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ABSTRACT

The accepted version of the history of eugenics - put forward by Kevles, Allen and Barkan amongst others - is that the example of Nazi eugenics contributed to the decline of the eugenics movement in the USA. This dissertation challenges that view and argues that Nazism was irrelevant to that decline.

In so doing this work argues against the widely held chronology of American eugenics. Whilst most historians suggest that the older (orthodox) style of American eugenics was weakened by 1933 and then killed off by Nazism, this work argues that it was already finished by 1933. Historians have argued that the newer (reform) eugenics movement began to decline and transformed itself into new fields and organisations partly because eugenics was so widely discredited by Nazism. This dissertation suggests that reform eugenics was not a coherent ideology, but was rather a collection of reactions to the older type of eugenics. As such it could only exist while there was an older eugenics movement to react against. It then voluntarily transformed itself into new fields, as it was too diverse to survive. The fields which developed using parts of the eugenics ideology included population control movements, birth control and family planning, human and population genetics.

Orthodox eugenics collapsed because of changes in scientific and social scientific knowledge, the emergence of birth control, opposition from groups like the Catholic Church and changes in economic circumstances. By 1933 the programme of the older generation had not changed, but all of its concerns had been removed from the scientific field to the area of social and cultural concerns.

Furthermore, there were tangible and clear-cut distinctions between American and German eugenics, in terms of policy and there were fractures in the international eugenics movement that led to a formal distance between German and American eugenics.
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• American and German Eugenics

In 1883, twenty-four years after the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* and eighteen years after Gregor Mendel first discovered the laws of genetics, Sir Francis Galton coined the word 'eugenics' for his science which aimed to improve humanity through improving its gene-pool (or 'hereditary qualities' in the language of the day). He defined eugenics as “the science of improving the stock, which is by no means confined to questions of judicious mating, but which... takes cognisance of all the influences that tend in however remote a degree to give the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable” [Galton; 1883; 24-5]. The ultimate aim of eugenics was to apply biological answers to human social problems. Raymond Pearl suggested that “a solid foundation is being laid for a truly scientific solution of the problem of national and social welfare” [Pearl; 1908; 9822]. In creating the science of eugenics Galton brought together aspects of contemporary thought in biology, biological history, medicine, anthropology, psychology and sociology and mixed them with middle-class attitudes regarding race, class and modernisation. Eugenics addressed issues within a framework of thought that saw modern culture as encouraging degeneration and counter-selectivity (see pages 46-52). Eugenics was only one in a line of movements stretching back into the nineteenth century, which sought to apply scientific knowledge, especially biology, to human issues. Thus it followed in the tradition of Social Darwinism and other movements and in this dimension at least was not totally new or revolutionary.

Eugenicists believed that their work was carried out in a neutral fashion and revealed only scientific truths. Charles Davenport suggested that “I suppose the political consequences of the statement of a truth are the last things in the mind of a scientific writer” [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 1-vii-1914]. In Germany, in 1926, Alfred Grotjahn stated that “eugenics is an objective science” [quoted in EugR; Apr
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The fact that eugenics is now seen as an expression and reinforcement of existing prejudices should not detract from the belief at the time that eugenics was a conventional, unprejudiced science. The relationship between science and society is a complicated one, but went largely unexplored as eugenicists, in common with most other scientists at the time, believed their branch of science to be a neutral and value-free enterprise untouched by the rest of society. In his defence of sterilisation policies Leon Whitney argued that if scientists alone were allowed to make decisions, this by itself would ensure impartiality. In the light of experiences in Germany, British eugenicists seemed to understand more of the complexities of the relationship. In a foot-note Norman Haire, editor of the British edition of Whitney’s book pointed out that “experience of Nazi Germany has shown that scientists are no more to be trusted to remain fair and impartial under certain political conditions than anybody else” [Haire in Whitney; 1935; 141]. T U H Ullinger reporting for American readers in 1942 saw no problem or responsibility for biologists conducting work directly for the Nazi regime to determine if somebody was biologically Jewish and their subsequent fate in “the cruel hands of the SS, the SA, and the Gestapo” [JofH; 33 (1942); 142]. The Nazis’ utilising of science for political ends, caused scientists in the post-war world to have a far greater understanding of how their work interacted with the world around them.

Eugenics and its basic ideas were formulated in England but they were only the culmination of a process which can be traced back to the increased contact of the European nations with non-European people, rapid industrialisation and urbanisation and the problems that came with these processes, and the development of modern sciences such as medicine and biology as well as the publication of Darwin’s theory of evolution. German eugenics under Alfred Ploetz and Wilhelm Schallmayer, more than American eugenics, began as a force independent of the British movement. In the USA Charles Davenport had solicited Britain’s leading eugenicist - Karl Pearson - for support and selected him as a referee when he was trying to establish the Eugenics Record Office (ERO) at Cold Spring Harbor [KPP; 674/1; 14-x-1902]. The ERO in the USA was largely based on
the one in London. Harry Laughlin, superintendent at the ERO referred to the British movement as “the parent... of all eugenic organisations” [WIHM SA/EUG D109; 09-iv-1931]. There are numerous references in the work of American eugenicists to events in Britain, to Britain as a model and even to Britain as the “mother country” [Rice; 1929; 5]. At least in part this is because orthodox eugenicists saw themselves as part of an Anglo-Saxon elite. German eugenicists, especially under Nazism, did acknowledge the influence of British eugenics, at least partly because it added to the legitimacy of German eugenics. In 1932 Eugen Fischer informed Karl Pearson of his being awarded the Rudolf Virchow medal, which had never before been awarded to a non-German (previous recipients included the pro-eugenics plant geneticist Erwin Baur) [KPP; 689/3; 22-xi-1932]. Such moves were attempts to intertwine the major eugenic (and race hygiene) movements. As will be seen a number of Britons - such as J B S Haldane and Julian Huxley - were influential in the history of American eugenics.

During the early years of the twentieth century eugenics became a topic of general debate in both the USA and Germany. In part this is due to the rediscovery of Mendel’s work and the confidence given to eugenicists with this apparently simple model of inheritance. Or as Davenport put it, “with the rise of Mendelism a new era opened” [TICE; 1934; Davenport; 18]. (It was supplemented by August Weismann’s rejection, around the same time, of Jean Lamarck’s theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics. This debate was not so comprehensively resolved, with some geneticists - such as Herbert Spencer Jennings - uncertain on the issue until into the 1930s). Garland Allen suggests that eugenics was held back in the pre-Mendelian years because it “lacked a firm and workable theory of heredity” [Allen; 1986; 225]. These developments gave eugenics the scientific spur it needed. Looking back over the early years of the century Thurman Rice wrote that “no great movement has forged ahead more rapidly than the great eugenics or race hygiene program” [Rice; 1929; 367].
The United States' first eugenics organisation - the American Breeders Association's eugenics committee - was established in 1903. Although initially designed to look at Mendelism the committee grew rapidly and established itself as a separate eugenics organisation. Charles Davenport, the committee's chair, had become interested in eugenics after meeting Sir Francis Galton and Karl Pearson in England in 1897 and went on to become the movement's "scientific pope" and its "patron saint" [Chase; 1980; 114 & Allen; 1975; 30]. Davenport remained the most important and influential figure of the eugenics movement up to his retirement in 1934.

In Germany a recognisable eugenics movement emerged early in the century, in parallel movements established by Wilhelm Schallmayer and Alfred Ploetz. The two men worked separately but from the same basic assumptions, coming to their own formulations of eugenics. On racial questions sharp divisions existed. Ploetz believed in Nordic supremacy and opted for the name 'Rassenhygiene' (race hygiene) for the movement. Schallmayer rejected this racial slant and opted for the more neutral 'Eugenik' (simply the German form of the English word 'eugenics'). The debate between their two factions was on-going until the Nazis settled the argument once and for all, in favour of Rassenhygiene and its overtly racialised eugenics. The publication of Schallmayer's book Vererbung und Auslese im Lebenslauf der Völker (Selection and Heredity in the Life History of Peoples) in 1903, based on his 1900 Krupp prize-winning essay, brought eugenic issues to a broader public. (Géza von Hoffman called it "the fundamental book on Eugenics in the German language" [CBDP1; Hoffman to Davenport; 25-vii-1913]). In 1904 Ploetz (with Ernst Rüdin and others) founded the journal, the Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie (The Archive of Race and Social Biology or ARGB), and the following year founded the internationally oriented Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene (Society for Race Hygiene).

In the USA eugenics began in New England and the mid-Atlantic states from where it fanned out. In 1913 Harry Laughlin listed thirty centres for eugenic study - 20 of which were in east coast states [ERO Report 1; vi-1913; 16]. In institutional terms American eugenics was centred on Davenport and Laughlin's ERO with its journal
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Eugenical News, and then from after 1922 it also centred on the American Eugenics Society (AES) and its subsidiary Eugenics Research Association (ERA). Although it was successful in California and found representation in most states, American eugenics always remained a movement centred on the East Coast and the Midwest. In Germany there were two main centres for eugenics with Munich representing Ploetz's racially-oriented *Rassenhygiene* wing and Berlin the *Eugenik* wing, which followed Schallmayer's ideas. In 1927 the *Kaiser Wilhelm Institut für Anthropologie, Menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik* (Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics - *KWI*) was established with centres in both cities. (This new research centre formed one part of the older *Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft*, founded in 1911). Peter Weingart describes the *KWI* as "the single most important institution for race hygiene in Germany" [Weingart; 1989; 260].

Having formulated the concept of eugenics and led the movement in the early years, Britain's importance in eugenics declined rapidly. The reasons are complicated but include infighting between Mendelians and biometricians. The personality of Karl Pearson - leader of the biometricians - led to him falling out with a great many people, including Leonard Darwin, long time president of the Eugenics Education Society. [See his various files of personal correspondence at University College London]. In an obituary Raymond Pearl described Pearson as an "extreme individualist who could not possibly have worked effectively on a 'committee'" [Pearl; 1936; 664]. This created competing centres in Britain - Darwin's Eugenics Education Society and Pearson's Galton Laboratory. (Likewise, while Germany had two eugenics factions it too had no legislative success until one faction - *Eugenik* - disappeared).

By 1914 the USA was the world's acknowledged leader in eugenic policy and eugenic research. Davenport himself had claimed this in 1911 [Davenport; 1912; 3]. In 1913 Fritz Lenz wrote an article in which he rued the fact that the USA was so far ahead of Germany in eugenic policies [ARGB; 10 (1913); 250]. In 1912 the First International Eugenics Congress was held in what had been the centre of eugenics -
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London. The Second International Congress of Eugenics, delayed by the war, was held in 1921 in New York, by then the indisputable new centre. Domination by American eugenics was reflected in the subjects chosen for the Second Congress. The seven categories included "Eugenic Regulation of Immigration", "Expressing Eugenic Principles in Legislation", and "Race Mixture and Miscegenation" (the subjects "Eugenics and the Effects of War" and "Eugenics and the Birth-Rate" were more in tune with the concerns of Europeans). The first congress marked the beginning of a formally organised international eugenics movement, which for much of the period 1918 - 1945 failed to simultaneously include properly both Germany and the USA, firstly because of the war and its aftermath and then because of politicisation by the German members.

The high point for American eugenics came in the early and mid-1920s, with eugenically inspired or justified legislation passed on the topics of immigration, interracial marriage, sterilisation of the disabled as well as other areas. By the end of the 1920s immigration control was based on eugenic principles, eugenic sterilisation laws had been passed in around thirty states and Black-White marriages were illegal in a majority of states. Frederick Osborn wrote that "the period 1904 through 1926 saw the rise and finally the decline of eugenic promotions" [AESP; Frederick Osborn, History of the AES; 1]. (1926 is early, but he is certainly correct to name the period well before 1933 as the period of decline. In probability he says 1926, because this dissociates him from the decline of the AES, as he was not a board member at this point). At the high point, however, the ground was being cut from beneath eugenics. A realignment occurred in Anglo-American science which split the movement into eugenicists and geneticists, with many once enthusiastic eugenicists such as Hermann Muller, Pearl, W E Castle and Haldane attacking the orthodox and racial eugenics movements from the more scientifically rigorous genetics movement and from a more moderate reform eugenics position. Divisions between the branches of eugenics were exacerbated by the emergence of birth control as a major new tool of social and reproductive control. Eugenicists were divided on the implications of widespread birth control. Furthermore, political events
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drew a sharp divide between the Catholic Church and the eugenics movement. (These included the implied anti-Catholicism of immigration legislation and the debate on sterilisation). A decline in funding and the economic crash of 1929 brought on a financial crisis for most eugenic organisations. By 1933 the old styles of eugenics were finished.

World War One brought population and racial questions to a head in Germany, perhaps more than any other country, although it was another fifteen years before a recognisable programme of eugenic policies was enacted. The 1920s saw debate between Germany’s Eugenik and Rassenhygiene wings (and the new Weimar Republic) with only slow progress on policy. Germany’s turbulent economy and politics and its new constitution made eugenic progress hard. An indication of the extent to which German eugenics, especially the Rassenhygiene wing, had failed to make its mark, even by the late 1920s is revealed by an article in the British journal the Eugenics Review which claimed that “the race problem in America... has stimulated most of the experimental observations on racial differences which have so far been made” [EugR; July 1928; 1]. By then reform eugenics was taking hold in the Anglo-American world and its claims were being taken seriously - the author of the same article went on to claim that the idea of racial hierarchies was dying. They were, however, yet to demonstrate their full potency in Germany. The 1920s were a time of change for German eugenics. It was through this period that control of the movement slipped away from the moderate Eugenik school of Alfred Grotjahn, Arthur Ostermann and Hermann Muckermann and towards the Rassenhygiene school of Rüdin, Fischer and Lenz. To try to bolster the Eugenik wing in the mid-1920s the German Union for Regeneration and Genetics (Deutsche Bund für Volksaufartung und Erbkunde) was formed as a broad based group to promote a non-racist national regeneration [ARGB; 17 (1925); 349-50]. In 1932 the Rassenhygiene Society for Race Hygiene absorbed the Eugenik German Union for Population Improvement and Genetics, keeping the Society for Race Hygiene’s name, but adopting the broader based approach of the latter, relaxing the criteria for ordinary members of the public joining the society. Following this merger the Society
for Race Hygiene became more centralised, something that would have happened under Nazism anyway [ARGB; 26 (1932); 94-104].

In the early 1930s as Germany's Rassenhygiene wing strengthened and the USA's orthodox movement declined, Germany surpassed the USA as the world's leader in eugenics. In the same way that the USA's surpassing of Britain around World War One was marked by a move of the international congress and taking over of the higher positions in the movement, so Germany's overtaking the USA was marked in a similar way. In 1930 the Swiss born, German based Ernst Rüdin, became president of the International Federation of Eugenic Organisations (IFEO), taking over from an American, Davenport, (who in turn had taken over from a Briton, Leonard Darwin - son of Charles). In 1939 Vienna (by then part of the Greater German Reich) was chosen as the venue for the ill-fated Fourth International Congress of Eugenics - a choice as symbolic as London in 1912 and New York in 1921 and 1932. This rise of German eugenics and the death of the American movement prompted the statement in 1934 by Joseph DeJarnette, of the Virginia eugenics movement, that "the Germans are beating us at our own game" [quoted in Kevles; 1995; 116].

It was only after 1933 and the election of the Nazis that eugenics became national policy in Germany. Various factors in the Weimer republic had prevented eugenic action, although many research and data collection organisations had been established - both within government and the research community. The lack of progress under the Weimar system and the hope that Nazism and Adolf Hitler personally gave to eugenicists is reflected in the praise given to Nazism by Rassenhygiene eugenicists like Rüdin and Lenz [ARGB; 25 (1931); 300 & 28 (1934); 228-9]. The Nazi programme would become the world's most famous and most notorious eugenics experiment, with policy ultimately extending to the wholesale destruction of 'lives unworthy of living' and unwanted racial groups, at least partly on eugenic grounds. There had been small amounts of eugenics policy introduced in the final years of the Weimar Republic and it seems likely that more
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eugenics policies would have been enacted with or without Nazism. In 1930 a Bachelor Tax was introduced to encourage marriage [Weindling; 1989; 332], a sterilisation law was introduced to the Prussian parliament and in December 1932 Prussia barred Jews from adopting 'German' names as this masked "an individual's bloodline" [legislation at Noakes & Pridham; 1991b; 457-458 & 525-6].

Germany's eugenic organisations came under the control of the party and the government. In mid-1933 the ARGB and Volk und Rasse became the official publications of the Reich Committee for Public Health (Volk und Rasse had long been effectively under Nazi party control anyway). Wilhelm Frick, as Minister of the Interior gained the power to appoint the President of the most important eugenic organisation - the Society for Race Hygiene. In 1934 that appointment went to the pro-Nazi Rüdin [ARGB; 28 (1934); 228]. While the Nazis strengthened Rassenhygiene, the already declining Eugenik wing was conceptually and physically closed down. The journal Eugenik, Erblehre, Erbpfllege had closed in 1931 [Dietrich; 1991; 76]. The word Eugenik was gradually deleted, its organisations side-lined or merged into others and leaders of the Eugenik wing such as Hermann Muckermann and Arthur Ostermann forced to retire. Jewish eugenicists such as Richard Goldschmidt were also forced out of their jobs. Goldschmidt complained that Nazism "took over our entire plan of eugenic measures" and continued to support aspects of Nazi eugenics from the USA [quoted in Külhl; 1994; 52].

By 1933 orthodox and racial eugenics in the USA had in effect been ended and reform eugenics began dismantling itself as population control, human genetics and other movements emerged. After a protracted death the ERO was forced to close in 1939, long after the rest of the movement was gone and orthodox eugenics "lost its major institutional base" [Allen; 1986; 254]. The only eugenics organisation in the USA to survive the war - the AES - was in a much altered form. In contrast to the gentle decline and closure of most of American eugenics, German eugenics would take a world war, and the death of tens of millions of people partly using eugenic
IDEALISM, TO REACH CLOSURE. EVEN THEN CLOSURE WAS NOT COMPLETE [SEE E.G. WEINDLING; 1993].

Garland Allen has summarised eugenics as having had:

A widespread influence particularly in the United States during the early decades of the 20th century, where it provided a quasi-scientific rationale for passage of the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924, and of sterilization and anti-miscegenation laws by over 30 state legislatures between 1907 and 1935. In Germany it led ultimately to the Holocaust with biological and genetic claims for the inferiority, and hence dispensability, of Jewish people

[Allen; 1980; 22]

In July 1919 Casper L Redfield, a successful lawyer and amateur eugenicist with more enthusiasm than scientific ability, wrote to Davenport. The letter concerns Redfield’s theory of inheritance and in the main is not remarkable. At the end of the letter, however, he warns Davenport that “coming events cast their shadow before” [CBDP2; Redfield to Davenport; 12-vii-1919]. German eugenics, particularly between 1933 and 1945, has cast its shadow over the whole of the twentieth century and to some people Nazi eugenics cast a shadow before itself, in the form of American eugenics. It is easy to see events before 1933 as simply the prelude to and preparation for what is now symbolised to the world by Auschwitz. The unparalleled scale of the German eugenics programme under Nazism and the feelings of generations since (including many people who supported eugenics in the pre-war world) has influenced scholarly interpretations of the period, and of the place of Germany in relation to the American eugenics movement. The result of this has been confusion about how similar or different German and American eugenics were from 1918 to 1945, and more especially the assumption that the example of Nazi eugenics was a major factor in the demise of American eugenics. This dissertation seeks to reassess that relationship between Nazism and American eugenics and in the process it reassesses the conventional understanding of events in the USA. In many ways German eugenics in general and Nazi eugenics in particular form a fixed point, against which American eugenics is considered.
A Taxonomy of Eugenics

The literature on eugenics has grown rapidly over recent years and the generally accepted view of it has altered substantially. Until the 1960s eugenics was seen as a monolithic, reactionary, pseudo-science accompanying fascist and associated ideologies. This is now seen as wholly inaccurate. Elazar Barkan states that "the eugenics movement, especially of the period between the world wars, is now presented as versatile and multifaceted" [Barkan; 1992; 189]. This now acknowledged nature of eugenics has created a need to distinguish between the various parts of the movements.

Writers have offered several systems for identifying the constituent parts either by time or by ideology. In the American context Daniel Kevles offers the terms 'mainline', 'anti-mainline', 'reform' and 'new'. Mainline eugenics refers to what can be seen as the standard American eugenics world-view after World War One. Of all eugenic factions this is the one that is easiest to characterise. This style of eugenics was expressed through the ERA, the ERO, the pre-1929 AES and the Galton Society. They were made up of various combinations of Davenport, Laughlin, Paul Popenoe, Henry Fairfield Osborn and others. The policies proposed were sterilisation, immigration restriction and anti-miscegenation in varying proportions, depending on which organisation or person was promoting them. Anti-mainline eugenicists like Jennings and Haldane offered a substantial critique, rejecting mainline eugenics but offering no firm alternative eugenic vision. Reform eugenicists, like Frederick Osborn and Hermann Muller also rejected mainline eugenics but offered an alternative eugenic vision, based on more rigorous science and less on racially-biased categories. New eugenics refers to the re-emergence of eugenic ideas since the end of the Second World War.

Taking Kevles' classifications as a starting point I propose using the terms orthodox eugenics, racial eugenics and reform eugenics. Orthodox eugenics equates with Kevles' mainline group except that it excludes people like Madison Grant, Charles
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Gould, Robert DeCourcey Ward, Clarence Campbell and Lothrop Stoddard, who while accepted by orthodox eugenicists, differed from them in that they saw race as the central issue of eugenic concern - focusing on Nordic supremacy, anti-Black issues and frequently on anti-Semitism. The differences between this group and others has been acknowledged but not formally identified. These names are often referred to with labels such "extreme eugenicist" [Selden; 1988; 64]. The racial eugenicists had a more radical eugenic vision but were accepted by, and worked with the orthodox eugenics movement. Grant was a founder of the orthodox AES, while Stoddard was on its advisory committee. In the introduction to The Passing of the Great Race Grant wrote of “the overwhelming importance of race and... the folly of the 'Melting Pot' theory” and later declared that “race is everything" [Grant; 1922; xxviii & 100]. This neatly summarises racial eugenics in the USA. In 1930 some of the key orthodox eugenicists Davenport, Popenoe and Laughlin wrote The Alien in Our Midst in conjunction with the racial eugenicists Gould, Grant and Stoddard. Identifying the racial eugenicists as a separate group is not to deny the importance of race to others within the movement; it is a question of emphasis rather than an agreement with or rejection of thinking within a racial framework. For the remaining and larger part of Kevles' mainline group I have chosen the term orthodox eugenics, because it describes the position more accurately and shows that it does not equate exactly with the Kevles' group. The word orthodox is also the term used by Pearl in his 1927 article which formally began the emergence of reform positions [Pearl; 1927; 262].

