tasmania*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)
- Josephine D. Lee, *The Japan of Pure Invention: Gilbert and Sullivan's The Mikado*, (University of Minnesota Press, 2010)

Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain*, (London: Routledge, 2001);

Alan Lester, "British Settler Discourse and the Circuits of Empire," *History Workshop Journal*, 2002, 54:24–48

Kenneth Little, 'The Study of Racial Mixture in the British Commonwealth: Some Anthropological Preliminaries', *Eugenics Review* (1941), 32: 4, 114–20.

Kenneth Little, 'Racial Mixture in Great Britain: Some Anthropological Characteristics of the Anglo-Negroid Cross', *Eugenics Review* (1942), 33: 4, 112–20.

Kenneth Little, *Negroes in Britain: a Study of Race Relations in English Society* (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1948).

Kenneth Little, 'Behind the Colour Bar', *Current Affairs* (1950), 118: 1–19.

Vicki Luker, "The Half-Caste in Australia, New Zealand, and Western Samoa between the Wars: Different Problem, Different Places?" in *Foreign Bodies*, ed. Douglas and Ballard (cit. n. 21), pp. 307–337.

Stanford M. Lyman, "The 'yellow peril' Mystique: Origins and Vicissitudes of a Racist Discourse," *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 13.4 (2000)

Richard Lynn, Will China Become the Next Hegemonic Superpower, *Mankind Quarterly*, September 2002, pp. 107-110

Richard Lynn, The Intelligence of the Chinese and Malays in Singapore, *Mankind Quarterly*, October 1977, pp. 125-128

Richard Lynn, National and Racial Differences in Anxiety, *Mankind Quarterly*, April 1971, pp. 205-214

Macgregor, P. 1998. "Dreams of Jade and Gold: Chinese Families in Australia's History," in *Australian Family: Images and Essays*, ed. A. Epstein (Melbourne: Scribe Publications), pp. 25–36.

Kenneth Mackay, *The Yellow Wave: A Romance of the Asiatic invasion of Australia*, (London, 1895)

Mackinder, H.J., 'The Geographical Pivot of History', *The Geographical Journal*, 23:4 (1904), 421-437.

Kenan Malik, *The Meaning of Race: Race, History and Culture in Western Society*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996)

J.A Mangan, *The Imperial curriculum: Racial images and education in the British colonial experience*, (Routledge, 1993)

Gina Marchetti, *Romance and the 'yellow peril'*, (University of California Press, 1993)

Steven G. Marks, 'Bravo, Brave Tiger of the East!' The Russo-Japanese War and the Rise of Nationalism in British Egypt and India.' *The Russo-Japanese War in Global Perspective: World War Zero*. Ed. John W. Steinberg, et. al. History of Warfare. 29. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005. 609-626.

Andrew Markus, *Australian Race Relations 1788–1993*, (Sydney, 1994)

Andrew Markus, *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850–1901*, (Hale & Iremonger, 1979).

Saho Matsumoto-Best, Race and Pan-Asianism reactions against the White superiority network-attempted racial solidarity and its failure, *East Asian Journal of British History*, Vol. 4 (2014)

Basil Matthews, *The Clash of Colour: a study in the problem of race* (Edinburgh House Press, 1924)

Roy May and Robin Cohen, 'The Interaction between Race and Colonialism: A Case Study of the Liverpool Race Riots of 1919', *Race and Class*, vol. 16, no. 2 (1974), pp. 111–26

J.W McCarthy, 'Chinese in Australia', *Quarterly Review*, 167:333 (1888) 162- 185.

Russell McGregor, *Imagined Destinies: Aboriginal Australians and the Doomed Race Theory, 1880–1939* (Melbourne: Melbourne Univ. Press, 1997)

Adam McKeown. "Conceptualizing Chinese Diasporas, 1842 to 1949," *The Journal of Asian Studies* (1999) 58(2): 306–37.

L. Kong Meng, Cheok Hong Cheong, Louis Ah Mouy, ed. *The Chinese question in Australia, 1878-79*, (Melbourne: F.F. Bailliere, 1879)

C.R. Moran & Robert Johnson, In the Service of Empire: Imperialism and the British Spy Thriller 1901-1914 *Studies in Intelligence*, 54, 2 (June 2010):

G.P Mudge, 'The Menace to the English Race and to its Traditions of Present Day Immigration and Emigration', *Eugenics Review* (1920), 11: 4, 202–12.

A.O Neville, *Australia's Coloured Minority: Its place in the Community*, (Currawong Publishing Co, 1947)

Ethelred Nevin, Galton on a Chinese Africa, *Mankind Quarterly*, April, 1965, p.4-5

Mae M. Ngai, Chinese Gold Miners and the "Chinese Question" in Nineteenth-Century California and Victoria, *Journal of American History*, 2015 101: 1082-1105.

Kakuzo Okakura, *The Awakening of Japan*, (New York, 1904)

A. Palfreeman, *The Administration of the White Australia Policy* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1967).

Michael Paris, Red Menace! Russia and British Juvenile Fiction, *Contemporary British History*, (2005) 19:2, 117-132

Kunal M. Parker, *Making Foreigners: Immigration and Citizenship Law in America, 1600-2000*, (Cambridge University Press, 2015)

Charles H. Pearson, *National Life and Character: a Forecast*, (London and New York, 1893, reprinted 1894)

Charles H. Pearson, 'The Black Republic', in *Reviews and Critical Essays*, ed. Herbert Augustus Strong, London, 1896 (review of Sir Spenser St John, *Hayti, or The Black Republic*, (London 1884, reprinted New York, 1889)

Charles Pearson, 'The Land Question in the United States', *Contemporary Review* September-December 1868.

Nicolas Peterson, "'Studying Man and Man's Nature': The History of the Institutionalization of Aboriginal Anthropology," *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, 1990, 2:3-19

Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)

Pietsch, T. (2014). Imperium et Libertas: G.C. Henderson and Colonial Historical Research at Adelaide. In Wilfrid Prest (Eds.), *Pasts Present: History at Australia's Third University*, (pp. 77-85). Adelaide: Wakefield Press.

Patrick Porter, *Military Orientalism: Eastern war through Western eyes*, (Columbia University Press, 2009)

Joseph. M Powell, Griffith Taylor and "Australia unlimited". *The John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lecture, 1992*, (St. Lucia, Australia, University of Queensland Press, 1993)

Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, (New Press, 2007)

C. Price, *The Great White Walls Are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australasia, 1836-1888* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974).

Guy Ramsey, "Cherbourg's Chinatown: Creating an Identity of Place on an Aboriginal Settlement." *Journal of Historical Geography* 29.1 (2003): 109-22.

Caroline Reitz, *Detecting the nation: fictions of detection and the imperial venture*, (OSU, 2004)

Robert Reid Rentoul, *Race culture; or, race suicide? : (a plea for the unborn)*, (London : Walter Scott, 1906)

Henry Reynolds, 'Racial Thought in Early Colonial Australia', *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 20: 1, April 1974

Henry Reynolds, *North of Capricorn: the Untold Story of Australia's North*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 2003)

Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People*, (Viking, Camberwell, 2005)

Paul Rich, *Race and Empire in British Politics*, (UCP, 1986)

Sax Rohmer, (Arthur Sarsfield), *The Insidious Dr. Fu-Manchu*, (New York: Dover, 1997) (first edition 1913)

Rohmer, *The Mystery of Dr. Fu Manchu*, (London: Methuen, 1913)

Rohmer, *The Bride of Fu Manchu*, (London, 1933)

Theodore Roosevelt, 'National Life and Character', *Sewanee Review*, 2:3 (1894), 353-376.

Henry E. Roseboom and Cedric Dover, The Eurasian Community as a Eugenic Problem, 'A decade of progress in Eugenics', *Scientific Papers of the Third International Congress of Eugenics held at American Museum of Natural History New York*, August 21-23, 1932, (Baltimore, 1934)

Edmund P. Russell, "Speaking of Annihilation": Mobilizing for War Against Human and Insect Enemies, 1914-1945, *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 82, No. 4 (Mar., 1996), pp. 1505-1529

Toeolesulusulu Damon Salesa, "Half-Castes between the Wars: Colonial Categories in New Zealand and Samoa," *New Zealand Journal of History*, 2009, 34:98 –116;

Kay Saunders, 'An Instrument of Strategy': Propaganda, Public Policy and the Media in Australia During the Second World War, *WAR & SOCIETY*, Volume 15, Number 2 (October 1997)

Gavin Schaffer, "Assets or Aliens? Race science and the analysis of Jewish intelligence in inter-war Britain," *Patterns of Prejudice*, 42:2, 191-207

Gavin Shaffer, 'Dilemmas of Jewish Difference: Reflections on Contemporary Research into Jewish Origins and Types from an Anglo-Jewish Historical Perspective,' *Jewish Culture and History*, Vol. 12, No.1&2, pp.75-94

Gavin Schaffer, "Like a Baby with a Box of Matches": British Scientists and the Concept of "Race" in the Interwar Period', *British Journal for the History of Science* (2005), 38: 3, 307–24.