Later eugenics positions were challenges to the orthodox view and were always constructed in relation to it. I have merged Kevles' anti-mainline and reform groups into one reform group. This is because his distinction between them seems superfluous and distinguishing between them is not always easy. The people he identifies as anti-mainline eugenicists (i.e. having no clear alternative eugenic programme), such as Raymond Pearl and Herbert Spencer Jennings still accepted the basic eugenic paradigm and in many respects were not particularly different to people like Muller and Frederick Osborn in their positions. Pearl's most famous
attack on eugenics in 1927 did not call for a dismantling of the project, merely its modernisation - a clearing out of "the old-fashioned rubbish" [Pearl; 1927; 266]. Reform eugenics was a nebulous and less coherent force than has so far been presented in the literature. Like orthodox eugenics it was made up of geneticists, other scientists, social scientists, related professionals and amateurs. Reform eugenicists variously supported ideas of environmental improvement, sterilisation, birth control, human genetics and sometimes parts of the orthodox programme. The term reform is to some extent only used for the convenience of historians who need a single term to identify non-orthodox eugenicists. It should not be inferred that those people identified as reform eugenicists were necessarily similar or linked in ideology or organisation. Indeed much of what today is seen as reform eugenics was not identified as such at the time. Reform eugenics is a convenient term to identify what existed as transitional forces in moves away from older positions. An important difference between orthodox and reform eugenicists is that orthodox eugenicists were often, but not always, eugenicists primarily (Davenport, Laughlin, Popenoe). Reform eugenicists were more likely to be geneticists (Muller, Jennings), birth control campaigners (Pearl, Henry Perkins) or anthropologists (E A Hooton) first and eugenicists second. All this in part explains the break up of the reform faction in the 1930s and 1940s. My reform group is larger and looser than is Kevles’ group, by its inclusion of the anti-mainline group.

As with any system for identifying groups of eugenicists the borders between orthodox and racial eugenics and orthodox and reform eugenics are not always clear. The groups are imposed types, which help to make sense of events and ideas. They were not, necessarily formally organised groups as such and so the individuals involved make up a continuum. The boundaries are to some extent arbitrary. Laughlin had a great deal in common with the racial eugenicists but generally operated as an orthodox eugenicist, while Pearl was not unusual in starting out as an orthodox eugenicist and moving to a reform position. Roswell Johnson appears to have moved from racial to reform eugenics in one go. There were also men like Leon Whitney and Henry Perkins who represent aspects of both
reform and orthodox eugenics simultaneously. It must be borne in mind that the movements themselves in the first half of the twentieth century did not always keep factional distinctions clear (the two main factions in the German context, by contrast, were acutely aware of the terms they used and what they signified).

The most important alternative taxonomy to Kevles’ is offered by Garland Allen in “The Eugenics Record Office 1910-1940” and “The Role of Experts in Scientific Controversy” which divides the movement into “old” and “new” eugenics. Old eugenics equates to Kevles’ mainline group (my orthodox and racial groups), while new eugenics refers to attempts to move away from the old group’s theories, programmes and formulations. Allen suggests that the old movement ran alone until 1925 and the old and new movements ran together from 1925 to 1940, at which point the old movement died away [Allen; 1987; 172-4]. The groups equate roughly with those of Kevles but Allen offers a different timeline of events. Like Kevles though he sees the old / mainline group surviving into the Nazi period.

German eugenics breaks into two clear factions, which equate roughly to America’s orthodox and racial eugenicists and reform eugenicists. As noted above the groups stem from the ideas of Ploetz and Schallmayer. The two groups competed over the choice of name for the movement - *Eugenik* or *Rassenhygiene*. Several different sets of terms can be used to distinguish between the factions of the German eugenics movement. The different names chosen by the factions can be used - *Eugenik* (eugenics) and *Rassenhygiene* (race hygiene). Alternatively we can use Nordic / Aryan supremacists and non- Nordic / Aryan supremacists. The two factions centred around different German cities, with *Rassenhygiene* concentrated in Munich and the *Eugenik* faction mainly in Berlin, hence the terms Munich School and Berlin School. Whichever terms are used they still refer largely to the same two groups of eugenicists - Schallmayer, Arthur Ostermann, Alfred Grotjahn, Richard Goldschmidt and Hermann Muckermann on the one hand and Ploetz, Lenz, Ernst Rüdin, Fischer, Otmar von Verschuer and Hans F K Günther on the other. The arbitrary nature and fluidity of the groups evident in the USA is also true of Germany but to a lesser
The separate origins of the Eugenik wing and the Rassenhygiene wing and the issue of the name itself mean that it is easier to demarcate the groups. When I need to refer to specific parts of German eugenics I will use the German names that each supported - calling them the Eugenik wing and the Rassenhygiene wing. I will use the word eugenics when referring to the two factions together.

Sheila Faith Weiss has chosen to divide German eugenics into three categories, on chronological lines, based on the regime that eugenics was operating under - referring to Wilhelmine, Weimar and Nazi eugenics. Her purpose in this seems to be to help end the idea that all German eugenics was just part of the build up towards genocide. This is certainly a worthwhile exercise; we should not see German eugenics as a single movement moving inexorably from its inception at the beginning of the century towards its logical conclusion in the killing of entire populations in the pursuit of eugenic and racial fitness. Weiss’s system, however, places the emphasis on chronological differences rather than conceptual ones and when it is examined we find that it can obscure events. Wilhelmine eugenics equates to Eugenik ideas, while Nazi eugenics equates to Rassenhygiene. Weimar eugenics is not a singular identifiable entity, but instead refers to the gradual movement from Eugenik towards Rassenhygiene and the fusing with Volksch nationalism and the far-right. The dominant eugenic views at the beginning and end of the Weimar period are totally different. By using these three terms, it is implied that there is something uniform about eugenics in each of the three periods - which there is not. As with American eugenics, labels based on the way that eugenics was conceptualised, rather than the time in which it was operating provide a better system. This makes the gradually changing nature of German eugenics clearer by allowing for the idea of competing groups within the movement at any one time.

When discussing the German movement both 'eugenics' (Eugenik) and 'race hygiene' (Rassenhygiene) can be used. Some writers, such as Sheila Faith Weiss and Paul Weindling use the two terms without discrimination. Weiss recognises the differences between them, but chooses to “employ the two terms interchangeably”
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Weiss; 1987; 193]. Donald Dietrich treats them as two halves of the same thing, as in "the racial hygiene and eugenics movement" [Dietrich; 1991; 72]. Recent works such as Stefan Kühl's The Nazi Connection continue to use race hygiene and eugenics as synonyms [Kühl; 1994; 109]. Other writers use the two terms interchangeably, but do not address or acknowledge their differing meanings - Allan Chase suggests that "the German word for eugenics is Rassenhygiene" [Chase; 1980; 9]. The differences between the words were important at the time and are important today if we wish to understand the German movement.

In the German context the terms Eugenik and Rassenhygiene have distinct meanings and uses, while in the Anglo-American context eugenics is generally the only applicable term. In Anglo-American eugenics, however, race hygiene was used on occasions. In Australia The Race Hygiene Association of New South Wales was essentially a normal eugenics organisation like others in the English speaking world. In the USA the orthodox Eugenical News was subtitled The Current Record of Race Hygiene. Thurman Rice proposed changing the name eugenics to race hygiene and with it tried to redefine the whole project - the idea did not catch-on. In Scandinavia and Germany writers with a race hygiene leaning often used the word eugenics because it appeared to be a respectable scientific concept which was encompassed in the broader race hygiene concept.

That eugenics and race hygiene were one and the same movement is not in question. As has already been noted writers at the time and historians today often use the terms interchangeably. The constant debate over names in Germany and changes in the balance of power demonstrate that the argument was one of emphasis within what was essentially one movement. Eugenicists outside of Germany also viewed race hygiene as synonymous with eugenics. In 1913 when Harry Laughlin listed the world's eugenic movements, he listed Alfred Ploetz's Rassenhygiene over Wilhelm Schallmayer's Eugenik and named the ARGB as the movement's journal. For international conferences he listed both the 1911
International Congress of Race Hygiene in Dresden and the International Eugenics Congress in London in 1912 [ER0 Report 1; vi 1913; 24].

In Germany the choice of terminology was more than just personal preference, as the two terms came to be used to denote different branches of the movement, with the Rassenhygiene wing ultimately triumphing. In the article “German Eugenics Between Science and Politics” Peter Weingart traces the history of the Berlin KWI from its foundation in 1927 to its repackaging as the Max Planck Institute in 1947. The article emphasises the importance that the words Eugenik and Rassenhygiene played in the power struggles of the movement. Supporters of Rassenhygiene tended to emphasise Nordic supremacy and later anti-Semitism (in short, the ‘racialist’ component of the science), whereas the Eugenik wing played down the racialist dimension in favour of a focus on issues such as class, disability and social problems (they certainly were not entirely free of racial bias). From the earliest days Ploetz had organised a secret Nordic supremacist branch within the Society for Racial Hygiene. By contrast, Schallmayer famously claimed that the incorporation of racialist ideas could only “guide the eugenics movement in a direction that leads nowhere, or nowhere good” [quoted in Weiss; 1986; 45].

Men like Schallmayer preferred the term eugenics as it had less racial connotations, while others like Lenz saw the racial implications as an advantage [ARGB; 11 (1915); 445-8]. As the influence of the factions waxed and waned, so the names in use altered. In 1930 the Berlin Society for Race Hygiene became the Berlin Society for Eugenics in order to distinguish itself from the more racially-oriented Rassenhygiene movement. After negotiations led by Muckermann the Berlin Society for Eugenics merged with the Society for Race Hygiene and the new organisation was named the Society for Race Hygiene (Eugenics) (Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene (Eugenik)) [Weingart; 1989; 265 & Dietrich; 1991; 76]. Immediately after the rise of Nazism the word eugenics was removed. In the end Rassenhygiene triumphed comprehensively over Eugenik and Ploetz was praised by the Nazis, awarded the Goethe Medallion and given an honorary chair of racial hygiene.
Despite the fundamental differences between the two wings, the bodies and journals promoting each side published work from both viewpoints. Ploetz's ARGB published articles opposing the Nordic movement and the racialising of the issues [e.g. ARGB; 17; (1926), 235 & 14 (1922); 52-6]. The two German factions had clear lines demarcating them, but they were not polar opposites. As in the USA members of each faction sustained friendships with the other and co-operated widely, publishing in each other's journals. It is vital to see that even as Nazi eugenics emerged, the Eugenik wing had a "scientific posture, innocently conceived [that] could support a position treacherously close to that of the Nazi ideologists" [Dietrich; 1991;75].

There are strong similarities between the USA's racial and orthodox eugenicists with Germany's Rassenhygiene wing on the one hand and between the USA's reform eugenicists and Germany's Eugenik wing on the other. When orthodox eugenicists spoke of Germany's eugenic movement they referred to individuals, organisations and journals associated with Rassenhygiene, rather than Eugenik, despite the similarity of name [ERO 1; vi-1913; p24 & ERO Bulletin 13; vi-1915; 35]. When the Rassenhygiene movement re-printed articles or spoke of America's eugenicists they turned to men like Laughlin, Popenoe, Campbell and Grant. The actual connections between reform eugenics and Eugenik were very limited and amount to little more than participation in a few organisations like the World Population Union. (Possibly this is due to the much looser nature of reform eugenics and Eugenik). Links between orthodox and racial eugenicists with Rassenhygiene, by contrast were extensive. Internationally they met through the IFEO. Personal contacts continued throughout the period - between Alfred Ploetz, Eugen Fischer and Erwin Baur on the one hand and Charles Davenport, Harry Laughlin and Clarence Campbell on the other. Links between the ARGB and Eugenical News were formalised with an arrangement for each reviewing the other's journal [CBDP1; Davenport to Lehmann; 22-xii-1924]. Orthodox and racial eugenicists had their work published in Germany and Rassenhygiene members had theirs published in the USA. Works by Whitney and Grant were owned by Hitler and signed for him by the authors [LWA; 205].
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In the area of the type of eugenics practised two groups can be identified - racial groups and social groups. Racial groups is a self-explanatory category, referring to populations defined on various bases - Black / White, Jewish / non-Jewish, Nordic / non-Nordic etc. Social groups can be broken into two further groups - the mentally and physically disabled and groups defined by behaviour. The latter group includes, for example, criminals, alcoholics, prostitutes and the 'morally degenerate'. It is not entirely possible to disentangle racial and social eugenics, and it would not be desirable to do so, because this would obscure the essential connection between them. Social and racial eugenics were both built on the premise that human beings and society can be understood in biological terms, and that people either as individuals or as members of socially constructed groups have different values. As Stoddard phrased it "The idea of 'natural equality' is one of the most pernicious delusions that has ever afflicted mankind... Nature knows no equality" [Stoddard; 1922; 30]. Reform eugenicists often concurred with this view. Haldane wrote as late as 1949 that "the dogma of human equality is no part of Communism...the formula of Communism: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs", would be nonsense, if abilities were equal" [quoted in Paul; 1984; 567].

One of the fascinations of eugenics and one of the reasons it has received so much attention in recent years is the tension within the movement. Eugenics contained tensions at both the institutional and organisational level on the one hand, and on the personal level on the other. In the former category, of macrocosmic tensions, are things like: the self presentation as an objective and value-free science, whilst campaigning for strict immigration control; the use of the idea of progress to support a reactionary ideology; the racial eugenics bias of Margaret Sanger, but the linking of her movement with reform eugenicists; and, the condemnation of class bias and the equation of superiority with social status. On the microcosmic level the tensions in people's behaviour are numerous: Jennings respect for Davenport as a scientist; Franz Boas' opposition to eugenics but his ambivalent relations to it, such as his listing as an active member of the Third International Congress of Eugenics [TICE; 1934; 513]; and, Pearl's vigorous rejection of scientific racism but long-standing
cultural racism. A better understanding of the eugenics movement, its motivations, background and politics can reveal the reasons for these seeming tensions. This dissertation reveals some of the tensions of eugenics, but explanations are often outside the scope of this dissertation. The apparent contradictions within people's attitudes and within institutions are evidence of the complexity of the field, rather than of poor scholarship either in this or other work. David Barker lists the ways that different historians - Kevles, Bentley Glass, Kenneth Ludmerer, Allen, Germaine Greer - have seen various eugenicists - Edward East, E G Conklin, Haldane, Huxley - in conflicting moulds [Barker; 1989; 361]. Further examinations are needed on these various conflicting view and tensions, particularly with reference to the older generation of reform eugenicists - Pearl, Jennings, Hooton, Muller, Ellsworth Huntington - and their complex relations with eugenics of all varieties.

• Eugenics and Other Movements
Eugenics was never a singular movement, working alone towards a set of pre-determined and generally agreed goals. Eugenics was part of a group of movements with similar objectives. Eugenics always found allies in a range of movements. Movements and topics that were at least partially allied included: social hygiene; mental hygiene; sexual hygiene; immigration control; physical anthropology; psychiatry, genetics; criminology; psychometrics; birth control and so on. Particularly relevant to this study are the fields of genetics, immigration control and intelligence testing. In the USA, when John Kellogg's Race Betterment Foundation held its conferences they were attended by a variety of groups - the American Genetics Association, the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-Minded, the American Anthropological Association and the American Social Hygiene Association. (Likewise eugenicists attended conferences of other organisations - such as the International Congresses of Genetics and meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science). Margaret Sanger founded and edited the journal the Birth Control Review, was a member of the AES and employed the Nazi-admiring anti-Semite Lothrop Stoddard. At the end of World War Two the AES, the American Social Hygiene Association and the National
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Committee for Mental Hygiene all shared an address in New York [O'Keefe; 1998; 4]. Prescott Hall was a founding member of the Immigration Restriction League (IRL) and chair of the Committee on Immigration at the ERO [ERO Report 1; vi 1913; 9]. Madison Grant co-founded the AES and was vice-president of the IRL for over twenty years [CBDP1; Grant to Davenport; 16-ii-1917]. The same kind of connections are evident in Germany. In 1915 The Berlin Society of Social Hygiene announced that it would give a prize for the best essay on the topic "The Influence of Social Betterment of Families on Eugenics". The most influential book on heredity - the Baur-Fischer-Lenz book* - was a collaboration of a plant geneticist, a physical anthropologist and a eugenicist. On an international level the Third International Congress of Eugenics and the Fifth International Genetical Congress were deliberately held simultaneously in New York [WIHM SA/EUG D109].

This context that eugenics acted within was recognised at the time by those within the movements. Activists and eugenics experts understood that they were part of a wider movement promoting progressive, rational and efficient planning of society, including scientific answers to social issues. The ERO produced a cartoon in the 1920s showing a tree marked "Eugenics" with the roots labelled variously with the names of the contributory fields - two of the largest roots being reserved for genetics and anthropology. The caption under the cartoon reads "Like a tree eugenics draws its materials from many sources and organises them into an harmonious entity" [EROP; Ms Coll No.77 Series X; "Eugenics" Broadside]. When the AES established its advisory board the information it sent out stated that it wanted to include "eugenicists, geneticists, biologists, physiologists, physicians, statisticians, educators, philanthropists and others [HSJP2; Eugenics Committee of America; n.d.]. Eugenical News promoted partnerships between eugenics and statistics, anthropology, psychology, medicine, genetics, physiology and history [EugN; 18

---

* The Baur-Fischer-Lenz book was Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene was first published in 1921. It was a cornerstone of German eugenics and genetics well into the Nazi period. In 1931 it was published in English as Human Heredity.
 Nazism itself blended eugenics and other race sciences with Volkisch nationalism and far-right politics.

Many of the fields mentioned above shared similar aims and policies - the distinctions came more in the form of priorities and the prominence given to aspects of agendas. (Differences did exist between the groups mentioned - as well as within them - but there was considerable overlap). If eugenics had never been formed as a distinct movement, then all the ideas it stood for would still have existed within other organisations and movements. Frank Dikötter suggests that eugenics changed the way that people and organisations saw the world. The language of eugenics became a part of the language and outlook of most westernised societies in the 1920s and 1930s. It was not a view that one subscribed to in the same way as being socialist or conservative. It was part of the accepted way that modern people looked at the world, and consequently eugenic sentiments can be found throughout all areas of life in the period. As eugenics was part of the currency of the day its ideas are to be found everywhere and often connected to people or groups with no formal links to eugenic organisations. Dikötter slightly overstates the case when he writes that "Eugenics was not so much a clear set of scientific principles as a "modern" way of talking about social problems in biologizing terms" [Dikötter; 1998; 467]. It was this element, however, that allowed the American and German movements to include communists, socialists, Social Democrats, conservatives, nationalists and Nazis.

It has been a general trend in histories of eugenics to claim a huge role for eugenics and eugenicists. Eugenicists were wont to do this themselves. Laughlin frequently made the claim that his Model Eugenical Sterilisation Law was the basis of the German sterilisation law - which is at best partially true. Eugenicists in the USA claimed the credit for the passing of the 1924 Immigration Act, for the sterilisation laws and for the various anti-miscegenation laws. Many historians - Haller, Chase, Kevles - have given eugenicists the credit or blame for the introduction of these laws, especially the first two. Legislation compatible with eugenic beliefs could never be passed purely on the basis of eugenic desirability. Eugenics did often inform or
underpin debate regarding social questions, but eugenics needed allies for legislative success. The Immigration Act was passed by an alliance with economic interests, work in psychometrics and nativist groups. Sterilisation laws were passed again with the help of economic interests, ideas of public protection and the growing influence of health and social care professionals [e.g. Kevles; 1995]. Anti-miscegenation laws were passed largely without contributions from eugenicists and were more legislative extensions of existing social, cultural and economic prejudices. In Germany eugenics policies were only introduced when the movement allied itself with the Nazi regime and its set of priorities. This is important because when eugenicists lost the interest of their allies they would suffer marginalisation of their movement although aspects of their programme may or may not have continued.

Much has been written about the relationship of eugenics and genetics. For much of their early lives in the USA it is almost impossible to separate them out from one another. Eugenics was seen merely as the application of genetics, and so to support one was to support the other. Laughlin believed that “eugenics budded from the more general science of genetics” [ERO Report 1; vi-1913; 1]. The names who today are associated with the early development of genetics can often be seen in the eugenics movement of the early twentieth century. In the USA Jennings, Muller, Castle and even Davenport, and Eugen Fischer and Richard Goldschmidt in Germany worked on both subjects, with Castle’s book Genetics and Eugenics and the Baur-Fischer-Lenz book amongst the standard texts well into the 1930s. In Germany the word for genetics (Erblehre) was coined by Fischer. The relationship of genetics to eugenics and their development into separate movements was an important factor in the decline of eugenics in the USA. While in the USA eugenics grew from a genetic / agricultural background, the German movement tended to be much more from the worlds of medicine and public health. A simple count of the number of geneticists and agriculturists in the USA’s movements and physicians and public health officials in the German reveals this almost universal difference in personnel.
• Eugenics and Society

Many people see eugenics as inextricably linked to extreme right wing politics and today this is usually the case. It has now been well established that it was not always so. A number of works have shown how debate raged regarding eugenics, with eugenics being used to support various political stances. Eugenics and the Welfare State (edited by Nils Roll-Hansen and Gunar Broberg), Diane Paul’s “Eugenics and the Left” and Loren Graham’s “Science and Values” demonstrate how eugenics was used by various parts of the political spectrum. In Scandinavia it was democratic welfare statism that introduced eugenic sterilisation, in Germany it was Nazism and in the USA it was middle-class democratic-capitalist interests. If there was an overriding view of eugenics up to 1945 then it was that eugenics was a progressive movement. It may now be argued that eugenics was reactionary and about saving money, serving the agenda of the middle-class, but at the time it was not seen like this. Thurman Rice claimed that opponents of eugenics were like those who had opposed the steam-boat or the radio - against progress. [Rice; 1929; 364]. The idea of progress as an innately good thing, like eugenics, was seized upon by people across the spectrum. In Germany large sections of the eugenics movement had openly allied itself with the far right by the end of the 1930s, although before this eugenics had been promoted by the SPD in the Reichstag and by communists such as Alfred Grotjahn. When eugenics became national policy in Germany, however, it was not under the reactionary far-right, but under a regime that mixed progressive and traditional ideas. The battle for eugenics included claims such as one by Lenz that Marxism would fail because it saw the environment as all powerful. This placed Marxism (environmentalism) and eugenics (hereditarianism) in direct opposition to each other. [ARGB; 24 (1930); 24]. Yet, as Loren Graham demonstrates Soviet Marxism in the 1920s made use of eugenics, trying to establish Marxism and eugenics as mutually supportive with each providing scientific validation for the other [Graham; 1977]. Outside of the USSR eugenics appealed to Marxists like Muller in the USA, Grotjahn in Germany and Haldane in Britain.
All of this was possible because at bottom eugenics defined itself as, and was seen by others as, innately progressive and in this way anyone who called themselves progressive could lay claim to eugenics. For eugenicists progress was a good thing, all parts of society, including population questions needed rational planning and management, and a scientific outlook was vital to doing this efficiently. It has been pointed out before that the linking of eugenics to progressivism is only of limited use. Progressivism was such a wide concept and embraced so many different positions that it begins to become meaningless [e.g. Allen; 1986; 255]. Its use here is primarily to distinguish supporters of eugenics from those who saw themselves as traditional or conservative. (In the Supreme Court case Buck versus Bell the liberal / progressive Justice Holmes voted for sterilisation, while the conservative / traditional Justice Butler voted against [Chase; 1980; 317]). Furthermore, not all progressives were great supporters of eugenics. Theodore Roosevelt, the first truly progressive President, was a vocal supporter of eugenics, but at the other end of the period his nephew Franklin Roosevelt was equally progressive, but little concerned with eugenic issues. He may have privately supported it, but in public he all but ignored the subject. Progressives such as Franz Boas were amongst the strongest opponents of eugenics.

**Eugenics and Language**

Academic work throws up questions of language and terminology, and a historical work of this nature throws up more than its fair share of such problems. Running alongside debates surrounding Nazi genocide, eugenics and race science there is the debate about what language is acceptable and what is unacceptable. There are three main reasons why language and terminology pose serious problems in this study. Firstly, the terms used for various groups are almost always those imposed from outside of the group on the basis of a dominant group’s conceptualisation of society. The names are rarely self-ascribed. Secondly, the eugenics movement, and Nazism in particular, used deliberately euphemistic and misleading language. Finally, the view of eugenicists was racist and socially divisive and forces historians to make classifications that s/he does not necessarily agree with.
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The groups attacked by eugenicists were victimised on an ideological-scientific basis and as such had an alleged unifying feature or features. In the USA anti-miscegenation laws were based on White eugenicists' fears and could define somebody as Black for having "any ascertainable trace of Negro blood", regardless of how they or the Black community saw them. In many instances eugenicists' and others' definitions were constructed to force out of the dominant group any trace of other cultures or of unwanted social groups. Once pushed outside of the dominant group they were then lumped together and ascribed group identities in a way that was convenient to eugenicists rather than reflecting any definitions proposed or desired by the target group.

In Nazi Germany terms like 'euthanasia' and 'Final Solution' were used to disguise the true nature of policy. The euthanasia programme would not fall under any normal understanding of euthanasia which is of a painless death or assisted suicide for somebody who will die within a short period of time, based on the desire to ease a person's suffering and with the person's consent. Nazi euthanasia involved mass killing without consent of people who often could have lived long and happy, but economically non-productive lives. [see e.g. Proctor; 1995; especially 177-198].

In the eugenicists world-view there were a number of supposedly identifiable groups who we would today have trouble conceiving of as separate groups. American eugenicists and others spoke of the feeble-minded as a supposedly scientific term for those with no other diagnosable mental illness, but who were of low IQ or had problems socialising normally. The dividing of White people into races such as Nordic, Mediterranean and Alpine is similarly scientifically and socially dubious. (I have not tried to untangle the terms Nordic and Anglo-Saxon which were used in a very unfocused way (and certainly not on a scientific basis) with regard to White people in the USA, although they were used in more consistent ways regarding White people in Europe. In the American context the terms were generally applied to the same groups of people and were thus interchangeable). In Germany there were
the Rheinlandbastarde - the 300 or so children of mixed White German and Black French parents. German eugenicists from 1921 often referred to lives unworthy of living (lebensunwerten Lebens) as a catchall term for the mentally and physically disabled along with those with learning difficulties and so on.

Terms in all three of these groups pose problems and are generally inadequate, the arbitrary nature of the categories making them technically useless. They are, however, the terms that were used in the period 1900-1945 and refer to groups as understood by eugenicists and a large majority of society. Abandoning such terms is pointless as there are rarely terms available to replace them (such as Rheinlandbastarde). Eugenics' terminology and classifications are vital in understanding the subject. Therefore it is necessary to continue to use the terminology of the period, although the reader should be aware of the insufficiency (and sometimes offence) that such terms carry. The use of a term neither means that it is acceptable nor that it is scientifically or socially accurate. The only words that I have changed are the substitution of Black for Negro, and sometimes mentally and / or physically disabled for people variously called cripples, handicapped, lunatics and so on. Substitution in these cases is possible because the terms have been superseded by others that have not changed the actual definition of the group in question. (The term 'African-American' is too narrow as it excludes Black people from outside of the USA). The destruction of various population groups by the Nazi regime, outside of the euthanasia programme, will simply be referred to as Nazi genocide. This is because in a study of this nature the scientific rationale and technological and personal continuities are of more importance than numbers destroyed, percentages or perceived scales of suffering. The use of the words Holocaust, Shoah or Final Solution can obscure these continuities.

For ease of writing, and to aid understanding it is necessary to get inside the framework of eugenic thinking and this includes using language with which many people feel uncomfortable - I have chosen to use the word race instead of ethnicity. In addressing the use of such terms some writers have chosen to use quotation
marks whenever they use particular words or phrases, or to preface words like euthanasia or feeble-minded with 'so-called'. I have chosen not to do this because, as Henry Friedlander argues it “burdens the reader by making the text less readable” [Friedlander; 1995; xxi]. Whilst using British English for the bulk of the text, I have not changed Americanised spelling or punctuation in quotations from American authors - so, for example, I use “sterilisation” in the general text, but “sterilization” when I am quoting from American publications. Likewise I have not capitalised the words Black or Negro when the appear in a quotation without capital letters.

A further problem arises in the use of German. Eugenics had its own terminology and language and so care must be taken when talking about one country’s movement in a foreign language. Foreign words and phrases can make reading harder but on occasions it is unavoidable, especially where a phrase in one language is not a recognisable phrase in another. Translating the word ‘Volkisch’ into the English word ‘folk’ destroys a huge amount of the word’s meaning. Volkisch carries with it nationalist sentiment as well as mythical ideas of a link between people and land. As we have no comparable word in English and it would be tiresome to give an explanation each time the word is used, it is easier to just use the German word - a convention that many historians and other commentators have used. The less familiar ‘life unworthy of living’ will be followed by the German Lebensunwerten Lebens to show that it is / was an expression in German.

There have been numerous writers and historians (e.g. Allan Chase) who have written of eugenics as a pseudo-science. This is misleading because it discriminates between what we might today think of as good and bad science (and between science that we approve of and disapprove of). It also belittles the importance of science of which we might not approve and perpetuates the myth that science is innately good. In the 1920s and 1930s eugenics was seen as working within the scientific norms of the day - it was practised by legitimate scientists with scientific backgrounds, used scientific methodologies of the day and was accepted by both
scientists and non-scientists as science. In short it looked like science, it behaved like science, was treated like science and was called science. The primary literature of both eugenicists and non-eugenicists is littered with references to the “science of eugenics”. (I am not denying that the movement attracted ‘cranks’ and amateurs). It was largely in the aftermath of the war and Nazi genocide that the idea of eugenics as a pseudo-science emerged. At the Nuremberg Military Tribunal Dr Andrew Ivy (appointed by the American Medical Association) condemned Nazi eugenics as an “immoral, and unscientific ideology of the inequality of human beings or the mythology of the Master Race” and went on to argue that German scientists “had become immoral and dishonest, therefore their achievements were of a pseudo-scientific character” [quoted in Mitscherlich & Mielke; 1949; x & xii]. Such statements were attempts to preserve the notion of science as intrinsically good and to distance genuine science and scientists from the logical conclusions of eugenic ideologies that many had supported. Any science that was not “good” was by definition pseudo-science. All this masks a reality illustrated by the case of the Nazi sympathetic Fritz Lenz, of whom Paul Weindling writes “Lenz’s talents as a medical geneticist should not be underrated” [Weindling; 1993; 645]. Furthermore such a free use of the terms science and pseudo-science begins to resemble the eugenicists’ tendency to ascribe good and bad as if they were objective criteria.

The Literature on Eugenics

Over the last twenty years there has been an enormous growth in the literature dealing with eugenics. A number of scholars have commented on this “newly burgeoning literature” [Adams; 1990; 217]. Modern studies of eugenics began in the 1960s with the publication of two books - Mark Haller’s Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought (1963) and Donald Pickens’ Eugenics and the Progressives (1968). These books are seen as amongst the first to integrate “internalist” and “externalist” factors; that is changes within the science itself and changes in the wider world (economics, politics and so on) [e.g. Allen; 1976; 105]. Until the 1960s eugenics had been treated simply as part of the history of genetics, within the internalist history of science. Books such as those by geneticists like L C
Dunn had dealt with the details of the scientific development of genetics. Pickens' and Haller's books suffered from the major weakness that in the 1960s many of the papers of institutions and individuals that are now available to historians - the ERO and Laughlin papers to name just two - were not available. On the other hand they benefited from the fact that people like Paul Popenoe, Frederick Osborn and various geneticists were still alive and willing to correspond or give interviews. These two works set the ball rolling for the growth of the study of eugenics, with works like William Provine's Origins of Population Genetics (1971), Kenneth Ludmerer's Genetics and American Society (1972) and Allan Chase's The Legacy of Malthus (1977) coming out soon after. At this time many more sets of papers became available to historians, and fortunately a large number have over the years been gathered together at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia * (although others remain at the University of Saint Louis in Missouri, the Peabody Museum at Harvard and other places).

It was from the late 1970s onwards that the 'eugenics mini-industry' emerged, with a spectacular growth of books and articles on eugenics. This literature has overwhelmingly focused on Britain, the USA and Nazi Germany, for obvious reasons. Garland Allen suggests that "in the United States and Germany in particular, the movement reached its peak as a full-scale racial and ethnic hierarchy" [Allen; 1983; 108]. Britain has received a large amount of attention, firstly because of its importance in the early and theoretical aspects of eugenics and secondly

* There are new questions which arise from the papers at the American Philosophical Society. Most pertinent is the fact that many of the files of correspondence end abruptly in the early 1930s, without explanation. This applies to a number of collections, most notably the Davenport papers. One has to ask why this is. It seems highly improbable that everybody stopped writing simultaneously, or that a huge amount of correspondence was accidentally destroyed in several collections from one period. The most obvious answer is that they were systematically purged. It is not so clear who would purge them or why. The most probable motive seems to be to protect the writers from the potential damage that the letters could cause (possibly relating to views of Nazism). The original correspondents seem to be unlikely to have done it, as more than one person's correspondence is involved. If they were purged, it was presumably at some point after all or some of the papers were brought together.
because of its close associations with the development of American eugenics (as well as the American birth control movement and genetics).

Daniel Kevles' *In The Name of Eugenics* (originally published in 1985) examined the rise and fall of American and British eugenics and is now widely considered to be the standard text on eugenics in these countries. Elazar Barkan's *The Retreat of Scientific Racism* (1992) also deals with the USA and Britain. It is broader than Kevles' work, in that it deals with areas like biology in general and anthropology, but narrower in that it only focuses on race. The work of Garland Allen, through numerous articles, has looked at various aspects of eugenics, including economics, the role of the ERO, the work of Raymond Pearl, the relationship of T H Morgan to eugenics and Davenport. He has also written about various resources for the study of eugenics - the Laughlin papers and the AES papers. These works and those like Diane Paul's *Controlling Human Heredity*, have looked not just at genetics and its relationship to eugenics, but have also examined psychology, intelligence testing, birth control and other movements. They have established a generally agreed timeline of events.

These historians of American eugenics have reached broad conclusions about the demise of American eugenics. The standard outline, using Kevles' terminology, suggests that mainline eugenics dominated until the late 1920s. In the 1920s and early 1930s criticism of the mainline position emerged from genetics and from within eugenics. Coupled to other factors, this led to the emergence of reform eugenics in the early and mid-1930s. Growing hostility to Nazism led to the final collapse of the already weakened mainline movement. Despite its attempts to reconstruct eugenics and to oppose Nazism, the reform eugenics movement too suffered decline resulting in its collapse towards the end of World War Two, and the absorption of parts of its ideology and personnel into the emerging fields of human genetics, population genetics and population control. (There are differences between the Allen and Kevles timelines, see p131-2). The common feature of all the histories of eugenics that refer to Nazism as a factor, is that they only mention it in passing, as
they are actually histories of some other aspect of eugenics. Therefore the claim about the role of Nazism is frequently made, but never analysed. I would suggest that the problems emerged earlier than this. Mainline eugenics was effectively ended by 1933, and reform eugenics voluntarily disbanded itself once the mainline group was gone. (The lack of comparative studies has to some extent allowed this myth of the effect of Nazism to continue).

Since this timeline has become established, historical works on American eugenics have built on this and deal with specific aspects of eugenics, rather than with the movement as a whole. In the mid-1990s Edward Larson published *Sex, Race and Science* looking at eugenics in the Deep South, Martin Pernick published *The Black Stork* examining the history of a single film on eugenics and Marouf Hasain published *The Rhetoric of Eugenics in Anglo-American Thought* looking at language and culture. There has also been work dealing with specific states, such as that of Kevin Dann (1991) and Nancy Gallagher (1999) on Vermont.

German eugenics too has produced its own 'mini-industry' (in both English and German). The study of German eugenics in its own right is relatively recent, as for so long its study was overshadowed by Nazism. Robert Proctor's *Racial Hygiene* is the equivalent to Kevles' *In The Name of Eugenics* in that it is widely seen as the central introductory text in any study of the movement. Sheila Faith Weiss has written extensively on Wilhelm Schallmayer, the emergence of German eugenics and divisions between *Rassenhygiene* and *Eugenik*. Paul Weindling's *Health, Race and German Politics* gives an in depth account of the interaction of eugenics and health issues. Benno Müller-Hill's *Murderous Science* highlights the continuities in the murder of Jews, Gypsies and other groups. Ernst Klee's *Euthanasie im NS-Staat* gives an account of the euthanasia programme, while Michael Burleigh's *Death and Deliverance* and Henry Friedlander's *Origins of Nazi Genocide* have examined the theoretical and practical connections between the euthanasia programme and Nazi genocide. Books and articles on eugenics, family policy and women include Gisela Bock's "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany" (1983), Lisa Pine's *Nazi Family Policy*
While there is this huge body of literature dealing with eugenics in Germany and in the Anglo-American context, there has been little systematic examination of the relationship between them. Many studies of American eugenics have made passing references to Germany, but only two works have engaged in any kind of comparison or analysis of the interactions and relationships between the countries or the movements. Certainly almost all authors see Nazism and its genocidal policies as the logical conclusion of a eugenic programme. Kevles, for example, speaks of the "river of blood [that] would eventually run from the sterilization law of 1933 to Auschwitz and Buchenwald" [Kevles; 1995; 118].

The Legacy of Malthus by Allan Chase - a professional author, rather than an academic - examines questions of race, science and politics in the USA and Germany up to the early 1970s. Although widely cited Chase's study is broad, detailed but limited in analysis. It is often referred to using words like "impassioned". In 1994 Stefan Kühl's The Nazi Connection was the first book length academic comparison of eugenics in Germany and the USA. Kühl's book deals with one specific area of the relationships of the two movements. The personal connections between members of the movements. In studying American eugenics Kühl had been "struck by the fact that their support for Nazi Germany had received little attention" [Kühl; 1994; xiv]. He was also surprised that Kevles' study In The Name of Eugenics, like others, had only found two eugenicists - Laughlin and Campbell - to be vocal supporters of eugenics in Nazi Germany. Kühl's work showed that links between Rassenhygiene and orthodox and racial eugenics were extensive and that they continued into the later 1930s. My study broadly agrees with Kühl's conclusion about the extent of the involvement of Americans with German and Nazi eugenics. (The extent of this relationship can be overstated. It is my belief that while American experiences influenced subsequent eugenic policies in Germany, there was very little influence the other way). None of this, however, sheds any light on the
assumption that involvement with and support for Nazi eugenics helped to undermine the American movement, or that it was enough to end the American experiment.

The overwhelming majority of work on eugenics focuses on the USA, Germany and Britain. This is despite the fact that according to Mark Adams at least thirty countries had recognisable eugenics movements [Adams; 1990; 5]. (There were movements in Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dutch East Indies, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, South Africa, Switzerland and the USSR. These countries each had, at some time, organisations belonging to the IFEO [CBDP1; IFEO - Finances]. Australia, India, Japan, New Zealand, Thailand (Siam), Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia also had eugenics movements). Two books which stand out against this Anglo-American-German trend are Nancy Stepan's The Hour of Eugenics looking at eugenics in Latin America, and Roll-Hansen and Broberg's Eugenics and the Welfare State which examines eugenics (specifically sterilisation) in Scandinavia and Finland. (The very existence of these two books call into question some of the common assumptions about the background and function of eugenics). There has been no work to integrate these or other significant countries, like Australia or France, into the eugenics field and into the general discourse on Anglo-American or German eugenics. (Likewise there has been no work looking specifically at the international organisation of eugenics, such as the International Congresses of Eugenics or the IFEO). Comparative work on eugenics is an area of research in which much academic work needs to be done. Almost universally acknowledged as the first systematic and comprehensive comparative was Loren Graham's 1977 article "Science and Values" which examines the emergence of political dimensions of eugenics in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. In 1990 Mark Adams published The Wellborn Science which was a collection of four separate studies on eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil and Russia, by four different authors. It did contain a chapter entitled "Towards a Comparative History of Eugenics" which acknowledged the dearth of comparative literature. Peter Weingart's 1995 article "Eugenics -
INTRODUCTION

Medical or Social Science” compares, in part, the roots of race hygiene and eugenics.

This study does not attempt to deal with the ethical or moral aspects of eugenics, except insofar as they are directly relevant to particular aspects of the work. Likewise, it will not deal with the technical scientific dimensions of eugenics, although it is taken for granted that eugenics is scientifically flawed and thus discredited within the contemporary world. This work will not give a detailed chronological narrative of either German or American eugenics, beyond that given in this introduction and examinations of particular policy areas in subsequent chapters, as they are relevant. Chronological narratives are widely available including Kevles' *In The Name of Eugenics* (the USA and Britain), Chase's *The Legacy of Malthus* (the USA and Germany), Proctor's *Racial Hygiene* (Germany) and Stephen Jay Gould's *The Mismeasure of Man* (racial sciences in the USA, Germany and others). Philip Reilly's *The Surgical Solution* details the history of involuntary sterilisation in the USA. This work seeks to establish that Nazism was irrelevant to the decline of American eugenics, because the American movement was effectively finished by 1933.

The upsurge in interest in the history of eugenics has been mirrored in the growth of television programming concerned with it, of newspaper column inches devoted to it and to articles in mainstream magazines. The internet has provided an egalitarian platform in which information is available without editing or censorship. Whilst on the one hand this has been a help to academics and historians by making available some primary source material, such as parts of the Laughlin papers, the soon to be launched site from Cold Spring Harbor making available documents from its eugenics period in the 1920s and 1930s, and Barry Mehler's extensive resources at the web-site of the “Institute for the Study of Academic Racism”. On the other hand the internet has provided a vehicle for the dissemination of pro-eugenic work ranging from the crude (Stormfront) to the popular (American Renaissance) to the academic (eugenics.net). Understanding the nature and history of eugenics is all the
more important as more channels for disseminating information to more people from more sources become available.
(i) BACKGROUND

American and German eugenics developed from circumstances that were common to all countries which had influential eugenics movements including Britain, Canada and Scandinavia. Eugenics did not become established uniformly and each country has its idiosyncrasies of eugenic history. There had been massive changes in both Germany and the USA in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, following German unification in 1871 and the American Civil War of 1861 to 1865. There was a certain parallel development in the USA and Germany in the years leading up to 1918 and which underpinned the growth of eugenics. The factors common to the development of the two countries fall broadly into two groups - material factors and theoretical factors. The first group consists of urbanisation, industrialisation, growing welfare services, social development and improved communications - in short modernisation. The second group includes the desire for rational planning in all areas of life, the idea that modern society was counter-selective and that populations were eugenically degenerating.

• Material Factors
By 1914 America and Germany had both grown to positions where they could challenge Britain's position as the world's greatest economy. Britain had begun to lose her commanding economic position through a slowing down of economic growth. Coupled to the rapid economic expansion in Germany and the USA were the associated urbanisation, growth of social problems and so on.

America's economic growth was spectacular at the end of the nineteenth century. From 1860 to 1910 heavy industries surged ahead, as they did in Germany. American coal production rose from 9,000 tons in 1860 to over 400,000 tons by 1910 (in Germany it went up seven-fold between 1871 and 1913, while in Britain it just over doubled). Steel production rose from less than one million tons to 26 million tons between 1860 and 1910 (in Germany it went from one and a half million
to nearly 19 million tons between 1880 and 1913 and in Britain from 982,000 to seven million tons). The USA’s iron ore production rose from 2.8 million tons to 57 million tons over the same period and crude petroleum production rose from 500 barrels per day to over 200,000 barrels per day [Campbell; 1971; 20 & Balfour; 1964; 439]. By 1914 Germany’s total National Wealth had overtaken that of Britain. Germany’s Gross National Product more than tripled between 1870 and 1914, while Britain’s GNP barely doubled.

According to Norman Cohn expansion of railways “at the time was the surest index of industrial development” [Cohn; 1996; 113]. In Germany the total mileage of railway track grew from 19,500 miles at unification to 61,000 miles by 1910 (nearly double the amount in the UK). [Balfour; 1964; 438] This impressive growth was outstripped by the USA. Between 1860 and 1900 America’s railways grew from 36,500 miles to 260,000 miles. In the decade up to 1910 the USA saw a bigger expansion of the railway network than any other country in the world, from 260,000 miles to over 350,000 miles [Campbell; 1971; 15]. (In the same decade Britain’s network barely grew). The railways spread across the USA towards the Pacific and it was during this period that the first transcontinental railway lines were laid.