Gavin Schaffer, 'Re-Thinking the History of Blame: Britain and Minorities during the Second World War', *National Identities* (2006), 8: 4, 401–20.

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* (2007), 41: 2, 253–78.

Bill Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, Vol. 1: *The White Man's World* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011)

Geoffrey Russell Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: a Study in British Politics and Political Thought 1899–1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).

Geoffrey Russell Searle, *Eugenics and Politics in Britain 1900–14* (Leyden: Noordoff International Publishing, 1976).

Y Shen, *Dragon Seed in the Antipodes: Chinese Australian Autobiographies* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001).

M.P. Shiel, *The Yellow Danger*, (London, 1898)

M.P. Shiel, *The Yellow Wave*, (London, 1905)

David Shih, The Color of Fu-Manchu: Orientalist Method in the Novels of Sax Rohmer, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Volume 42, Issue 2, pages 304–317, April 2009

Brian Singleton, *Oscar Asche, Orientalism, and British Musical Comedy*, (Praeger, 2004)

Grafton Elliot Smith, *Tutankhamen and the Discovery of His Tomb*, (London: Routledge, 1923)

Frank Spencer, “The Rise of Academic Physical Anthropology in the United States (1880–1980): A Historical Overview,” *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 1981, 56:353–364

Nancy Stepan, *The idea of race in science: Great Britain, 1800–1960*, (London: Macmillan, 1982)

Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia's Indigenous-Asian Story*, (University of New South Wales Press, 2007)

Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Colour against White World Supremacy*, (New York, 1921)

Lothrop Stoddard, *The Revolt against Civilisation: The Menace of the Under Man*, (New York, 1922)

Dan Stone, *Breeding Superman: Nietzsche, Race and Eugenics in Edwardian and Interwar Britain* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002).

Dan Stone, ‘Race in British Eugenics’, *European History Quarterly* (2001), 31: 3, 397–425.

Carolyn Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008).

Carolyn Strange, ‘Transgressive Transnationalism: Griffith Taylor and Global Thinking’, *Australian Historical Studies*, (2010) 41:1, 25-40

Laura Tabili, 'The Construction of Racial Difference in Twentieth Century Britain: the Special Restriction (Coloured Alien Seamen) Order, 1925', *Journal of British Studies* (1994), 33: 1, 54–98.

Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe, 2005)

Griffith Taylor, *Journeyman Taylor: The Education of a Scientist*. (London: Robert Hale, 1958)

Griffith Taylor, *Environment and Race: A Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1927)

Griffith Taylor, and F. Jardine. "Kamilaroi and white: A study of racial mixture in New South Wales." *J and Proceedings Royal Society of NSW* 58 (1924): 268-92.

Griffith Taylor, "The distribution of future white settlement: A world survey based on physiographic data." *Geographical Review* 12 (1922): 375-402.

Griffith Taylor, "The evolution and distribution of race, culture and language." *Geographical Review* 11 (1921): 54-119.

Griffith Taylor, "Geographical factors controlling the settlement of tropical Australia." *Queensland Geographical* 32-3 (1918): 1-67.

Griffith Taylor, *The Control of Settlement by Humidity and Temperatures*. Melbourne: Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology, 1916.

Michael S. Teitelbaum, Jay M. Winter, *The Fear of Population Decline*, (London, 1985)

David P. Thomas, *Reading Doctors' Writing: Race, Politics, and Power in Indigenous Health Research, 1870–1969* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2004)

Andrew S. Thompson, 'The language of imperialism and the meanings of empire: Imperial discourse in British Politics, 1895–1914', *Journal of British Studies*, 36 (1997) 147–77.

Luke Trainor, *British imperialism and Australian nationalism : manipulation, conflict and compromise in the late nineteenth century*, (CUP, 1994)

John Tregenza, *Professor of Democracy: the Life of Charles Henry Pearson 1830–1894, Oxford Don and Australian Radical*, (Melbourne, 1968)

William Tucker, *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002).

UNESCO, *Statement on Race: an Annotated Elaboration and Exposition of the Four Statements on Race Issued by the UNESCO* (New York: OUP, 1972).

David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850–1939* (St. Lucia: Univ. Queensland Press, 1999)

David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, eds, *Australia's Asia: From 'yellow peril' to Asian Century*, (UWA Publishing, 2012)

David Walker, 'Climate, Civilization and Character in Australia, 1880–1940', *Australian Cultural History*, 16 (1997/98): 77–95.

David Walker, Shooting Mabel: warrior masculinity and Asian invasion, *History Australia*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 89.1-89.11.