Following the economic expansion of the USA and Germany there were correspondingly huge changes in the populations. In raw numbers the USA grew from 30 million people in 1860 to over 90 million by 1910. Germany grew from 41 million people in 1871 to 65 million in 1910. Rapid growth hides the fact that birth rates declined substantially. This decline was offset, however, by the curbing of infant mortality and a lengthening of average life expectancy. When the cumulative effect of these changes filtered through after 1900, there was widespread concern about changes in the population structure, especially in Germany - at the same time as the eugenics movement entered the mainstream of public and political debate.

These population increases and economic growth caused rapid urbanisation, which many saw as “biologically bad for all races” [TICE; 1934; Holmes; 121]. In the USA
the urban population grew from 19.8% in 1860 to 54.4% in 1910 (of a substantially larger population) [Campbell; 1971; 15]. In 1871 one third of Germans lived in towns of more than 2,000 people. By 1910 this figure had almost doubled to 60%. Germany's big cities saw an even more dramatic growth. 4.8% of Germans lived in cities of over 100,000 people in 1871, by 1910 21.3% of Germans lived in such cities [Weiss; 1983; 15]. All these changes and their breakneck speed led to rising fears amongst the American and German middle-classes about the numerical rise of the urban working class and of worker radicalism, socialism and social democracy. There were fears about rises in crime, in insanity and mental health problems, in alcohol consumption and especially changes in sexual behaviour including prostitution, promiscuity and homosexuality.

The modern world had provided mass transportation, which produced its own set of eugenic problems. In the USA eugenic concerns were supplemented by fear of European immigrants. (Numbers of arrivals had risen from around 300,000 per year in the 1870s to a million a year by 1910 [Campbell; 1971; 36]). Mass transportation had meant that migration was cheap and easy, and this coupled with the rapidly developing USA with its high standard of living led eugenicists to argue that there had been a change in the type of person attracted to immigration. Earlier migrants were seen as pioneers, of brave and resourceful character, while the newer generations of immigrants were believed to be lazy and eugenically unfit failures in their home countries who saw the USA as an easy answer to their problems. These changes led directly to the heightening of racial issues because "on account of modern means of transportation all races of mankind are beginning to mix together" at a time when race crossing was widely condemned [CBDP2; ERA - Committee on Policy and Research No.2 1928-9].

- Theoretical Factors

Two related concepts that grew up in tandem with economic growth, and which were vital to the appeal of eugenics, were the ideas of the counter-selective nature of the
modern world and the degeneration it caused. Counter-selectivity theories suggested that modern ways of living were helping the unfit to thrive by allowing them to survive and encouraging them to produce defective children who they could not have produced or cared for in previous societies - thus working against natural selection. Degeneration argued that there was a gradual decline in the eugenic (genetic) quality of the population, reflected in the rise in mental health problems (like insanity and feeble-mindedness) and the rise in physical disability, crime and social problems. This was the frequently referred to "race suicide", "racial decline" and "racial degeneration" that underpinned the eugenics movements. For many people this was supplemented by the perceived decline of the White race, especially its Nordic and Anglo-Saxon parts. The answer to these problems, according to eugenicists, was to have a rationally planned population policy which would limit the growth of the degenerate and working class population through negative eugenics, while encouraging the growth of the eugenically desirable and middle-class populations through positive eugenics. Natural selection would be replaced by rational selection. This would balance counter-selectivity and reverse degeneration. Clarence Campbell of the ERA suggested that eugenics dealt with "the difficult problem of reconciling humanitarian ideas with the biological law of natural selection, or the still more difficult and hazardous task of improving upon natural selection by a scheme of human selection" [CBDP2; ERA - Committee on Policy and Research No.1 1928-9]. Many eugenicists saw their work as genuinely humanitarian because it would eliminate the need for brutal selection on a Social Darwinian basis.

The middle-classes across Europe and north America believed that modern society selected the weak over the strong and encouraged them to propagate more of their inferior type. This went against the new laws of nature as revealed by Darwin’s *On the Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection* (1859) and more especially by *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871). (Darwinism and

---

*There is a huge literature on degeneration. Primary sources in this area include the work of Bénédict-Augustin Morel, Max Nordau and Cesare Lombroso. Secondary sources include*
Social Darwinism had struck a chord in German society. Sheila Faith Weiss claims that “Darwin was more popular in the land of Goethe and Kant than in his native country” [Weiss; 1983; 68]. In Germany Ernst Haeckel was particularly inspired by this kind of thinking. As the middle-classes limited the size of their families, the irresponsible working classes continued to have large families. This recklessness was encouraged, by giving them increased access to health care, welfare facilities and charity. Modern medicine and health policies encouraged families amongst many people who in earlier times would have died. For example, as care for the tuberculous improved the argument emerged that this was counter-selective because those who got tuberculosis were genetically weak anyway. By helping the tuberculous to live for longer they were simply encouraged to produce offspring who were similarly genetically inferior [Huntington & Whitney 1928].

The class issue ran through all forms of eugenics. It was claimed that the better (middle) classes were not producing enough children, while the worse (working) classes were having too many. This was the central issue of books like Huntington and Whitney’s *The Builders of America* (1928). Eugenicists frequently stressed that eugenics was not about class and that good heredity could be found in all sections of the community, but then equated all things good with the middle and upper-middle classes and all things bad with the urban working class (“children of superior social status yield a higher average mental age than children of the laboring classes” [Terman; 1919; 115]). Raymond Pearl’s early work, which supported orthodox eugenics also correlated social status with eugenic value, and then showed that the higher groups were having less children than the eugenically less valuable [Pearl; 1908; 9822].

The specific features of life responsible for counter-selectivity included medicine, welfare payments, inventions like running water and transport, and so on [e.g. Davenport; 1912; iv & CBDP2; ERA - Committee on Policy and Research No.1 1928-9]. These were coupled with a more traditional form of counter-selectivity -

Daniel Pick’s *Faces of Degeneration* (1991) and work by Nancy Harrowitz.
charity and sentiment - for which the churches were largely to blame [Grant; 1922; 49-51]. (It was argued that charity without knowledge of eugenics was dysgenic and cruel [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 133]. Counter-selectivity was based on crude Social Darwinism of the survival of the fittest. It ran through eugenic discourses, and was used in justification of all eugenic policies. The ERO's report into defective germ-plasm suggested that "with all of the upbolstering influences of modern humanitarianism, natural forces no longer suffice to select only the fittest for the human breeding stock". So when the natural selection of Social Darwinism failed, the rational selection of eugenics, and especially sterilisation, would restore the natural order [ERO Bulletin 10A; ii-1914; 57-8]. Leaving the growth of these classes of the unfit unchecked was seen as the cause of race suicide and degeneration. "The laws of nature require the obliteration of the unfit" [Grant; 1922; 49]. At the Third International Congress of Eugenics Eugene Gosney claimed that "nature's law of the survival of the fittest took care of that problem in past ages. In those stages it was only the physically strong and mentally alert that could survive", the modern world, however, meant that "nature's hard but effective law was nullified" [TICE; 1934; Gosney; 369-71]. Huntington and Whitney illustrated counter-selectivity by claiming that "famine as a eugenic agency is fast giving place to a dysgenic freedom from famine" [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 128]. These ideas built on those put forward earlier by Comte Arthur de Gobineau, the Reverend Thomas Malthus and others.

It was Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919) was amongst the first to voice the counter-selectivity argument in Germany [Weiss; 1983]. Counter-selectivity was cited in the first pages of the first issue of the ARGB [ARGB; 1 (1904); 3-26]. The counter-selectivity argument was not confined to the Rassenhygiene wing. In 1931 Hermann Muckermann wrote in the journal Eugenik that "civilisation has eliminated natural selection. Public welfare and social assistance contribute... to the preservation and further reproduction of hereditarily diseased individuals" [quoted in Dietrich; 1991; 75].
Following on from the idea of counter-selectivity, society was seen as degenerating. Degeneration was the idea that the biological quality of populations was in decline. It had been put forward in mid-nineteenth-century France and gained rapid acceptance across Europe and North America. Sources of degeneration were concentrated in what became the traditional targets of eugenics, the unfit - the poor, the diseased, the criminal, the alcoholic, the mentally and physically disabled, the feeble-minded. These were the very groups that the counter-selectivity of modern life was encouraging to thrive. Degeneration was also often held to be a result of race-mixing and the resultant ‘disharmonious offspring’. After a long period of anecdotal evidence, intelligence testing provided scientific evidence for eugenicists and others whose philosophies rested upon the concept of degeneration, that “demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that the vast reservoir of undeveloped genius” did not exist in the working classes [JofH; 24 (1933); 143]. At the Third International Congress of Eugenics this idea was still being promoted “the unintelligent portion of the population are continuing to propagate at the same rapid rate as formerly [TICE; 1934; Robie; 206]. Thus the exponential growth of the lower classes, supplemented by immigration, could only increase the degeneration of American society and the West generally. Despite its blatant class bias and its racial dimensions the concept was embraced by all eugenicists, from proto-Nazis like Fritz Lenz to supporters of Soviet communism like Hermann Muller. Reviewing the 1931 edition of the Baur-Fischer-Lenz book in the Birth Control Review Muller wrote: “Lenz settles down to the position that ‘degeneration is the central problem of racial hygiene, and the prevention and the overcoming of degeneration are its main objects.’... The prevention of degeneration is laudable enough in itself, but how weak-kneed, negative, and uninspiring as the major focus of eugenics” [Muller in BCR; i-1933; 20]. Degeneration, then was common ground across the spectrum of political positions taken up by eugenicists even if they placed different emphasis on its importance.

In the USA there was a widespread belief that there were natural levels of increase for populations. Therefore if the lower classes increased rapidly, or too many
immigrants were allowed into a country, then the native-born population stopped having children. This argument blamed the lower classes and immigrants directly for the perceived problem of declining birth rates in the middle-classes. Prescott Hall argued that immigration “tends to sterilize all strata of higher social and economic levels already in that country... nearly all students of the matter are agreed that the United States would have a larger population today if there had been no immigration since 1820; and... a much more homogeneous population” [JofH; 10 (1919); 125]. In this way class, degeneration and immigration issues were brought into one argument.

As with the class issue, many eugenicists claimed to not have any racial bias, but then equated Blacks or Jews or Slavs with bad traits, and the Anglo-Saxon or Nordic race with superior traits. After calling for a total halt to non-White immigration and tough limits on non-Nordic immigration Thurman Rice wrote that “there is not necessarily any implication of racial superiority or inferiority” [Rice; 1929; 308]. In this regard, of course, there were many orthodox and racial eugenicists in the USA and Rassenhygiene eugenicists in Germany who openly promoted the idea of different racial values. In the introduction to The Passing of the Great Race, Madison Grant wrote:

To admit the unchangeable differentiation of race in its modern scientific meaning is to admit inevitably the existence of superiority in one race and inferiority in another. Such an admission we can hardly expect from those of inferior races.

[Grant; 1922; xxviii]

Such arguments about degeneration and counter-selectivity were not confined to eugenicists. They permeated American (and European) society to the highest levels. Theodore Roosevelt condemned “the conduct of a nation which permits unlimited breeding from the worst stocks... [and allows] the men and women who ought to

* This work of Madison Grant’s was extremely popular and often cited, becoming a best-seller almost immediately. It received favourable reviews in journals like Science and was reprinted in the USA in 1916, 1918, 1920, 1921 and throughout the rest of the period. Importantly, it was used in Congressional hearings for the 1924 Immigration Act.
marry, and if married have large families, remain celibates or have no children or only one or two” [CBDP1; Roosevelt to Davenport; 3-i-1913].

Garland Allen argues, from a Marxist perspective, that “racism and class struggle were inherent in the very epistemic questions on which eugenics was built” [Allen; 1987; 194]. This may be a slight exaggeration but it is roughly accurate. From this point of view eugenics was intrinsically and by definition racist, a question which has been debated by many historians of the movement. Many historical and sociological works on eugenics have dealt with aspects of eugenics in isolation - Barkan's The Retreat of Scientific Racism, David Barker's The Biology of Stupidity to name two. Valuable though these works are, it is important to recognise that eugenics was a movement in which class, race and social categorisation were blended and, although helpful in some ways, it is somewhat artificial to separate them out.

Eugenics was an attempt to introduce a rationally planned population policy which would effectively treat humans in the same way as units of capital, as part of a strategy to reverse degeneration and to secure economic prosperity. As early as 1905, William Bateson in Britain, a pioneering geneticist and a prominent critic of eugenics, saw efficiency as the cornerstone of eugenics' rationale and foresaw its potential. He accurately predicted that “mankind will begin to interfere; perhaps not in England, but in some country more ready to break with the past and more eager for 'national efficiency'... At some time, not, perhaps, far distant, that power will be applied to control the composition of a nation... That may be the one [thing] which will most profoundly change the destiny of men” [quoted in Harvey; 1995; 116].

Eugenics attempted to raise efficiency by dividing people into productive and non-productive categories, with the aim of eliminating the economically non-productive. Edward East made an explicit connection between business management and population management, writing that “one sees "business barometers" in every newspaper. It is only a small step from this point to recognition of the necessity of constructing "metres" of public health and national prosperity by recording facts about the people themselves” [East; 1923; 8]. Davenport's dislike of poverty was on
the grounds that it was a form of “inefficiency”, rather than because it caused unhappiness, poor health, stunted ambition or other problems [Davenport; 1912; 80]. Economics was a central motive of eugenics both by making society more “efficient” and by reducing tax burden or middle-class tax-payers. The prominence of the economic rationale for eugenics is apparent amongst reform eugenicists too. Hermann Muller - a pro-Soviet communist - argued for segregation of the feeble-minded because in institutions “they constitute much less of an economic and psychological burden on their fellow men” [TICE; 1934; Muller; 138].

These motives were just as present in Germany. Saving money was the driving force behind various proposals. Having rejected humanitarianism on economic grounds, Professor Kaup suggested that even though defectives “could never repay the money spent on them”, they be put into work colonies in order to reduce the amount needed [ARGB; 10 (1913); 747-8]. The Depression was named as a spur to Nazism’s eugenic policies. William Peter, after a trip to Germany in 1934 cited economic conditions in general as the justification for Germany’s sterilisation programme. He specifically named the slow pace of recovery including unemployment and inflation [Peter; 1934; 187-91].

- The Solution
By 1914 the USA and Germany were in comparable positions in terms of their industrial and economic modernisation and the issues that went with it. (They were far from similar in other areas of political modernisation as Jeffrey Herf’s book Reactionarv Modernism - and some German works - demonstrate with regard to political modernisation). They had both experienced rapid growth and had overtaken Britain in economic importance and were now jockeying for position as the world’s biggest economic power. The analysis of the population problems facing the countries was, not surprisingly, similar although there were different emphases. As is mentioned above it was widely believed in the USA and Germany that the modern world was counter-selective, and that degeneration was a real and occurring phenomena. Three conclusions arose from this. Firstly, the eugenically fit (in the
form of the middle-classes) were not reproducing enough to maintain a high genetic standard. Secondly, insanity, feeble-mindedness and other mental conditions were increasing faster than the growth of the general population, as were physical disabilities. Thirdly, there was a general moral decay manifesting itself in high levels of crime, prostitution, divorce, alcoholism, drug abuse, promiscuity and other social problems. In short modern life-styles brought to the fore everything that eugenicists, the middle-classes and others feared or disliked. On top of this were questions of political and social modernisation including women's rights, democracy, minority rights, immigration, socialism and birth-control.

The rapidly modernising and industrialising states of Germany and the USA also underwent transformations in popular modes of thought amongst the ruling classes. Amongst these trends in contemporary thought, which were particularly pertinent for the eugenics movements were the growth of ideas surrounding planning, efficiency and management, not just in the narrow business sense, but in the wider contexts of welfare, social questions and population issues. At the end of the nineteenth century the laissez-faire economic model and its intellectual sibling of Social Darwinism were dominant. By the end of the First World War these had been superseded by the Progressive idea of regulation, rational management and intervention. In the same way that capitalism was to be regulated, population questions could be subjected to planned rational management. (Eugenics did in part utilise Social Darwinism, such as the survival of the fittest mentality in ideas of counter-selectivity). Steven Selden summarises Garland Allen's point thus: "if the laissez-faire capitalism of the nineteenth century "needed" Darwin, then the corporate order of the twentieth century was well served by Galton's eugenics" [Selden; 1988; 63 & Allen; 1986; 264].

Eugenics was an ideology and movement, which arose as a seemingly rational response to a set of issues emerging from the economic expansion and social change of the fifty years up to the First World War and the dominant analysis of the problems associated with these changes. This formed an important part of the
backdrop against which eugenics developed and this change in general attitudes at least partially explains the willingness of the ruling classes to contemplate, and the lower classes to accept, proposed interventions in personal spheres on a scale altogether unheard of before. From the outset in both countries eugenicists saw their role as developing a system of rational population management to complement emerging regulated capitalist economies, with clearly demarcated racial groups to mirror clearly demarcated nation-states. Before the war Schallmayer was calling for statesmen to recognise "that the future of his nation is dependant on the good management of its reproductive [human] resources" [Weiss; 1983; 1].
CHAPTER 1

(ii) WORLD WAR ONE

The importance of the war on subsequent developments in German, European and American eugenics and associated ideologies has often been overlooked in the past. In 1981 George Mosse wrote in the preface to the second edition of The Crisis of German Ideology. "If I were to write this book today,... World War One...would be given greater space. Not only because the myth of the war experience proved susceptible to Volkisch ideas, but because, as a result of the lost war and its consequences, Germany became the nation in which the Volkisch dream was to be realised" [Mosse; 1981; vi]. Coupled to this Volkisch dream was a programme of eugenic policies for population restructuring. The war was of crucial importance in the development of Germany's eugenics movement. Saul Friedländer, for example, writes of eugenics that "as in so many other domains, the war was of decisive importance" [Friedländer; 1997; 39]. In the context of this study the war is important in several respects - its radicalising effect on German eugenics, its effect on the USA and its impact on the international eugenics movement.

The First World War had a profoundly greater direct effect on Germany (and other European powers) than it did on the USA, and impacted fundamentally on the later development of Germany by preparing the ground for a radical eugenics programme in important ways. While Germany was at the epicentre of the historical and cultural earthquake of 1914-1918, the USA was at its edge. The crudest comparison in this regard is simply in terms of the casualties sustained. Whereas Germany suffered 1.8 million war dead, the USA suffered only 116 thousand deaths [Gilbert; 1994a; 158]. This difference of outcome was recognised by American eugenicists. Charles Davenport suggested that Americans could understand European attitudes “better if the war had caused the loss of more of our young men” [HSJP; Davenport to Jennings; 17-iv-1920]. Furthermore, Germany had fought the war close to home and for her very survival, and when Germany lost the war - which was still being fought on foreign soil - she lost land, population, economic power and colonies. The war cost Germany dearly in economic and financial terms. World War One destroyed
the German economy and then added to that the cost of reparations, a loss of primary industry and a reliance on the American economy. Germany’s gold reserves were reduced by £123 million (by far the biggest loss of gold of any belligerent). Reparations to the allies were set at $25,000 million, enough to cripple the German economy when coupled with the loss of some of Europe’s best areas for primary and secondary industry (for example, Germany lost nearly half of her iron producing capacity). By contrast, the USA was a financial beneficiary of the war - increasing its gold reserves by £278 million, and with a total debt from Europe of $9,806 million [Gilbert; 1994b; 157].

- The War, Germany and Radicalisation

Conditions in the war, the way it was fought and its results caused massive changes in German perceptions of war. By the war’s end modern warfare in contrast to previous types of war was almost universally seen as dysgenic. Furthermore, as Omar Bartov states, the fighting “completely shattered the image of war as an exercise in chivalry” [Bartov; 1996; 20] or as Hitler says in Mein Kampf “the romance of battle had been replaced by horror” [Hitler; 1992; 151]. The war comprehensively smashed any illusions of war as glorious. It was the first truly modern war and was highly industrialised - on the battlefield, in the systems of supply, the scale of death and destruction and the ‘total’ nature of the war for many of the participating countries. Wilhelm Schallmayer had long rejected all forms of war and militarism as dysgenic, although he did emphasise military fitness as important in the fight against degeneration (Schallmayer himself had been discharged from the army for being unfit) [Weiss; 1983; 90]. For German eugenicists, however, much more than Americans there was an ambivalence towards war, seeing it as dysgenic, yet unavoidable. During the Ruhr crisis of 1923 Lenz wrote a letter to Davenport containing the passage “Europe goes with rapid steps toward a new frightful war... I do not wish this certainly; I know that our race in it will suffer more heavily than in the past World War but it cannot be avoided”. He went on to point out that America would inevitably join Germany’s opponents in a world Anglo-Saxon alliance [CBDP1; Lenz to Davenport; 8-viii-1923].
The racial dimension was much more important than economic or other considerations of the war for Germany’s eugenicists. Before the war Alfred Ploetz stated that “Poles, Hungarians, Russians and South Slavs...have an extremely high birth rate and are successfully pushing westward everywhere...the Nordic race is severely threatened as a result” [Ploetz; ARGB; 1913; 171]. (This was not just crude war propaganda as it was published in 1913 and stated in 1912 at the First International Eugenics Congress). In the thirty years up to 1914 Germany’s total population rose by 34% to 63 million, while the Slavic population of Europe rose by 53% to 160 million. In Britain Karl Pearson, like many people in Germany concluded from this that “every year war was deferred meant less numerical strength in the Germanic as compared with the Slav factor in Europe” [Pearson; 1914; 10]. Leading German eugenicists (Schallmayer, Ploetz, Lenz, Rüdin) from both wings, believed that the 1914-1918 war could leave Russia and other Slav countries biologically untouched and with rapidly increasing populations, while devastating Germany [e.g. Lenz; ARGB; 10 (1918); 444]. (Indeed in the war years the already declining birth rate plummeted and for the first time Germany's death rate exceeded its birth rate [Weindling; 1989; 327]). According to Sheila Faith Weiss, Schallmayer saw his work as “aimed at saving his country and others... from the ‘Russian bear’” [Weiss; 1986; 45]. The idea that there would have to be a decisive war between Germany and the Slavs to her east continued after the war [e.g. ARGB; 14 (1922); 212-8]. This same fear of increasing Slav numerical strength spurred both Hitler's early ‘Drang nach Osten’ ('drive to the east') and German eugenicists, unlike their American counterparts, to include absolute increases in population in their programmes. Pearson claimed that it “has embittered the Germans so much against us [the British], when they find ‘Anglo-Saxons’ not including themselves in the available ‘140 Millionen Germanen’” to fight the Slavs [Pearson; 1914; 10]. This racial contest between the Germanic and Slav people, is reflected in the perceived cultural battle. The war was a struggle for the survival of German Kultur against a lower Slav culture. At the war's end the Reich Health Office calculated that Germany had lost
3.5 million births due to the war. The British Registrar-General Sir Bernard Mallett put the figure at 2.6 million [Weindling; 1989; 330 & Mallett; 1918; 1].

The events of the First World War caused an explosion of interest in eugenics in Germany and a radicalisation of belief for many of those already involved in the movement. The war strengthened and radicalised German eugenics. Before the war there had been those like Professor Kaup of the Society for Race Hygiene, who believed that Germans would never accept a sterilisation programme. (Instead an economically driven policy of segregation was his preferred policy with people organised into work colonies to recoup the money spent on them [ARGB; 10 (1913); 723-48]. A German article in 1914 balked at Laughlin's suggestion of sterilising ten percent of the American population [ARGB; 9 (1914); 184]. In 1917 Erwin Baur, the plant geneticist, wrote an article in which he implied that the war had heightened his interest in eugenic themes. Furthermore it had roused the German people in general to an interest in eugenics and race hygiene [Baur cited in Harvey; 1995; 106]. Paul Weindling argues that Baur's work was motivated by a desire for autarchy in the post-war world [Weindling; 1989; 325]. Donald Dietrich suggests that Hermann Muckermann's conversion to a belief in eugenic sterilisation was caused by the First World War [Dietrich; 1991; 78]. Muckermann went on to write articles and books attempting to synthesise Catholic belief and eugenic sterilisation. It is no coincidence that after the war there was a proliferation of work dealing with eugenics and related topics. The war rippled through the 1920s and 1930s, with eugenics work peppered with references to the war. In 1934 a German official was quoted in the Eugenics Review as arguing that it was the war that put sterilisation high on the agenda of German eugenicists [EugR; July 1934; 137]. It could be argued that the war was one of the factors which led to the gradual decline of the Eugenik programme through the 1920s and the growth of the more radical Rassenhygiene movement.

In the aftermath of the war many eugenicists and others saw the future of eugenics as bright because the need for eugenic action had been intensified by the war.
CHAPTER 1

Recognising the profound effect of the war on Europe, Madison Grant made the prediction that "interesting efforts to improve the quality as well as the quantity of the population... will probably be made in more than one country after the war has ended" [Grant; 1922; 52]. American supporters of Nazism would later use the First World War as a justification for Nazi eugenics. In 1934 an American eugenicist specifically cited reparations, war debt and the loss of colonies amongst the reasons why Germany's sterilisation programme was necessary [Peter; 1934; 187-91]. Frederick Osborn coupled several strands of thinking together when he wrote in 1937 that "in Germany, the need for eugenic measures was not only the result of the war, but also of the increasing urbanization and mobility of her people" [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.8; 24-ii-1937]. In 1940 Lothrop Stoddard claimed that Germany was working to undo the eugenic damage caused by the deaths of the war and the Depression [Stoddard; 1940; 190].

Until the outbreak of the war the German government had shown little interest in eugenic and population issues. During the war, however, Germany's government became progressively more interested in such themes, and began sending representatives to various conferences on eugenic and other population themes. This was something that would continue after the war with the newly formed, democratic Weimar government funding the KWl, funding research at universities, funding the Society for Race Hygiene and setting up departments within the civil service for data collection on issues relating to eugenics. Prussia set up a race hygiene and population policy committee at the war's end. (The USA's Rockefeller Foundation also contributed substantial sums to the KWl in the late 1920s and well into the 1930s [Weindling; 1993; 537 & Harwood; 1987; 402]).

On top of the eugenic costs of the war in terms of soldiers lost and numerical issues regarding Germany's neighbours, there was one direct racial eugenic question raised by the war which remained until it was resolved by the Nazi regime in 1935. At the war's end French occupation troops included Black African soldiers, who were stationed in the Rhineland area for a number of years, causing outrage
amongst the German population (and much sympathy in Britain and the USA for Germany). Erwin Baur told Davenport that “eugenically the worst is what we call the Black Shame, the French negro regiments, which are placed all over Germany and which in the most shameful fashion give free rein to their impulses toward women and children” [CBDP1; Baur to Davenport; 24-ix-1920]. As with many other people at the time hysteria obscured fact. In the same letter Baur referred to a “mass of mulatto children”. The eugenic legacy that these soldiers left was actually three hundred or so children of mixed ethnicity, many of whom by coincidence reached sexual maturity at the same time as the Nazis came to power. Thus they were one of the first ethnic groups to be comprehensively dealt with by a Nazi regime opposed to race crossing. The *Rheinlandbastarde* served propaganda ends for the new regime. In 1934 a eugenics exhibition, opened by Joseph Goebbels, included a feature on them under the caption “the invasion of the black races in Europe” [EugR; July 1934; 164]. Immediately after the assumption of power, Hermann Göring in April 1933, ordered an enquiry into these mixed race children. Further meetings were held by Wilhelm Frick in March 1935 with experts including Lenz and Rüdin, after which the children were forcibly sterilised, in the Summer of 1937. It may seem surprising that the regime gave so much attention to just 385 children. But unlike the (numerically larger) issue of mixed Jewish / non-Jewish marriages, Black / White marriages could be dealt with quickly and effectively. The question of the *Rheinlandbastarde* could easily be dealt with.

The most important area in which German eugenics radicalised was in the area of taking life. Central to the crossing of the line into this area was Hoche and Binding’s *Die Freigabe der Vernichtung Lebensunwerten Lebens* (Allowing the Destruction of Lives Unworthy of Living). Although it dealt only with the killing of the disabled, this was still a Rubicon. Once one form of killing, especially a non-consensual one, had been biologised and legitimised on eugenic grounds, it was a relatively easy step to

---

* For a full account of the story of the *Rheinlandbastarde* see Rainer Pommerin’s *Die Sterilisierung der Rheinlandbastarde*, also his 1982 article “The Fate of Mixed Blood Children in Germany”. For reactions in Britain see Robert Reinders’ “Racialism on the Left: E D Morel and the ‘Black Horror on the Rhein’”.
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move from one unwanted group (the mentally disabled) to another (ethnic minorities and others). Hoche and Binding’s book is worth examining not only because it was one of the first books to bring questions of euthanasia to a mainstream audience, from a legalistic and biological basis, but because as Burleigh and Wippermann argue, it “sparked off an animated public discussion” [Burleigh & Wippermann; 1992; 141]. This debate extended to physicians, politicians, health care professionals and legal experts. As importantly it introduced parts of the thinking which would be used in justification of Nazi policy, and especially euthanasia.

Alfred Hoche and Rudolf Binding, university teachers of psychiatry and law respectively, published their book in 1920 examining legal, moral and practical aspects of euthanasia. Amongst the groups they saw as Ballastexistenzen (ballast lives) or Lebensunwerten lebens (lives unworthy of living) were the terminally ill, incurable idiots, the wounded, the deformed and feeble-minded. Hoche and Binding used the analogy of a diseased body for euthanasia arguing that the state was like an organism and the disabled and others were like a disease which needed removing [Hoche & Binding; 1920; 59-60]. Although the authors claimed that their support for euthanasia was on humanitarian grounds, like most other eugenic texts there was an economic motive too as they pointed out of the financial burden to families and the state, which they quantified at 1,300 Marks per year per person [Hoche & Binding; 1920; 54]. Their work was certainly inspired by the events of World War One. Before the war Hoche had opposed euthanasia, changing his mind only at the end of the war [Weindling; 1993; 395]. Part of this change may be explained by the fact that he had lost a son at the front [Burleigh; 1994; 15]. The book made explicit references to wartime losses [Hoche & Binding; 1920; 35-7], and even used the classic argument of eugenicists that the war had killed the eugenically fittest, while the weak and defective were protected and fed at home [Hoche & Binding; 1920; 27]. These kinds of claims were frequent in the post-war years with suggestions that those in institutional care had lived in luxury at the expense of ordinary Germans during the war. (Benno Müller-Hill estimates that
"about half of the patients in German mental hospitals... died from hunger and infectious diseases" [Müller-Hill; 1988; 8]).

The power of Hoche and Binding's argument was far-reaching. Although himself not a supporter of euthanasia, Hermann Muckermann referred to "useless individuals unworthy of life", which was clearly taken from Hoche and Binding [Dietrich; 1991; 75]. According to Robert Proctor the war was decisive in radicalising Boeters' eugenic views, converting him, like others, to the idea of euthanasia [Proctor; 1995; 178]. In the post-war years he carried out what Stefan Kühl describes as a "one man initiative" in the first German campaign for sterilisation legislation in 1923. Boeters drew heavily on American experience and laws to support his proposals [Kühl; 1994; 23].

In the USA too the war focused the minds of eugenicists and others on the issue of the war and the disabled. In the same way as many Germans contrasted the suffering of the eugenically fittest on the battlefield, with the supposed life of luxury of the dysgenic at home, so too did Americans. Twelve months after the USA's entry into the war, Eugenical News published an article on this topic:

this war which has shocked the world and horrified mankind with its destruction of the human race is doing no more toward that end than the unnecessary, inherited, and self-inflicted diseases are doing. In battle we have the slain, the wounded, the missing, and the captured. In the social struggle we have the same classification of injured people; the killed from unnecessary diseases, the wounded (deaf, blind, feeble-minded, insane, criminal); the captured (incipient cases of TB, temporarily insane, prisoners, drunkards), the missing (escaped criminals, deserters, tramps, footpads and all those who are at liberty and a dangerous burden to society.

[EugN; III (Apr 1918); 30-1]

But while this kind of comparison in Germany led many to support radical solutions, including compulsory euthanasia of the disabled, in the USA eugenic proposals did not go this far. American eugenicists proposed schemes to reduce the numbers of births of the unfit and proposed spending less on welfare and care. The mainstream medical and scientific community spoke for American eugenicists as well. An
editorial in the Journal of the American Medical Association in 1915 claimed that most people believed that "for sheer humanity's sake the insane must have food, clothing and adequate housing accommodations;... they must receive necessary personal attention and must not be subjected to abuse." But the article got to the heart of the matter when it stated that "within the limits of decency, the less spent the better" [JAMA; 4-xii-1915; 2014-5]. Even racial eugenicists like Madison Grant supported these views [Grant; 1922; 51].

Economic conditions in post-war Germany made the introduction of a eugenic programme highly unlikely. As the USA was to find out in the Depression, outside of the faithful few, eugenics would not be seen as a high priority in a time of economic stress (see pages 186-196). Despite the rise in the urgency of a eugenic programme for many Germans, "the entire work of eugenics" was made "very difficult with us" because of the post-war situation, according to Erwin Baur [CBDP1; Baur to Davenport; 24-xi-1920]. German scientists believed that the war had reduced German science materially and spiritually. The economic situation caused by the war left German science drained for many years and became a 'charity case' to many (literally in the case of Boas' Emergency Society for German and Austrian Science and Art [CBDP1; Boas No.2]). A letter to Karl Pearson from the Berlin Institute for Anthropology, Ethnology and Ancient History stated that "we ourselves will scarcely be in a position anymore to present the scientific world with publications... We have become impoverished" [KPP; 634/6; 29-iii-1920]. Davenport offered to pay reproduction costs of charts for Baur's journal articles [CBDP1; Davenport to Baur; 15-ix-1920].

- Future Wars

Many American eugenicists believed that if White people continued their wars they would effectively be committing suicide and allowing other races dominate, especially as modern warfare killed the eugenically fit. This view was particularly strong amongst the racial eugenicists like Madison Grant, who believed that the Civil War in the USA had "shattered the prestige of the white race", but was also
prevalent amongst orthodox eugenicists [Grant; 1922; xxxi]. When Grant published his work *The Passing Of The Great Race* in 1922, Henry Fairfield Osborn wrote in the preface "war is in the highest sense dysgenic rather than eugenic" [in Grant; 1922; xiii]. In fact the title of the book refers to the slaughter of the Nordic race during the war, which Grant believed to be evenly divided between the two sides, and in effect fighting a civil war [Grant; 1922; 168, 187 & 230]. Huntington and Whitney made the same argument as Hoche and Binding, although they did not come to the same conclusion; "we still pick out the young men who most excell [sic] in body, mind, and spirit, and kill them off in war... we devise all sorts of schemes to safeguard the lives of the less valuable young men who are not fit to be soldiers" [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 128]. This was overwhelmingly the dominant attitude in the USA by the war's end. The anti-war argument used three main claims: that war destroyed the bravest and best, while leaving the weak at home to continue the race; that in the chaos of war and its unpredictability the planning which eugenicists desired could not be achieved; and, that by killing off only males war upset the normal procedures of selection. By 1918 the idea of modern war as dysgenic was unchallenged, and its proponents were drawn from all political and social backgrounds. However, with the war on-going and its results uncertain, nationalist propaganda triumphed over perceived scientific fact, and the war continued. (Writing nearly twenty years after the war had ended Ploetz added a new reason to oppose war. He claimed that Nordics were worst hit by modern war because they were most likely to fight for their beliefs and were therefore most likely to be at the front. Jews on the other hand, were likely to be least affected by war because they were physically smaller and because they were less inclined to fight for ideas or for the survival of the state [ARGB; 29 (1935); 365]). The argument that war killed off the eugenically fittest could be slightly offset by conscription, which it was argued would draw men in from all groups and spread the human cost of war across more eugenic groups. This idea was voiced by Senator Chamberlain, who framed the US's First World War military draft legislation [EugN; III (Feb 1918); 15].

*For a discussion of eugenics and war in the USA and Britain around this time see Paul Crook's 1990 article; "War As Genetic Disaster?" in War and Society.*
In an echo of German concerns Madison Grant's 1916 book *The Passing of the Great Race* coupled together concerns about immigration and the war in the passage "in the present great war while the native Americans [sic] are at the front fighting the aliens and immigrants are allowed to increase without check" [Grant; 1922; 218].

The shadow of the First World War and the perceived eugenic disaster hung over the whole period. In 1923 when the Eugenics Committee of the US was transforming itself into the AES one of the many issues it listed as concerns was the introduction of laws to reduce the number and scale of wars and to institute better international relations [CBDP2; Eugenics Committee of the US]. Thurman Rice saw the situation after World War One in stark terms "in the opinion of many experts, another war like the last will spell the ruin of the white race... we are told that another will be even worse than the last. The white race has its choice from which there is no escape; it must cease its internecine strife or it must perish from the earth" [Rice; 1929; 188-9]. The IFEO unanimously passed a resolution at its 1934 meeting in Zurich. Proposed by Ploetz the resolution referred to "the unrest which assails the peoples of many nations at the threat of another great war... such a war would once more decimate the most virile males of the nations engaged, and would prove disastrous for Western Civilization" i.e. Nordic / Anglo-Saxon culture [CBDP1; IFEO - Meetings; 1934]. A Swedish correspondent with Henry Fairfield Osborn warned that "in reality every war is an immense barbarism, but people still agree that war is a means that may be used by civilized nations. Of course this opinion must be exterminated" [CBDP1; Arrhenius to Henry Osborn; 12-i-1920]. This ambivalence towards war was still in evidence when Frederick Osborn drafted his autobiography in the 1960s. While opposing war as dysgenic, he supported the US's involvement in both wars, arguing that it was justifiable to fight the war in order to save democracy against German dictatorship [FOP; Autobiographical Material].
In the shadow of the Munich agreement and the impending European war the Eugenics Review carried an editorial in 1938 which stated that "to Eugenists war is and must ever be an abomination". It went on to take comfort in the fact "that modern totalitarian war will not discriminate as did previous wars against the younger, the more energetic, the more courageous and enterprising members of society" [EugR; Oct 1938; 163]. In other words, it was eugenically desirable to widen out the killing from soldiers, and to include equally the old, children, civilians, the mentally and physically disabled and dependent groups.

• Eugenicists in the US Army
A number of eugenicists volunteered for service during the USA’s brief involvement in the First World War. Davenport joined the surgeon general’s office and became head of the Section of Anthropology and Eugenics. In this role he was in charge of anthropometric and racial data. He was especially grateful for the chance to study the question of what constituted Black and White amongst recruits of mixed race [CBDP1; Grant No.2]. Most famously Robert Yerkes became a major in the sanitary corps (where Lewis Terman was a captain) and secured permission to give intelligence tests to all new recruits - the “army tests” [CBDP1; Yerkes to Davenport; ca. 1917 & Terman to Davenport; 3-ii-1919].

In the early years of the twentieth century the growing field of intelligence testing became a prominent tool of eugenicists. Intelligence tests would be used to demonstrate that the wealthy Nordic / Anglo-Saxon classes were inherently more intelligent than European immigrants or American Blacks. Such findings were used to justify the economic and social status quo and linked class to eugenic value. In the USA the leading intelligence testers were keen eugenicists and their work was used time and again in eugenic campaigns, especially in the immigration debate. Intelligence or psychometric testing was vital in quantifying numerically the intellectual differences which until then had only been anecdotal for eugenicists. Intelligence tests were important in perpetuating racial myths. In the case of Black inferiority they provided proof of what seemed obvious to many Americans for a long
time. It was on the question of differences within the White race that the tests were most influential. The tests were used by Laughlin, Henry Goddard, Carl Brigham, Grant and the IRL to support their claims that Nordics / Anglo-Saxons were the carriers of high intelligence and hence of superior culture. Numerous books, articles and charts were produced to demonstrate the declining intelligence of immigrants and the inferiority of the Alpine and Mediterranean races [e.g. Brigham; 1923; 159 & 197]. The test results were used into the late 1920s and beyond [e.g. Huntington & Whitney; 1928 & TICE; 1934; Robie; 201].

Mental testing began in France when the government commissioned Alfred Binet to devise a way of testing children for learning difficulties. The test Binet came up with was not designed to measure a fixed inherited intelligence (what Charles Spearman would later call 'g'). In 1908 Henry Goddard introduced the tests to the USA and started using them to classify the feeble-minded. In 1916 Lewis Terman significantly revised the tests and introduced the term IQ. (The Stanford-Binet test devised by Terman is the basis for the Stanford-Binet test used today). According to Daniel Kevles it was at this stage that intelligence testing began to gain widespread acceptance in America.

In 1917 the rising status of intelligence tests was confirmed when the US army agreed to test all new recruits and to assign jobs according to the results. The tests were introduced after a campaign of several years by Robert Yerkes, president of the American Psychological Association*. (The committee he established to oversee the tests included both Terman and Goddard). Although many in the army were suspicious of the tests, over 1.75 million new recruits were given Yerkes' test (alpha or beta) after America's entry into World War One (a further 1.25 million were given other tests) [Kevles; 1968; 573]. Yerkes found that eastern and southern Europeans had a lower intelligence than did Nordics. Blacks, of course, came at the bottom of his table [Yerkes; 1921]. Average White intelligence was just 13.08 years. But within

* See "Testing the Army's Intelligence" by Daniel Kevles or Gould's The Mismeasure of Man (pages 222-262) for the history of the army tests.
this group Russians had an average of 11.34, Italians of 11.01 and Poles of 10.74. Black intelligence came in at 10.41 years - which fitted in with the stereotype of Blacks as childlike. This argument, which had been used for years, further linked together issues of social and racial eugenics in America, with Laughlin and others claiming that programmes of social eugenics such as sterilisation could only work if there were strong curbs on immigration [ER0 Bulletin 10B; ii-1914; 146].

The war was important because it gave Yerkes easy access to large numbers of subjects, who would not need to be paid and who could not refuse the test. Henry Fairfield Osborn went so far as to write that “those tests were worth what the war cost, even in human life, if they served to show clearly to our people the lack of intelligence in our country, and the degrees of intelligence in different races who are coming to us” [quoted in Gould; 1997; 261]. Perhaps more important than the introduction of the tests themselves, and the consequent stunting of many military careers due to the inadequacy of the tests, is the use that the data were later put to. In 1920 Yerkes (with Clarence Yoakum) published Army Mental Tests in which the authors wrote that the tests “are now definitely known, to measure native intellectual ability... the soldiers inborn intelligence and not accidents of environment determines his mental rating” [Yoakum & Yerkes; 1920; 27]. In 1921 Yerkes (with Terman and others) published Psychological Testing In The United States Army, followed in 1923 by Carl Brigham’s A Study of American Intelligence, which was also based on the army IQ data. The results of the tests were used time and again as evidence of the need for a strong eugenic programme. They were cited by Congressional committees and in the House of Representatives. They were used directly in debates on immigration, sterilisation and anti-miscegenation laws, as well as in general eugenic propaganda [see e.g. Stoddard; 1922; 67].

The results of the tests were used to support existing concepts of racial groups, regardless of what other interpretations might have been put on them. When the army tests revealed higher test scores for Blacks in the northern states this might have been taken as evidence of cultural bias and the value of better educational
opportunity. Carl Brigham suggested that it was the eugenically superior and hence more intelligent Blacks who would migrate north in search of better work opportunities. These Blacks he assumed also had a greater amount of White blood, and thus their greater intelligence came from their White ancestry. Similarly the fact that individuals’ scores correlated with the length of time spent in the USA was not seen as evidence that the tests were measuring time spent in the USA or educational opportunity, but was seen to support the idea that the quality of immigrants had declined fast since the late nineteenth century [Brigham; 1923; 110-11 & 190-2]. Thus the tests supported anti-miscegenation laws to protect White abilities and immigration restriction to keep inferior genes out of the USA.

Daniel Kevles claims that the war caused a “dramatic transformation” in attitudes towards intelligence tests [Kevles; 1995; 82]. Although many in the army had initially been extremely wary of psychometricians and their apparent interfering, the tests had been used extensively during the war years. At the war’s end, however, the programme was almost entirely wound down as the army realised the limitations of the tests [Kevles; 1968; 578]. This did not diminish the tests’ status in the eyes of many outside of the army, and did not remove the mass of data accumulated. The army tests were used in a number of ways. The results were frequently cited by policy makers and eugenicists. The army tests were also applied to various groups of people by researchers convinced of their value. They were applied to immigrants at Ellis Island and to people already in the USA, such as in Clifford Kirkpatrick’s work on immigrants in Massachusetts [EugN; XII (Sept 1921); 120]. Thurman Rice wanted to use the tests on immigrants themselves to determine whether or not they would be suitable for the USA [see e.g. Rice; 1929; 309]. Not surprisingly most researchers found that their results accorded with Yerkes’ original army data. Intelligence testing quantified the eugenics ideology and underpinned huge amounts of the debate through the 1920s and into the 1930s. This was exacerbated by the close relations between psychometricians and eugenicists (see pages 66-67, 97-99 and 156-8). Even after psychologists and psychometricians had rejected early intelligence tests including the army tests, less scientifically rigorous eugenicists
(especially amongst orthodox and racial eugenicists) continued to cite them as evidence of the inferiority of Blacks and immigrants.