David Walker, "Australia's Asian Futures," in *Australia's History: Themes and Debates*, ed. M. Lyons and P. Russell (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2005)

Alfred Russel Wallace, 'Australasia' in, *Stanford's Compendium of Geography and Travel*, (1879, new issue 1893)

P.J Waller, 'Racial Phobia: The Chinese Scare 1906-14, An Historical Study', in *Essays to C.M. Bowra*, (The Alden Press, Oxford, 1970)

Alan Ward, *A Show of Justice: Racial "Amalgamation" in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand* (Toronto: Univ. Toronto Press, 1973);

Stuart Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal* (Melbourne, 2001)

Stuart Ward. Ed, *Australia's Empire*, (OUP, 2008)

M. Williams, *Chinese Settlement in NSW: A Thematic History*, Report for the NSW Heritage Office (Parramatta: NSW Heritage Office, 1999).

Rebecca Wingfield, 'Gazing on Fu-Manchu: Obscurity and Imperial Crisis in the Work of Sax Rohmer', *Public culture* [0899-2363], (2008)

Anne Veronica Witchard, *Thomas Burke's dark chinoiserie: Limehouse nights and the queer spell of Chinatown*, (Ashgate, 2009)

Patrick Wolfe, "Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race," *American Historical Review*, 2001, 106:866 –905.

Suke Wolton, *Lord Hailey, the Colonial Office and the Politics of race and empire in the Second World War*, (Macmillan, 2000)

Angela Woollacott, "All This Is the Empire, I Told Myself": Australian Women's Voyages "Home" and the Articulation of Colonial Whiteness, *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 102, No. 4 (Oct., 1997), pp. 1003-1029

Diana Wyndham. *Eugenics in Australia: Striving for National Fitness*, (London: Galton Institute, 2003)

A.T Yarwood, *Asian Migration to Australia: The Background to Exclusion, 1896–1923*, (Melbourne University Press, 1964)

A.T Yarwood, 'Sir Raphael Cilento and the *White Man in the Tropics*', in Roy Macleod and Donald Denoon (eds), *Health and Healing in Tropical Australia*, (James Cook University Press, 1991), pp. 47–63.

Hashimoto Yorimitsu, 'Germs, Body-politics and 'yellow peril': Relocation of Britishness in The Yellow Danger', *Australasian Victorian Studies Journal*, 9, (2003), pp.52-66.

C. Yong, *The New Gold Mountain: The Chinese in Australia 1901–1921* (Adelaide: Raphael Arts, 1977).

Hashimoto Yorimitsu 'White Hope or 'yellow peril'? : Bushido, Britain and the Raj' in David Wolff, et al. (eds.), *The Russo-Japanese War in Global Perspective*, Volume. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp.379-402.

Hashimoto Yorimitsu, 'Japanese Tea Party: Representations of Victorian Paradise and Playground in The Geisha (1896)' in John K. Walton, (ed.) *Histories of Tourism: Representation, Identity and Conflict* (Clevedon, U.K. : Channel View, 2005), pp.104-124.

Ouyang Yu, *Chinese in Australian Fiction, 1888-1988*, (Cambria Press, 2008)

Heidi Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia: Herbert Basedow and the Black Caucasian* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2010).

Theses

Arvin, Maile Renee, *Pacifically Possessed: Scientific Production and Native Hawaiian Critique of the "Almost White" Polynesian Race*, PhD, University of California, San Diego, 2013

Kate Bagnall, 'Golden shadows on a white land: An exploration of the lives of white women who partnered Chinese men and their children in southern Australia, 1855–1915', PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 2007.

David Kerstein, 'Greater Britain: The rise and decline of a Victorian idea, 1865–1939', PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1999;

Benjamin Mountford, *The Open Door Swings Both Ways: Australia, China and the British World System, c.1770-1907*, DPhil Thesis, Exeter College, University of Oxford September 2012

Helen M. Rajabi, *The Idea of Race in Interwar Britain: Religion, Entertainment and Childhood Experiences*, PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 2013

Amelia Catherine Scholtz, *Dispatches from Japanglia: Anglo-Japanese Literary Imbrication, 1880-1920*, Rice University, PhD thesis, 2011

Peta Stephenson, *Beyond black and white: Aborigines, Asian-Australians and the national imaginary*. PhD thesis, Faculty of Arts, The Australian Centre, University of Melbourne, 2003

Richard Austin Thompson, *The 'yellow peril', 1890–1924*, University of Wisconsin, PhD thesis, 1957

Diana H. Wyndham, *Striving for National Fitness: Eugenics in Australia, 1910s to 1930s*, PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1996