- American Immigration

An article in Eugenical News in 1920 argued that "the war has created in American a great interest in race and the realization... that America can no longer remain blind to the existence of racial differences" [EugN; V (Sept 1920); 70]. The war heightened concern over immigration issues for many Americans, especially amongst eugenicists.

The war had a direct effect on immigration to the USA. At Ellis Island the rate of arrival from Europe plummeted after August 1914 from 3,000 people a day to 3,000 people a week [JAMA; 30-i-1915; 44]. America’s entry into the war in April 1917 caused another drop in immigration. In July to December 1917 net immigration to the USA was just 4,542 people [EugN; III (June 1918); 45] and in January and February 1918 the USA actually lost people, with a net emigration of 7,862 people [US Immigration Service Bulletin quoted in EugN; III (Aug 1918); 61]. (At this time - 1917 - a literacy test was introduced for European immigrants, which it was hoped would curb immigration and remove some of the more obviously defective migrants). Immigration totals were 325,000 in the fiscal year 1914-5, 300,000 in 1915-6 and 1916-17 and 110,000 in 1917-8 [JofH; 10 (1919); 68]. Many people, including those writing for journals and newspapers welcomed the respite in immigration, but feared equally that it could be the calm before the storm. Elazar Barkan suggests that some people believed that immigration could rise to ten million per year after the war’s end [Barkan; 1991; 97]. In 1915 a JAMA editorial entitled “Immigration Problems of the Future” stated that “Among the... effects of the present European war, the influence exerted on immigration assumes a prominent place... The cessation of the war will see a renewal of the flood of immigrants which will surpass anything heretofore experienced” [JAMA; 30-i-1915; 44].
Restrictionists who were eugenically minded tended to believe that the war would exaggerate further the trend for increases in inferior and degenerate groups when immigration resumed. In this context the war and the subsequent drop in immigration numbers actually gave encouragement to those calling for restrictions on immigration, by using the idea of the fear of the unknown, of what would happen when the war ended. These positions - that the war's end would cause a sharp rise in immigration and a drop in eugenic quality - was held officially by the American Genetic Association, as well as eugenicists and restrictionist groups [JofH; 10 (1919); 68].

• International Eugenics
The war caused schisms through the scientific community, dividing countries into camps based on wartime alliances. Moves towards a more international scientific world were put back as national concerns grew. Kevles argues that "international cooperation in research had been paralyzed for over a decade after Versailles" [Kevles; 1971; 47]. The direct effects of this were felt within eugenics. Kevles argues that during World War One science was reorganised on a political basis into groups based on wartime alliances. For many, especially in France, Belgium and Germany the war caused a move towards isolated camps and a large degree of nationalistic behaviour (based according to some on fear rather than hatred [HSJP2; Davenport to Jennings; 17-iv-1920]). Svante Arrhenius of Sweden recognising the depth of the problems the war would cause wrote that "science will have to suffer very much from the hatred between the nations" [CBDP1; Arrhenius to Henry Osborn; 12-i-1920]. Many eugenicists, however, maintained contacts across the international divisions that had been caused by the war (there is correspondence, for example, between Charles Davenport and various German eugenicists). As a whole the movement had difficulties well into the 1920s, although German eugenicists strengthened some international ties in the immediate post-war years. Ploetz's idea of an international race hygiene movement, which he had all but abandoned in the war was partly

* See for example Daniel Kevles' "Into Hostile Political Camps: The Reorganisation of International Science in World War I".
resurrected when, in 1920, Ploetz and Mjøen began editing the journal *Den Nordske Race* together [EugN; V (Jan 1920); 2]. It was relatively easy for Scandinavians to establish good links with Germany, not just because of geographic and perceived racial affinity, but because the Scandinavian countries had remained neutral during the war.

It sometimes appears that it was French and Belgian demands that kept Germany out of international eugenics, but it is likely that Germany would not have participated in the early post-war years, even if invited to do so. In 1920 Karl Pearson had received a letter from the Berlin Institute for Anthropology, Ethnology and Ancient History expressing the “hope that scientific relations... may once again be established on the old footing” [KPP; 634/6; 29-iii-1920]. Despite this feeling in some quarters, German academics, scientists and eugenicists could be a highly politicised group. In 1914 Karl Pearson referred to how in Germany “the Professor leaves his chair in Berlin and shoulders his musket” [Pearson; 1914; 10]. German scientists, academics and eugenicists were as reluctant as their Belgian and French counterparts to forget wartime animosities. While American scientists (including eugenicists) took a detached view of the war and international politics, Europeans tended to be more nationalistic.

The fractures that the war caused to international science took years to heal, and in eugenics too the effects were lasting (despite Davenport’s assertion that everything would be back to normal by mid-1921 [HSJP2; Davenport to Jennings; 8-v-1920]. Before the war Germany had been integral to the developing international eugenics movement. At the First International Congress of Eugenics in 1912 there had been two German vice-presidents - Ploetz and Max von Gruber, (at the Second International Eugenics Congress no German eugenicists were either invited or attended). When Leonard Darwin was sounding people out for the first congress German feelings had been crucial - the decision being taken “after making further inquiries in Germany, France and America, from which it appeared that good support would be forthcoming” [KPP; 673/6; 17-v-1911]. Ploetz’s internationally
oriented International Society for Race Hygiene (*Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene*) suffered and in 1916 Ploetz gave up his attempt at organising a single eugenics (specifically *Rassenhygiene*) movement. The International Society for Race Hygiene became the German Society for Race Hygiene (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene*) [ARGB; 24 (1930); 3].

Following the war’s end, the ensuing bitterness caused a systematic exclusion of Germany from international eugenics, against American wishes. The committee established to organise the 1921 Second International Congress of Eugenics contained four Americans - Davenport, David Starr-Jordan and representatives of the American Genetics Association and the Journal of Heredity. (Other places were taken up by four Britons and various numbers from France, Belgium, Italy, Norway and Sweden) [WIHM SA/EUG D109]. Charles Davenport was the driving force of the Second International Congress, and wished to use the event to try to bring the movement back together. Davenport, like some other committee members, saw the congress as a chance to heal wounds and at the same time promote eugenics in Europe because “now was the psychological time to bring home to a depleted breeding stock the importance of the laws of genetics to human reproduction” [HSJP2; Davenport to Jennings; 17-iv-1920]. T H Morgan cautioned Davenport that he risked stirring the whole matter up and doing more harm than good, “let the matter lie fallow for a few years” [CBDP1; Morgan to Davenport; 13-x-1919]. Nevertheless, Davenport was keen “to devote some time” to the matter and urged other Americans to do the same [CBDP1; Davenport to Henry Osborn; 8-v-1920 & 9-vi-1920]. The American organising committee was of the “unanimous opinion that invitations should be sent out generally, not omitting the enemy countries” [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 10-x-1919]. Davenport cabled a meeting of the international committee specifically to say that he desired “no national restriction”, but this was where problems began [WIHM SA/EUG D109; 18-x-1919]. French and Belgian delegates wanted all the former enemies excluded, but in the end a compromise was reached, resulting in the decision “that the issue of invitations to any of the countries that have been at war with the Allies should not be considered unless or
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until such countries have joined the League of Nations" [WIHM SA/EUG D109; 18-x-1919]. The result was that Austria and Hungary were invited and "the only nation whose institutions have not been invited to send delegates is Germany. I understand that the chance of their sending delegates in any case would be small" [HSJP2; Davenport to Jennings; 27-vi-1921]. Letters from Leonard Darwin reveal that it was specifically France and Belgium that caused problems over German participation. Leonard Darwin concurred with Davenport's view believing that "the longer we put the event off [German participation], the more difficult it will become" [WIHM SA/EUG E11; n.d. & 13-xii-1921].

While Davenport was organising the congress, some more conventional scientists like Herbert Spencer Jennings stayed away, telling Davenport that "I am reluctant to take part in organising an international Scientific Congress that excludes men on the grounds that are other than scientific" [HSJP2; Jennings to Davenport; 14-iv-1920]. Jennings seems to have made this point to a number of people, including Henry Fairfield Osborn and Clarence C Little. Little responded with the argument that the League of Nations was considered international "and yet several important nations are absent from its list of members" [HSJP2; Little to Jennings; 37[sic]-vii-1921]. The narrowness of eugenicists' thinking on ethnic matters is illustrated by the fact that while there was concern on all sides of the argument about the legitimacy of calling a congress international if Germany were absent, there was no concern about excluding the entire non-White world. The international committee felt that it was an issue that should be left to the American organising committee [WIHM SA/EUG D109; 18-x-1919]. It is not apparent what decision was taken in the technical sense, but at the second and third congresses delegates were from the Americas, Europe and Australasia. Likewise, when the Indian Eugenics Society joined the IFEO [Adams; 1990], it was made up of Britons and other Europeans in India like Cecil Dover, rather than local populations.

* On the question of German participation see also the letters between Jennings and Davenport at CBDP1; Jennings No.3.
The Second International Congress established an International Commission to organise congresses and deal with international matters (this became the IFEO in July 1925 [EugN; X (Sept 1925); 117]). Although Jon Alfred Mjøen of Norway argued for Germany’s inclusion the commission again excluded her along with Austria (and USSR). The commission reflected the wartime alliance. Its membership included Britain, the USA, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. (the other members were Czechoslovakia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and five Latin American countries) [WIHM SA/EUG E11; 27-ix-1921]. In October 1922 in Brussels the International Eugenics Commission voted unanimously to accept members “from all nations”, including Germany [TICE; 1934; Laughlin; 5].

The Brussels decision to include Germany in international eugenics came as a temporary relief to Davenport and other internationalists. The French and Belgian invasion of the Ruhr in 1923, the stationing of Black soldiers on German land and the economic crisis ignited the whole question of relations between these countries and made it touch and go whether Germany would rejoin the community or not. Davenport tried to enlist the help of Baur and Lenz to try to dissuade German eugenicists from refusing to sit with French and Belgian delegates [CBDP1; Davenport to Baur; 30-iii-1923]. Davenport contacted Fritz Lenz to express his hope that the Ruhr crisis would "be soon corrected and that it may be possible for German eugenicists and French eugenicists to meet in the same room, - as eugenicists primarily and not as Germans and Frenchmen" [CBDP1; Davenport to Lenz; 15-vii-1923]. Lenz’s answer did not sound promising. He informed Davenport that Otto Krohne of the Society for Race Hygiene was still undecided about such work and that French and Belgian actions had made co-operation impossible [CBDP1; Lenz to Davenport; 8-viii-1923]. On the subject of the never-to-be 1924 Prague Third International Congress of Eugenics, Lenz had apparently told Mjøen that “now is not the time for international congresses” [CBDP; Davenport to Lenz; 15-vii-1923]. In 1924, however, Germany’s Society for Race Hygiene agreed to send two delegates (Ploetz and Krohne) to the next international meeting, on condition that German be an official language and that the meeting not be held in Paris or Brussels [ARGB; 16 (1924); 458]. As late as 1926 Davenport wrote once more to Lenz to point out that
Although Germany had two official delegates to the new IFEO, "these members have actually not attended" any meetings. Davenport expressed the hope that they would attend the 1927 Amsterdam meeting [CBDP1; Davenport to Lenz; 8-x-1926].

At the New York Third International Eugenics Congress in 1932 both Austria and Germany were invited as normal delegations. This was some fourteen years after the war had ended, and by that time economic conditions were such that German participation was almost non-existent (see pages 216-222). Germany's formal re-integration in international eugenics came as France's importance declined considerably. This may in part have motivated Davenport in his attempts to bring Germany into the international movement. As early as 1921 Davenport expressed his annoyance at French inactivity in eugenics to Henry Fairfield Osborn [CBDP1; Davenport to Henry Osborn; 10-ii-1921] and in 1928 Aleš Hrdlicka said that France was "out of the running" as a potential centre for anthropometric work [KPP; Hrdlicka to Pearson; 20-ix-1928]. (Belgium had never been that significant a player anyway. Belgium's leading eugenicist Albert Govaerts and France's Lucien March both remained prominent in the international movement. Govaerts was influential in international moves to link eugenics and birth control).
(iii) EUGENIC POLICY

Before the main analysis of the American eugenics movement in the next chapter, it is necessary to provide some background information regarding eugenics policy in the USA and as relevant, policy in Germany over the same period. This section does not pretend to be a comprehensive description of eugenics policy in the USA either in terms of perceived problems or proposed solutions. Instead I have chosen several areas, which need examining in order to further understanding of issues and events described in subsequent sections. (There will be more information in the relevant sections as it is necessary). This chapter offers background to issues that are discussed elsewhere in this dissertation. The policies described here were generally more strongly promoted by the orthodox and racial wings of the movement. The move away from these policies and debates between reform eugenicists and racial and orthodox eugenicists are covered in chapter 3.

The policy areas to be discussed are: race mixing, sterilisation (and segregation), immigration restriction and euthanasia & genocide. This is not an extensive list of policies or of groups targeted. There were many groups who were of concern to eugenicists who will not be covered in these sections, some of whom (like the non-institutionalised disabled, alcoholics and prostitutes) have received little attention in histories of eugenics generally. Also I have not chosen to discuss any specific ethnic groups except as they come up in relation to particular issues like race crossing and immigration. I have chosen to examine euthanasia and genocide as they provide an important divide in international eugenics, and one which merits some further discussion.

• Race Crossing
Race crossing is perhaps the theoretical issue which best illustrates the move in eugenics (and genetics) from an orthodox and racial position to a reform position. It was essentially a move from condemning race crossing between divergent races
(such as Black and White), to one of not seeing it as biologically detrimental (although it was often still condemned on social and cultural grounds, such as by Raymond Pearl and W E Castle). William Provine characterises the shifts in scientific views of race crossing as firstly from condemnation to agnosticism in the 1930s and then from agnosticism to the belief that crosses were harmless, during and after World War Two [Provine; 1973; 796]. It is important to make some general distinctions about race crossing. Crosses between similar races were universally supported in eugenics. In the American context this applies especially to what were called ‘old American’ or ‘native’ stocks - Germans, Scandinavians, Dutch, British and so on (i.e. Anglo-Saxon / Nordic). The second type of cross that was widely discussed was that of inter-White crosses, such as Nordics / Anglo-Saxons with Jews, Slavs or Mediterraneans, the biological consequences of which divided the orthodox and racial groups. Finally, the issue of Black-White crossing was one of division between orthodox and racial eugenicists on the one hand and reformers on the other. Much of the change regarding race crossing was in its removal from the arena of scientific concern. As race came to be seen as a non-scientific category, so the question of race crossing came to be seen as one of social rather than scientific concern.

There was a universal assumption, in all countries that Jews and Blacks (excluding Australian Aborigines) formed distinct racial categories, which unlike the White race did not divide into further racial groups. Black people and Jews were Black people and Jews regardless of origin, citizenship, or current location - so they could never be American, German or British. Yerkes’ army tests used these classifications as did all immigration debates. Those outside of eugenics made the same assumption. One study referred to various groups including those born in the USA, Ireland, Germany and so on, but then remarked that “the negroes and the Jews form separate groups without regard, however, to country of birth or length of time in the USA” [JAMA; 01-vii-1911; 9]. (These assumptions about the genetic similarity of Black people and Jewish people contrasts with knowledge today that Black Africans contain more genetic diversity than the rest of the world put together and that Jewish
people share more genes with the populations amongst whom they live than they do with each other).

Although pointed out elsewhere in this dissertation, it is worth reiterating that the underlying belief (as with all areas of eugenic concern) was that inherited, genetically determined differences existed between different groups of individuals. In this case those differences encompassed physical, intellectual, moral and sexual differences - all of genetic origin. Madison Grant offers a concise summary of the view dominant among racial and orthodox eugenicists and the Rassenhygiene wing in Germany through most of this period. (It was modified by Germany’s Eugenik wing and more decisively by the reform eugenicists). Grant wrote that:

races vary intellectually and morally, just as they do physically. Moral, intellectual and spiritual attributes are as persistent as physical characters and are transmitted substantially unchanged from generation to generation. These moral and physical characters are not limited to one race but given traits do occur with more frequency in one race than in another. Each race differs in the relative proportion of what we may term good and bad strains.

[Grant; 1922; 226]

From here it was a small step to creating a fixed racial hierarchy. Most racial and orthodox eugenicists made this jump and the whole debate surrounding race crossing until the 1930s reflects the acceptance of these hierarchies. The standard hierarchy would run: Nordics and Anglo-Saxons; Mediterraneans, Slavs and Jews; Asians; Native Americans; Blacks; Australian Aborigines. Jews could be placed anywhere on this hierarchy, but they were generally placed alongside Slavs and other non-Nordic Europeans.

As in so many areas of eugenics, claims about race crossing were usually made with little evidence, and through the period very little work was carried out in this area. Calls for serious studies of the issue were made by Boas, Pearl, Hrdlicka and others. Claims were based instead on speculation, observation, and prejudice. William Provine names Davenport’s 1917 article “The Effects of Race Intermingling” as the first work to deal extensively with the issue of race crossing. Using an
agricultural analogy, rather than scientific research, he argued that each race had its own strengths and weaknesses which were adapted to local conditions. Crossing was therefore bad and the more different the races, the more dangerous the result [Provine; 1973; 791]. Davenport argued in 1918 that “miscegenation commonly spells disharmony - disharmony of physical, mental and temperamental qualities... A hybridized people are a badly put together people and a dissatisfied, restless, ineffective people” [Davenport in: EugN; III (Feb 1918); 14]. Anti-race mixing propaganda generally rested on two arguments. Firstly that it caused disharmony, so that parts of the offspring were incompatible, such as long legs and short arms or intellectual drive and low intelligence. Ellsworth Huntington and Leon Whitney suggested that it might lead to “a white man's ambition in a black man's lethargic body” [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 81]. Secondly there was the idea that the offspring would be somewhere between the abilities of the parents, thus lowering the standard for superior elements. Davenport’s opinions became the standard for orthodox eugenicists. But the question remained as to what constituted miscegenation or widely divergent races. For some orthodox and racial eugenicists it meant Black and White but not, say Slav and Nordic. For others it meant anything outside of the Nordic / Anglo-Saxon group. On top of all this it was generally agreed that such racial mixtures were entered into by the less eugenically desirable members of the white race anyway. This view was expressed by figures such as Castle and W A Plecker [Castle in JofH; 15 (1924); 367 & CBDP1; Grant No.4; 3-iv-1924].

There was universal agreement that Anglo-Saxon and Nordic groups could be crossed without any dangers. With the old type of eugenically fit British, German, Swedish and Dutch immigrant, according to Thurman Rice “it was an easy matter to fuse these peoples biologically”. [Rice; 1929; 301]. This was a widely held view repeated in many works, like Konrad Bercovici's On New Shores [reviewed in EugN; XI (Feb 1926); 26]. To those who wanted to believe it, the evidence pointed to the truth of this belief. In his 1925 book Old Americans, Aleš Hrdlicka argued that the older generations of north European immigrants were evolving, through 'race
amalgamation' into a single new American biological type [Hrdlicka; 1925]. Davenport held up the Roosevelt family as a "brilliant example" of this new and better mixture [TICE; 1934; Davenport; 22].

Racial eugenicists took a narrow view of what the definition of radically different races was. Madison Grant believed that crossing Nordics with other European races would lead to "mongrels" and offspring in which the inferior race would always predominate. Furthermore, such racial mongrels always had "unstable brains" [Grant; 1922; xxix]. Thurman Rice went along with this, arguing that the modern melting pot, with its huge variety of low quality people, made it impossible to create "a desirable national type" [Rice; 1929; 301]. While there was debate about whether intra-White crosses were disharmonious, it was generally agreed (based on intelligence test work) that such crossing would lower the intellectual capabilities of the superior racial elements. Madison Grant believed that with a greater understanding of race a time would come when "to bring half-breeds into the world will be regarded as a social and racial crime of the first magnitude. The laws against miscegenation must be greatly extended" - to cover intra-White and Jewish-White marriages [Grant; 1922; 60]. If the 'Melting Pot' were allowed to "boil without control", Grant saw the USA heading into a "racial abyss". He believed that New York in particular would produce "amazing racial hybrids and some ethnic horrors" [Grant; 1922; 92 & 263]. (Despite all this Grant believed that "much of the greatness of the English people" was due to the unique mixture of Nordic and Mediterranean races [Grant; 1922; 137]). This kind of thinking on racial issues fed easily into debates surrounding immigration.

The dangers of race-crossing for many racial and orthodox eugenicists were supported by crude interpretations of Mendelian genetics. Thurman Rice suggested that America's racial imbalance was caused by 'hybridization' with Slavs, whose traits were all dominant, while north Europeans had recessive traits. This meant that any amount of mixing would lead to Slav traits wiping out Nordic ones [Rice; 1929; 299 & 302]. Madison Grant believed in the recessive nature of White (non-Jewish)
characteristics in general: “the cross between a white man and a Negro is a Negro... and the cross between any of the three European races and a Jew is a Jew” [Grant; 1922; 18]. Davenport believed the opposite to be true regarding Jewish and non-Jewish crosses. He wrote that “in general the Jewish features are recessive to the non-Jewish” [quoted in Kevles; 1995; 75]. In the issue of race crossing the further up the perceived racial ladder one went, the greater the degree of protection that was needed.

The issue of intra-White cross breeding received more attention from orthodox and racial eugenicists, than that of Black-White crosses because for most of the period the latter issue was settled and then was seen as falling largely outside the scope of reform eugenics. The greater dangers of Black-White crosses were illustrated by claims made by Carl Brigham. In 1923 he claimed that the USA “must face a possibility of racial admixture here that is infinitely worse than that faced by any European country today, for we are incorporating the negro into our racial stock, while all of Europe is comparatively free from this taint” He also wrote that “American intelligence is declining, and will proceed with an accelerating rate as the racial mixture becomes more and more extensive. The decline of American intelligence will be more rapid than the decline in the intelligence of European national groups, owing to the presence here of the negro” [Brigham; 1923; 208-10].

While racial eugenicists such as Madison Grant believed that all Black-White crosses should be counted as Black, no matter what proportion of Black ancestry there was, orthodox eugenicists like Davenport took an apparently more relaxed approach. In explaining to Grant the reason for this belief, Davenport revealed the premise he worked from - that Black people were incapable of valid contributions to society. “I have far greater difficulty in thinking of the white, straight haired, emotionally controlled offspring of two such hybrids, capable of doing satisfactory college work as a negro” [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 1-vii-1914]. This was a circular argument, which was used by numerous eugenicists - Because all traits of Black people were bad, any Black person who achieved anything worthwhile must
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have some White ancestry. This denied any achievement by Black people. It was echoed too in Paul Popenee and Roswell Johnson’s influential book *Applied Eugenics*, when they argued that “the ability of a colored man is proportionate to the amount of white blood he has” [quoted in Ludmerer; 1969; 350]. In the same year *Eugenical News* claimed that “eminence in the colored race is achieved not by pure-blooded negroes but by mulattos; and the achievement is usually really the capacity of their “white blood”” [EugN; IV (Feb 1919); 11]. The view continued with Huntington and Whitney who, having established Black inferiority through the army tests, suggested “that almost the only Negroes who have accomplished much of importance have been partly white” [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 81].

Racial and orthodox positions on the race crossing issue never developed with advances in genetic knowledge, understanding of the environment and so on. Charles Davenport and Morris Steggardra wrote *Race Crossing in Jamaica* which concluded that the offspring of Black-White marriages were inferior to both the original parents. It continued to promote the idea that mixing was genetically unhealthy and produced disharmonious offspring. Meanwhile the rest of the debate had moved on to a more sophisticated understanding of the issues. The often quoted claim that some crosses had “the long legs of the Negro and the short arms of the white, which would put them at a disadvantage in picking up things off the ground” were looking ridiculous by 1930 [quoted in Provine; 1973; 793]. Elazar Barkan suggests that Davenport and Steggardra’s 1929 book *Race Crossing in Jamaica* received a “chilly reception… and elicited little enthusiasm” [Barkan; 1991; 106]. The book was widely criticised by W E Castle and others, who had formerly agreed with much of Davenport’s work. The book was written from the traditional orthodox and racial eugenics point of view, and the original research was funded by Wickliffe Draper, who went on to establish the Pioneer Fund [EugN; XIII (Feb 1928); 21].

Several policies were proposed to cope with the dangers of race crossing. For Black-White crosses segregationist policies were favoured resting mainly on anti-
miscegenation laws, which by the 1932 Third International Congress of Eugenics were in force in over half the states of the USA. The bias of the law-makers and the legislation they enacted is evident from the way in which they categorised people. The laws were framed by White legislatures to protect the ‘blood’ and culture of White people. Laws set levels of Black ancestry meaning that somebody should be counted as Black if they had a quarter, eighth or sixteenth Black ancestry. If these people, with more than 50% White ancestry, could not be counted as White, then they surely should not have been counted as Black either. In 1924 just before the destruction of scientific arguments against race crossing began, Virginia passed the strictest anti-miscegenation law, which classified as Black anyone “with any ascertainable degree of negro blood, other non-white races being included in the same class”. The law was quickly followed by similar ones in Georgia and Alabama [TICE; 1934; Plecker; 107]. The object of the laws was to shunt people of mixed ethnicity outside of the White group. Once outside of that group anyone with any Black blood could be lumped together. With regard to the question of intra-White crosses immigration restriction was the preferred option, because such large numbers were still arriving. Disharmony was seen as the primary issue regarding Black-White crosses, while ‘lowering the average’ was the main issue regarding intra-White crosses. These were key planks of the racial and orthodox programmes, but largely disappeared under reform eugenics.

The idea of the existence of numerous races declined considerably in the USA in the interwar period, leading to the erosion of the concepts of Nordic, Slav, Mediterranean races as discrete biological groupings. The concept of pure races, based on Black, White and so on did not decline, but it is important to draw a distinction between the belief in the existence of these races and the belief in the importance of them. Reform eugenicists and others continued to believe in the idea of the pure ‘great’ races, although they saw the inherent differences between them as far less than did their racial and orthodox predecessors. In the mid-1920s work in genetics, anthropology and biology demonstrated the error of opposing race crossing on biological grounds. This work included that of L C Dunn, Melville
Herskovits and W E Castle. E A Hooton presented these ideas to the largely racial
eugenic Galton Society [EugN; X (Dec 1925); 162]. Castle, like Pearl, Haldane and
others, still approved of anti-miscegenation laws on social grounds and continued to
believe that Blacks had lower IQs than Whites [JofH; 15 (1924); 366]. In the mid and
late 1920s significant steps were taken though, in removing scientific objections to
race crossing, even between widely diverse races, and in this area the isolation of
orthodox and racial eugenicists began. In 1924 Castle declared that “so far as a
biologist can see, human race problems are not biological problems any more than
rabbit crosses are social problems” [JofH; 15 (1924); 368]. In the programme of the
reform eugenicists racial issues were downplayed and race crossing fell outside of
the programme for most reformers, as it was no longer a scientific concern.

Franz Boas and others had regularly called for proper scientific investigations of this
issue. Raymond Pearl, who at the time broadly supported the orthodox programme,
was calling for a full study of Black- White race crossing as early as 1908 [Pearl;
1908; 9824]. Progress in this area was exceptionally slow. In 1926 Aleš Hrdlicka
wrote that “there is but little real scientific work of this nature” [CBDP1; Committee
On A Study Of The American Negro]. Clarence Campbell used a 1928 ERA paper
to urge research on all types of miscegenation [CBDP2; ERA Committee on Policy
and Research 1928-9 No.1]. A year later Charles Davenport and Eugen Fischer
could only name five significant studies in the field (including their own) [CBDP1;
Davenport to Fischer; 28-i-1932]. It was at the end of the 1920s that the IFEO
organised a full eugenical study of race-crossing (to look at issues like Black-White
crossing and Jewish-non-Jewish crossing, rather than intra-White crosses). The
choice of Davenport and Fischer to organise the IFEO investigation demonstrates
that eugenicists hoped the investigation would show miscegenation to be dysgenic
and disharmonious, and suggests something of the assumptions that the committee
would be working from [CBDP1; Davenport to Fischer; 2-xii-1929] (for example, the
view that “racial antipathy is instinctive and eugenical” [EugN; IV (July 1919); 54]).
Both men had published previously on the dangers of Black-White crosses, and
neither had significantly changed his views. By the time that the IFEO established
this investigation, racial and orthodox views were losing ground fast in the USA and many conventional scientists were suggesting that race crossing was not harmful, or at least that there was no evidence either way.

Race crossing had been a concern to Germans from long before the 1933. In 1908 the German Reichstag had outlawed Black-White marriages in South West Africa, declaring all previous such marriages to be void. In 1913 Eugen Fischer wrote a study of the offspring of Black-White marriages in the same area - who he called the Rehobother Bastards. The standard genetics text in Germany up to 1945 - the Baur-Fischer-Lenz book - which was first published after World War One, condemned race crossing, including that of Jews and non-Jews [Baur-Fischer-Lenz; 1931; 639]. By the mid-1930s the Rassenhygiene wing was still condemning 'disharmonious cross-breeds' [e.g. ARGB; 28 (1934) 228-33].

Hitler went along with these ideas of race-crossing and saw it as a vital issue in Germany's struggle for supremacy.

German nationality, unfortunately, is no longer based on a unified racial nucleus... the poisonings of the blood which have befallen our people... have led not only to a decomposition of our blood, but also of our soul. The open borders of our fatherland, the association with un-German foreign bodies along these frontier districts, but above all the strong and continuous influx of foreign blood into the interior of the Reich itself, due to its continuous renewal leaves no time for an absolute blending... If the German people in its historic development had possessed that herd unity which other peoples enjoyed, the German Reich today would doubtless be mistress of the globe. [Hitler; 1992; 360]

The chapter goes on to condemn all racial cross-breeds and supports the idea of German / Nordic purity - "every racial crossing leads inevitably sooner or later to the decline of the hybrid product" [Hitler; 1992; 364]. Prevention of race crosses was central to Hitler's belief system. Hans F K Günther who was part of the generation of Rassenhygiene scientists who worked under Nazism agreed about the need to return to pure races. He wrote that "the Nordic ideal becomes for us an idea of unity... the question put to us is whether we have the courage to make ready for
future generations a world cleansing itself racially and eugenically” [Günther in Stoddard; 1940; 189].

Under Nazism there was no uniform policy regarding race crossing. While it was illegal at least from 1935, there were already millions of people with mixed ancestry. But while with the Jewish question it was full Jews who suffered more and it seems likely that the regime was preparing a mass sterilisation programme for those of mixed Jewish-non-Jewish parents, with the Gypsy population it was the other way around. It was those with some Gypsy blood who were seen as most dangerous, while to some extent ‘pure’ Gypsies were seen as a less pressing concern [Noakes; 1985; 17]. With mixed Slav-Germans many were deemed to be suitable for ayranisation and were thus given the same status as other Germans [directives at Noakes & Pridham; 1991c; 946]. Mixed Black-White children (*Rheinlandbastarde*) were sterilised early in the Nazi years. As noted in the introduction the question of miscegenation was seen as a more pressing concern in the USA in the 1920s and then in Germany in the 1930s and reflects part of the general reversal of trends in eugenics in the two countries.

- Immigration Restriction

The immigration issue, in the USA in the early years of the twentieth century, was essentially about questions of European immigration. This was because Europeans formed by far the largest group of immigrants and because of the shifting patterns in immigration away from northern and western Europe and towards southern and eastern Europe. One study at the time estimated that 95% of immigration since 1819 had been from Europe [EugN; XV (Oct 1930); 146]. Eugenicists and others enlarged on the myths of the early USA as being racially pure and the immigration process as having been eugenically highly selective. They saw a ‘golden age’ in the early years of the USA, of small towns and an Anglo-Saxon Protestant majority. This contrasted with the ‘Melting Pot’, counter-selectivity and dysgenic selection of the USA in the early twentieth century [Grant; 1922; 83]. The industrial boom of the century’s early years, improved communications and changes in production
techniques led to a new round of rapid urbanisation and a corresponding rise in some social problems. America had grown rapidly due to immigration during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The total population of the USA in 1920 was 105,710,620, of whom 94,120,374 were White - up from 66,809,196 just 20 years before. Of the White population approximately 14% were born outside of the USA [Figures from Hall; 1934; 2 & 14]. Madison Grant argued that "while he is being elbowed out of his own home the American looks calmly abroad and urges on others the suicidal ethics which are exterminating his own race" [Grant; 1922; 91].

The old Anglo-Saxon / Nordic elite feared losing its position. This belief was incorporated into eugenic thinking, as many eugenicists formed part of this elite. Henry Fairfield Osborn, who supported restriction, warned of "the gradual dying out among our people of those hereditary traits through which the principle of our religious, political and social foundations were laid down... the Anglo-Saxon branch of the Nordic race is again showing itself to be that upon which the nation must chiefly depend for leadership, for courage, for loyalty, for unity and harmony of action" [in Grant; 1922; ix-xi].

Asian immigration to the USA had been largely ended by the early twentieth century. In 1882 and 1902 the Chinese Exclusion Acts were passed, and in 1907-8 the Gentlemen's Agreement between Japan and the USA came into force. Immigration restriction was not a serious concern in the context of Black people as such small numbers were entering the country anyway. In 1930 there were just 98,620 foreign born Blacks (or 0.83% of the total Black population) [Hall; 1934; 21]. Davenport still cautioned on the "undesirability of admitting thousands of alien negroes from any source" [CBDP1; Davenport to Albert Johnson; 24-xii-1923]. In 1907 Theodore Roosevelt had set up a commission to look into European immigration. The bias of the committee is evident from the choice for the chair - Professor Jeremiah Jenks - a Nordic supremacist and employee of the IRL. Legislation for written tests had been passed by Congress on three occasions, each time being vetoed by the President - Cleveland in 1897, Taft in 1913 and Wilson in 1915 [Chase; 1980; 113].
On the last occasion Congress amassed enough votes to overturn the veto and the test was introduced, to some extent curtailing immigration. In 1921 a temporary immigration law was brought in which restricted European immigration. The debate surrounding the 1924 law was the time when eugenicists were at their most influential and respected.

In the first decades of the century the Immigration Restriction League was a strong force. The IRL was founded in 1894 by Prescott Hall, Robert DeCourcy Ward and Charles Warren and reached its high-point in the campaign leading to the 1924 Immigration Act. Its leadership were highly sympathetic to eugenics and there was extensive co-operation and friendship between the leadership of the IRL and eugenicists like Davenport and Grant. Eugenists and the IRL met and exchanged ideas through the Galton Society, the ERO and the early AES. The IRL leadership undoubtedly saw their work as part of a racial eugenics programme. Prescott Hall saw the use of immigration controls in the USA as "a unique opportunity to exercise artificial selection on an enormous scale" [quoted in Chase; 1980; 142]. As noted in the introduction eugenicists worked for the IRL and members of the IRL served on eugenics committees.

The change in European immigration was broadly from north and west Europe to south and east. The change had happened over the last decades of the nineteenth century. In its inquiries into European immigration the Congressional Committee on Immigration and Naturalization published statistics which demonstrated the new immigration pattern. Where once the biggest groups of immigrants had been British, German, Scandinavian and Irish, between 1899 and 1920 the three biggest groups to arrive were south Italians (2,898,499), ‘Hebrews’ (mainly from eastern Europe and Russia) (1,565,607) and Poles (1,423,209). Next on the list were Germany (1,100,058) and England, including Canada (828,140). The rest of the top ten countries included such eugenically undesirable groups as Slovaks, north Italians and Croats. The Swedes and Dutch were no longer in the top ten immigrant groups [figures from committee documents reprinted in Chase; 1980; 295]. German
migration had represented 35% of the total in 1860, but by 1910 they were just 3% of total immigration [Campbell; 1971; 37]. These changes also meant a change in attitude, because as noted in the section on race crossing, it reflected a change from groups who were biologically easily assimilated to groups who were not. Furthermore, immigrants tended to be poor and remain in the big urban centres, which were widely condemned as causing racial degeneration through overcrowding, crime, alcoholism and sexual immorality. The outbreak of war in 1914 led many to argue that when immigration began again after the war, it would be from even lower quality groups.

It became a widely accepted view that the eugenic quality of immigrants was declining, even from countries such as Britain and Germany. This had been suggested in a report of the Commissioner General of Immigration [cited at JofH; 10 (1919); 69]. The original immigrants, so the theory went, were of strong, eugenically valuable, pioneering stock. Over time as travel to the USA became easier and conditions on arrival less harsh people migrated to the USA for the wrong reasons - to escape the military draft, to escape the law or for economic reasons. Even those who were escaping persecution were attacked. While persecution had supposedly meant that the early immigrants were morally strong, intelligent and inventive, later immigrants were seen as being "lowly refugees from 'persecution' and other social discards" [Grant; 1922; 74]. Robert Yerkes' army tests appeared to prove the decline in eugenic value of north and west European immigrants. Individuals' scores correlated with the length of time spent in the USA and this was used to show that the quality of immigrants had declined fast since the late nineteenth century [Brigham; 1923; 110-11]. Harry Laughlin made this point to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

These beliefs were supplemented with the idea of 'dumping', where European countries were accused of encouraging the eugenically unfit - the poor, criminals, revolutionaries - to go to the USA. This was not only true of southern and eastern European countries, but also of Britain, Scandinavia and Germany [Grant; 1922; 89
& Whitney; 1935; 67]. The accusation seems to have been most often levelled at Germany. Davenport amongst others asserted that “state immigration officials located in New York told me before the war that they had discovered excellent evidence that European governments, and especially Germany, were exiling certain of their convicts to America” [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 27-xi-1920]. Belief that Europeans were dumping unwanted populations was enhanced by protests, such as that from the Italian government against immigration restriction [Finkelstein; 1988; 38-55]. When the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization sent Laughlin to Italy, Mussolini (who took a strong interest in eugenic matters) is alleged to have told him that Italy would never let its eugenically best population emigrate [LWA; 198]. This would have been an indirect admission that Italy was using immigration to rid itself of the eugenically undesirable. In 1928 Huntington and Whitney described recent immigrants as “misfits... weeds! Men out of place; millions of them” and continued, “there are records which show that almost every European nation has at some time more or less consciously dumped inmates from jails and almshouses upon our shores” [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 75].

Views varied according to which country was discussing the issue. While in the USA immigrants were generally believed to be of an inferior standard to the typical American or previous German immigrant [Rice; 1929; 299], there was concern in Germany at the supposed loss of so many of the best citizens each year, a belief reiterated by Marie Kopp after a visit to Germany [Kopp; 1936; 762].

Racial and social dimensions of eugenics were conflated into one argument, which was used extensively in immigration debates. A connection had been established that degeneracy and especially mental illness were imported through immigration. Since the founding of American eugenics, eugenicists had seen immigration as a major source of mental health problems. In 1908 Alexander Graham Bell argued that the problem of defectives was compounded by immigration and that numbers of defectives could be cut if Congress established a system “controlled by suitable immigration laws tending to eliminate undesirable ethnical elements” [Bell; 1908;
In a 1917 article Henry Goddard had claimed that a large proportion of Jews (83%), Russians (87%) and Italians (79%) were feeble-minded - and hence susceptible to a host of other social problems from alcoholism to crime to pauperism. Furthermore that inferiority, so he believed, was inherited in exactly the same way as hair or eye colour [Goddard; 1917; 243-77]. Madison Grant believed that in the USA ethnicity and class were strongly correlated: "racial lines... correspond closely with the divisions of social clevage [sic]" [Grant; 1922; xix]. For eugenicists the issue was a eugenically fit north and west European stock in the USA trying to protect itself against a eugenically inferior and incompatible south and east European stock which contained large numbers of defectives.

As early as 1912 we find the link between ethnicity and the unfit entering the mainstream. In August 1912 the Journal of the American Medical Association contained an editorial on insanity stating: “the chief contributing factor to this increase is the immigrant population... It is a question of Eugenics" [JAMA; 17-viii-1912]. By World War One eugenicists and others had put biology at the centre of the immigration issue. From 1912 to 1914 the JAMA carried a number of articles espousing the view that immigrants were of a lower genetic quality than previous generations and were more susceptible to mental illness and vices like alcoholism than native born Americans. The declared answer was to slash immigration and increase resources for screening and testing new arrivals. An article in the JAMA in 1914 claimed that 44.5% of those in Philadelphia’s mental institutes were foreign born, and that to prevent insanity in the USA immigration should be cut [JAMA; 03-i-1914; 26]. Mainstream support for elements of eugenic ideology translated into concrete support with, for example, the American Genetics Association supporting strongly the proposed immigration controls [JofH; 10 (1919); 68-70].

The tendency to link social and racial eugenics was much greater in American than German eugenics. In the USA there was a largely common origin of eugenicists so those with social and racial concerns sprang from a common background. Peter Weingart suggests that in Germany, by contrast, the social dimension was
represented in eugenics by physicians, while the racial dimension came from physical anthropologists [Weingart; 1995; 204]. The separation of racial and social eugenics in terms of personnel, may in part explain their ideological separation. Nazism subsequently combined the two strands and promoted them equally.

Similarly in the USA all non-racially defined dysgenic elements were linked together. These groups included the feeble-minded, the mentally and physically disabled, the morally degenerate (e.g. prostitutes and the promiscuous), alcoholics and criminals. Orthodox eugenicists believed that displaying one of these characteristics meant not just that a person carried the genes (or germ-plasm) for that trait, but that the person had a general genetic weakness and that other degenerate traits would be found throughout the individual and their family. The most common vehicle for promoting this view was the family study, in which a degenerate person would be found at some point in a family's history, and it would then be demonstrated that the descendants of that person displayed a disproportionately large amount of degenerate characteristics. Family studies began in the 1870s with Richard Dugdale's *The Jukes: A Study in Crime, Pauperism and Heredity*, and new studies mostly died out in the 1920s. In the intervening period a number were published and all were widely read and cited. Amongst the most significant studies were Henry Goddard's *The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness* (1912), a study of the "Zero" family by Gertrude Davenport, a study of the "Nats" and the "Nams" by Gertrude's husband Charles Davenport and the Reverend McCulloch's study of the "Tribe of Ishmael". The work by Goddard was typical in that it traced the descendants of a soldier from the War of Independence, who had two lines of descent - one with his wife and one from an affair with a feeble minded woman. The descendants from his family life were found to contain signatories of the Declaration of Independence, founders of Princeton University and only three degenerates. The line descended from his affair with the feeble-minded woman contained 143 mentally retarded people, 33 sexually immoral persons, 24 alcoholics, 36 illegitimate children, 3 criminals, 8 keepers of "houses of ill fame" and 3 epileptics [Goddard; 1912]. This work and the others mentioned contributed to the
linking of various forms of degeneracy in the minds of eugenicists, the public and politicians. (Nicole Rafter identifies a number studies which carry an ethnic dimension. She lists references to darkness of skin, Black ancestry and so on in the studies of the Ishmaels, the Smoky Pilgrims, the Hickory's, the Pineys and the Dacks. She names Arthur Estabrook's 1926 book Mongrel Virginians as the most racist of all [Rafter; 1988; 45-6]. It blatantly conflated all the questions of defectiveness with miscegenation). Many of the most important studies were, in one way or another, connected to the ERO, which even published one of its ERO Bulletins on How to Make a Eugenical Family Study [ERO Bulletin; vi-1915]. There was one last flurry of family studies in the form of Henry Perkins' Eugenics Survey of Vermont which rested on the old assumptions and methodologies of the orthodox movement and ran until into the 1930s.

Long before scientific evidence had been available through Goddard's work and the army test data, the American eugenics movement, including its central figure Davenport, was united in its belief that the then recent changes in immigration patterns would be to the detriment of the USA, not just in its external racial qualities but in intelligence, morality and other areas. Davenport believed that:

> the population of the USA will, on account of the great influx of blood from South-eastern Europe, rapidly become darker in pigmentation, smaller in stature, more mercurial... more given to crimes of larceny, kidnapping, assault, murder, rape and sex-immorality... Since of the insane in hospitals there are relatively more foreign-born than native it seems probable that... the ratio of insanity in the population will rapidly increase.

[Davenport; 1912; 219]

It was a comparatively simple solution to selectively curb immigration. In doing so several objectives were met. A biological (racial) enemy was kept out of the USA, the source of mental illness and feeble-mindedness was attacked and the dominant position of the traditional Nordic / Anglo-Saxon elite was maintained.

Since the mid-1910s there had been a broad consensus that the USA neither could nor should carry on absorbing large numbers of immigrants. The period was
characterised by high unemployment, uncertainty about the future economy (for example, automation and the change to production line techniques). As well as scientific bodies like the JAMA and the American Genetics Association, the birth control movement led by the Birth Control Review and Margaret Sanger were vocal supporters of restriction, echoing exactly the eugenicists arguments. Anti-immigrant feeling encompassed groups who were not normally expected to be on the same side of a debate. For example, Trade Unionists feared wages being forced down. Meanwhile business leaders were scared of importing communism and radicalism through the large numbers of east European workers. ‘Nativist’ groups feared changes to American society and the loss of social, political and economic status for Anglo-Saxons / Nordics. Many liberals believed that it was unfair to allow in more immigrants than could reasonably be absorbed, favouring fewer immigrants who could be better cared for in terms of housing, education, learning English, and who could be processed properly. All of this was set against a backdrop of strong isolationism in the post-war years. On top of these abstract notions of immigrants was the scientific evidence that immigrants were a source of degeneration, through their low genetic quality and high levels of defectiveness, especially insanity and feeble-mindedness.

It was against this background that the 1924 Immigration Act was passed. The drop in immigration caused by the war and the fear of immigration on an unprecedented scale at the war’s end led many restrictionists to call for a total ban on immigration for up to four years [JofH; 10 (1919); 70]. In 1921 an emergency Immigration Act had been passed. This limited immigration to 3% of the foreign-born of any national population according to the 1910 census. (For example, if there were a million British born people in the 1910 census, then from 1921 30,000 - or 3% of one million - British people could migrate to the USA per year). Following the introduction of the act debate intensified rather than abated. In 1922 the law was renewed for a further two years. Congress established the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, which would need to have proposals in place for when the law expired in 1924.
In drawing up the battle lines eugenicists and their allies drew distinctions between the north west of Europe on the one hand, and the south and east of Europe on the other. The strategy was to reduce the level of immigration generally and to re-skew what there was in favour of the countries like Britain, Germany, Scandinavia and the Netherlands. On top of this an effective method was needed to prevent entry to those with specific defects and those of general eugenic weakness.

The Congressional committee investigating immigration had decided the outcome long before it met. There was a coalition of some committee members, witnesses, eugenicists and anti-immigrant psychometricians like Terman, Yerkes, Brigham and Goddard. The committee's Republican chair, Albert Johnson, joined the AES on its founding in 1922 and was a friend of both Davenport and Laughlin - it was at Johnson's personal request that Laughlin was appointed as the committee's permanent eugenic expert witness. Johnson was later to develop friendships with leading psychometricians - on the eve of the new bill's becoming law Johnson attended a dinner with Carl Brigham. The committee itself was made up primarily of conservatives, inclined towards racialist thinking, and who tended only to call witnesses, including Laughlin and Stoddard, who supported their pro-restriction views. Only two members fell outside this group, Adolf Sabath and Samuel Dickstein (who were both Jewish and represented high immigration areas).

When the committee held its hearings Harry Laughlin was given a warm reception, presenting several reports, each developing eugenic arguments regarding immigration. His work pointed to the inferiority of southern and eastern European immigrants and rested on traditional eugenic arguments (such as the number of immigrants in prisons and mental institutions), as well as the apparently indisputable army test data. (Psychometricians had campaigned for racially based immigration

---

* It has been suggested by some present-day psychologists, like Richard Herrnstein and Mark Snyderman that there was no connection between the intelligence testing community and the passing of the 1924 Immigration Act. For a response to this suggestion see Gelb, Allen, Futterman and Mehler's "Rewriting Mental Testing History" (1986).
restrictions. Yerkes had promoted it in his foreword to Brigham's 1923 book [Gelb et al; 1986; 24]). The two anti-restrictionists did manage to get Herbert Spencer Jennings called as a witness to counter the evidence of Laughlin and others. He was called for a few minutes late on a Friday afternoon. Although he did oppose parts of eugenics, Jennings' main argument against Laughlin was that the real source of degeneration lay not in southern and eastern Europe, but in the Irish [Barkan; 1991; 101].\footnote{For a description of Herbert Spencer Jennings' career see Elazar Barkan’s “Re-evaluating Progressive Eugenics” (1991) and Steven Selden’s “Resistance in School and Society” (1988). Jennings evidence to the committee was published as “Undesirable Aliens” in Survey 15 December 1923.} Rather than destroy the eugenicists argument this merely redirected it. Restrictionists already saw the Irish as degenerate and Jennings confirmed their views, albeit with a different emphasis [see also private correspondence e.g. HSJP2; Jennings to Fisher; 21-xi-1923]. (Other eugenicists called included Grant, Stoddard and DeCourcey Ward [Allen; 1987; 195]).

Not surprisingly, when the committee finished its work it sent a bill to the House of Representatives which was strongly restrictionist and skewed the quotas against southern and eastern European countries. The committee proposed slashing immigration by another one third over the 1921 and 1922 system, by simply reducing the percentages from 3% to 2%. They also moved the date of the census to be used from 1910 to 1890. This moved the starting point to before the onset of large-scale immigration from the supposedly degenerate south and east of Europe. According to Madison Grant's submission to the committee this year and quota was desirable because it would mean that north and west European immigration would be 83% of the 1920 total, while south and east European immigration would be cut to 11.7% [quoted in Chase; 1980; 294]. Only Sabath and Dickstein opposed sending the bill to the House of Representatives.

When the immigration bill reached the House it was well received. In the debate eugenic evidence including the army intelligence tests were referred to time and again. Steven Gelb et al quote the following from the Congressional Record. It is...
CHAPTER 1

from a speech by Representative Albert Vestal given on 2nd April 1924 drawing on exactly the kind of evidence offered by Laughlin, and was applauded by the entire House:

The intelligence test applied to the soldiers during the Great War has demonstrated that nearly one-half of our foreign born population is to be classified in the lowest two levels of intelligence rating. We have about 14,000,000 foreign born in America, and the army tests indicated that more than 6,000,000 of these are to be classified either as inferior or very inferior.

[Quoted in Gelb et al; 1986; 23]

When Congress voted on the bill it won overwhelming support in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. It was quickly signed into law by the pro-eugenic president Calvin Coolidge. There had been a three way relationship in operation between eugenicists, intelligence testers and Congress, which conspired to work against many potential European immigrants, and to brand those already in the USA as inferior.* This relationship was summed up by Lewis Terman in the Psychological Review when he wrote that intelligence testing “has become the beacon light of the eugenics movement... [and] is appealed to by congressmen in the reshaping of national policy on immigration” [Terman quoted in Gelb et al; 1986; 25]. At the same time that the immigration law was passed using the army test data, the US Navy began using a similar test on its new recruits [EugN; X (Oct 1925); 137]. (This idea had been proposed by Davenport in 1917 [Paul; 1995; 65]). The importance of eugenics to the immigration debate in Congress is demonstrated by the fact that after the 1921 Second International Congress of Eugenics, Laughlin’s exhibition on eugenics was moved directly to the Capitol Building, where it stayed on display for three years [Chase; 1980; 279].

The 1924 Immigration Act was praised by eugenicists and was for years to come held up, along with sterilisation laws, as the greatest success of the American eugenics movement. Allan Chase has described the law as “the greatest legislative triumph ever scored by the world eugenics movement” [Chase; 1980; 273]. Racial

* Some psychologists have tried to deny this relationship. For a commentary on this debate see Gelb et al “Rewriting Mental Testing History” in Sage Race Relations Abstracts.
and orthodox eugenicists all praised it. At the time Davenport called it "as nearly perfect as can be" [CBDP1; Davenport to Albert Johnson; 24-xii-1923]. They recognised fully that the act would cause different results within various sections of the population. Madison Grant recognised and approved the fact that the law restricted immigration not just on national grounds but on religious ones too. It curbed the numbers of his old enemies - Catholics and Jews. His 1933 book The Conquest of a Continent was largely a strong defence of the Immigration Act.

The legislation was an indisputable success from a restrictionist perspective. In 1914 east Europeans had accounted for 75% of new arrivals, after the 1924 act they accounted for just 15% [Allen; 1998; 6]. When the 1924 immigration quotas were brought in Polish immigration was slashed, on paper to less than 3,000 per year. In 1914 283,000 Italians had entered the USA [Gilbert; 1980; 19]. Under the new law Italian immigration was theoretically cut to 3,652 per year, although demand remained high - in 1922 400,000 Italians had applied to migrate to the USA, and in reality Italian immigration remained at around 30,000 per year [Finkelstein; 1988; 40]. Spain, Portugal and Greece amounted to immigration of less than 500 people per year between them. German immigration remained at over 55,000 and English at 18,000 [figures from Chase; 1980; 291].

Overseas observers praised the 1924 Immigration Act. In Mein Kampf Hitler praised the American law, writing that in the USA unlike Germany "an effort is made to consult reason at least partially. By refusing immigration on principle to elements in poor health, by simply excluding certain races from naturalisation, it professes in slow beginnings a view which is peculiar to the folkish state concept" [Hitler; 1992; 400]. The Rassenhygiene eugenicists too were enamoured of the law. During the Nazi years Hans F K Günther, (the racial anthropologist) and Walter Gross (of the Office of Racial Policy) praised the 1924 law and suggested the implementation of similar laws in Germany [Kühl; 1994; 38-9].
CHAPTER 1

From 1927 a new immigration system was used, based on numbers descended from particular national groups. (Unravelling national origins in the ‘Melting Pot’ could not have been an easy task by any standard). One of its most important features was the limit on total immigration. A ceiling of 150,000 people per year was set and this would simply be divided up according to the proportion of Americans originating in a given country [HSJP2; Whitney to Jennings; 12-i-1925]. Again it apparently shifted numbers in favour of British and other North Europeans, and again it was welcomed by eugenicists, restrictionist and nativist groups [e.g. CBDP1; Goethe to Davenport; 2-v-1927]. The reality was that the quota system did not especially skew immigration to favour eugenically valuable countries. The available figures can be presented to argue whichever case one likes. The only certainty is that total numbers were severely limited (to 150,000 in 1924 and 153,541 in 1927) [EugN; XIII (Apr 1928); 51]. True, quotas did rise for Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland., but this was sometimes by matters of tens, rather than thousands. At the same time, however, quotas also rose for Czechoslovakia, Danzig, The Irish Free State, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Spain, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Quotas fell for Britain and the Netherlands [figures from EugN; XIII (Apr 1928); 51]. Although the 1927 system was widely perceived as a eugenic triumph for changing the racial make-up of immigration, in reality it was only one in terms of limiting overall numbers.

Despite the massive eugenic success of the 1924 Immigration Act the issue did not go away for many eugenicists. Orthodox and racial eugenicists continued their analysis and campaigns as if nothing had changed. An article in Eugenical News from 1927 bemoans the lack of old blood in New England and contrasts the new immigrants from Europe with the “hardy God-fearing pioneer” stock of earlier migrants. It also argued that long term biological consequences had to be considered above short term benefits, such as cheap labour [EugN; XII (Feb 1927); 14]. They continued to look for new ways of reducing immigration and campaigned for further restriction. Thurman Rice proposed that amongst the conditions of entry should be a loyalty to the American system of government. He also reiterated an old
proposal that would effectively restrict migration to the wealthy. He proposed that
immigrants would have to put down a bond of $1,000 which the government would
return after five years if the person had not been convicted of a crime, been put in
an asylum or in any way depended on the state [Rice; 1929; 309].

Complaints continued about the quality and number of immigrants. *Eugenical News*
printed a call for a further extension of immigration restriction. Amongst the thirty-
four signatories were Laughlin, Davenport, East, Fisher, Huntington, Whitney, Grant,
Henry Fairfield Osborn, Yerkes and DeCourcy Ward [EugN; XII (Mar 1927); 27-28].
According to official US government statistics, the average number of migrants
between 1900 and 1924 from southern and eastern Europe was 434,810 per year,
between 1924 and 1939 the figure was 24,430 [figures given in Chase; 1980; 300].

Harry Laughlin continued to devote enormous amounts of energy and written words
to the cause. Thurman Rice called for an absolute halt to non-White immigration (up
to and including Turks). He went on to say that "members of the Slavic and Alpine
sub-race should be allowed to enter only in exceptional cases, since we have now
all of the blood that we can absorb, and probably more than is good for us." [Rice;
1929; 307]. Charles Goethe, as president of the ERA and a large financial donor to
several organisations called for the 1924 act to be extended to include Latin
America. This view was strongly supported by Roswell Johnson in the pages of
Margaret Sanger's *Birth Control Review* [BCR; ii-1932; 58]. (As late as 1936, when
the USA was a net exporter of people, the *Birth Control Review* referred to "the
deteriorating intellectual average of the American people, a down hill trend speeded
up by the continual entrance of immigrants into this country" [BCR; iii-1936; 4]). In

1939 after the Carnegie Institution of Washington had forced Laughlin to retire,
Laughlin embarked on what Allan Chase has called his "one last caper as a
eugenical hatchet man". Together with John Trevor (who designed the 1924
quotas), he campaigned to keep Germany's Jewish and anti-Nazi refugees out of
the USA, on the grounds that "immigrants are essentially breeding stock" and these
ones were undesirable [quoted in Chase; 1980; 352-3].
Eugenicists continued to campaign for more immigration restriction, even after immigration had all but ended after the 1929 crash. For the vast majority of the American public, and for reform eugenicists immigration was not a major issue. It all but disappeared from the agenda of the reform movement. Debates, interests and priorities changed within America, but orthodox and racial eugenicists continued with their old campaigns.

- Sterilisation

Sterilisation is the most widely discussed of all eugenic policies. It was used on a wider basis than any other policy, for longer and by different systems of government. Allan Chase has referred to sterilisation in Germany and the USA being “the weapon of choice” [Chase; 1980; 15]. Although many groups were targeted by sterilisation, in both countries the main concern was the feeble-minded - a vague term for those with learning difficulties, problems socialising and low IQs. This is reflected in the numbers of those sterilised. In Germany by 1939, out of a total of 375,000 people sterilised, over 200,000 had been sterilised on grounds of feeble-mindedness [figures in Chase; 1980; 350]. In the USA feeble-mindedness was seen as the underlying issue for most groups of defectives and usually topped the list of concerns for sterilisation. No law ever covered all the groups, but the following were variously included - the feeble-minded, alcoholics, epileptics, criminals, the tuberculous, moral imbeciles, manic depressives, psychopaths, the blind, the deaf, people with Huntington’s chorea, the insane, paupers, ne’er-do-wells, drug-users, the physically disabled. The plans of eugenicists like Harry Laughlin were much more wide-ranging than those actually enacted. His Model Eugenical Sterilization Law covered the feeble-minded, insane, epileptics, criminals, alcoholics, drug-users, tuberculous, diseased, syphilitic, psychopaths, blind, deaf, paupers, homeless, orphans and ne’er-do-wells [Laughlin; 1922; 446-7]. Some laws introduced to state legislatures included extra, and less obvious categories, such as Missouri’s 1929

\[\text{There have been wildly different claims about the numbers sterilised in Nazi Germany, with \footnote{Allan Chase writing of two million sterilisation operations up to 1945. He does not explain}}\]
law, which covered those convicted of rape, murder, highway robbery, bombing or chicken stealing [Chase; 1980; 135]. (To American eugenicists a comprehensive policy of segregation was essential to making a sterilisation policy work. Sterilisation could be used for those who were indisputably defective, and in the early days only cautiously. Segregation would have to be used for borderline cases and for the bulk of defectives until sterilisation was on a secure legal and scientific basis and states felt confident about using it on a wide scale).

Sterilisation was overwhelmingly the favoured policy within the social eugenics sphere (immigration restriction and anti-miscegenation laws in the USA were its partner for racial eugenics). Despite the predominance of social categories there were those who promoted a wider usage. Madison Grant proposed that sterilisation “be applied to an ever widening circle of social discards, beginning always with the criminal, the diseased and the insane and extending ultimately to worthless race types.” [Grant; 1922; 51]. Grant clearly saw sterilisation as potential policy towards tens of millions of Americans, on racial as well as social grounds. In Germany the possibility that sterilisation might be used against political prisoners or minorities like Jews was one of the areas which caused the law's controversy in the USA.

In the USA sterilisation legislation subtly combined social and racial bias. With existing prejudices against immigrants and Blacks legitimised by the work of Goddard, Terman and others, and put on a biological basis, it became all but inevitable that targets of sterilisation would be disproportionately foreign and Black. With classifications based on tests and diagnoses containing strong economic, social, educational and ethnic bias (such as the army test data), those outside of the Anglo-Saxon mainstream would fare badly. There were numerous studies, including those of Goddard, showing that inmates of various institutions from prisons to homes for the feeble-minded were made up of large numbers of immigrants and Blacks. As the laws only applied to institutionalised people, sterilisation statistics

how this figure was arrived at [Chase; 1980; 16]. By the 1990s it has been generally accepted that the figure is up to 400,000 people.
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would show a similar disproportion. (See for example Reilly; 1991). Edward Larson writes that “African Americans and foreign immigrants were sterilized at nearly twice the rate, per capita, as the general population” [Larson; 1995; 38].

For others such uses seemed impossible. Writing about fifteen years after Madison Grant published these ideas, Harry Laughlin wrote in Germany’s ARGB that: “the possibility that sterilization might become a political tool that might be used by one race against another, by one religion against another, or by one social class against another, is very remote” [ARGB; 23 (1929); 261]. By 1937 in Germany mass sterilisation using X-rays was being seriously investigated and by 1941 senior figures in the Nazi hierarchy were investigating its usefulness for Soviet and Jewish forced labourers [WIHM SA/EUG D248; 8-11 & documents at Arad et al; 1981; 273]. These facts were not available to America’s policy makers, eugenicists or public.

The rationale for sterilisation is important. There were four main motives for legislation: the therapeutic (that it helped the person sterilised); the punitive (purely as punishment); the eugenic (that it prevented the birth of defectives); and the social (to save expenditure on those who were non-productive, dependant or unable to look after children). In the early years the therapeutic rationale had been used extensively, but this died away by the early 1920s as it became apparent that there was no therapeutic benefit in the procedure. In the USA eugenic motives and punitive often remained intertwined with criminals and others included for sterilisation along with the supposedly hereditarily defective. After Buck versus Bell the punitive motive declined as the eugenic principle had been seen to be upheld. It was in Depression America that the social motive emerged as an explicit justification for sterilisation and ultimately became the overriding motive. (In Germany by contrast the eugenic and punitive rationales were separated by the introduction of separate legislation, one for eugenic sterilisation, the other for punitive sterilisation or castration of sex offenders and others).
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Eugenic sterilisation in the USA can be divided into distinct phases up to 1945. The year 1927 marked an important turning point in the USA's sterilisation programme. In this year the case of Carrie Buck went to the Supreme Court and sterilisation was declared constitutional. At this point sterilisation stepped up a gear, growing in use through to the Second World War. Between 1927 and 1937 twenty new sterilisation laws were enacted “most of them patterned on the Virginia law” [Lombardo; 1985; 31]. Sterilisation in the USA was a state affair, rather than a federal government issue. This meant that legislation needed to be passed by each of the state legislatures and could vary in details of groups covered, effectiveness and legal procedures. The first eugenic sterilisation Bill was introduced in Michigan in 1897, but was easily defeated. When a Bill was introduced in Indiana in 1907 with eugenics much more popular nationally, the Bill was easily passed into law (fifty-nine votes to twenty-two in the House and twenty-eight votes to sixteen in the Senate) [ERO Bulletin 10B; ii-1914; 14]. Indiana's two sterilisation laws remained little used and by 1930 just 123 people had been sterilised in Indiana [Human Betterment Foundation; 1930; introduction]. By 1922 eighteen state legislatures had passed sterilisation legislation, sterilising 3,233 people [Critchelow; 1992; 345]. Over thirty states had some form of sterilisation at some point in the period 1907-1945.

The two greatest propagandists for sterilisation in the USA were Harry Laughlin of the ERO and Paul Popenoe of the Human Betterment Foundation (from 1929-1937). Both men saw their role as two-fold. Firstly they simply promoted the idea of sterilisation. Secondly, they hoped that the information and studies that they published would help future laws avoid the many problems encountered by earlier ones. Laughlin’s Model Eugenical Sterilization Law was published in 1922 in his book Eugenical Sterilization in the United States and aimed to provide a template for future sterilisation legislation. Laughlin promoted his law for the best part of twenty years and it was widely distributed by the ERO and the AES to legislators, governors, heads of institutions and to organisations like the IRL and nativist groups. Popenoe published journal articles and worked through California’s Human Betterment Foundation to promote sterilisation, producing a mass of studies on the
subject. His most important work was the 1930 collection of studies published as *Collected Papers on Eugenic Sterilization in California*. Both men were praised by the Nazis for their influence on sterilisation in the USA and Germany. Popenoe and Laughlin were trying to overcome problems highlighted by Thurman Rice who wrote that: “a large part of the disrepute that has been brought to the subject of eugenics is due to...[laws] which have been passed or proposed by legislators and reformers who had no proper or adequate conception of the difficulties of the problem”, a matter that he believed was compounded when these laws were then ignored or otherwise failed to work. If laws were introduced they had to be properly framed and effective [Rice; 1929; 317-8].

America’s orthodox and racial eugenicists saw sterilisation as a policy that could be used on a rolling basis, moving through various groups of people and ultimately affecting a massive proportion of the population. Madison Grant saw it being used first on “ten per cent of the population. When this unemployed and unemployable human residuum has been eliminated... it would be easy to consider the advisability of further restricting the population of the then remaining least valuable types” [Grant; 1922; 54]. This was not as ambitious as the plan of Theodore Robie of the Essex County Mental Hygiene Clinic in New Jersey who called for the sterilisation of those who would fail the by then discredited army tests - around 14,000,000 Americans. But this was only the beginning as this covered intelligence alone. Robie proposed sterilisation for plenty of other social groups as well - “the insane, criminals, prostitutes, paupers and social misfits” - it appears that his unspecified total may have approached twenty million people [TICE; 1934; Robie; 201-2]. Harry Laughlin’s scheme proposed in 1914 saw a programme starting with 80 / 100,000 of population rising to 150 / 10,000 by 1980. By 1980 fifteen million people would have been sterilised, but this was only the beginning because then “would begin the second period of still more eugenically effective decimal sterilisation” and so on because “it will always be desirable to purge the existing stock of its lowest strains” [ERO Bulletin; ii-1914; 144-5]. Many orthodox American eugenicists proposed variations on this theme, usually looking at the bottom ten percent of the population.
- the "submerged tenth" - in a programme that should target groups of conditions before moving on to a new set and then returning to sterilise the next ten percent [CBDP; Grant to Davenport; 6-vii-1914]. Even by the 1930s when the eugenic basis of sterilisation was being eroded and orthodox eugenicists had lost most of their popularity they continued to promote the idea of large scale sterilisation. Paul Popenoe, Charles Davenport and Harry Laughlin still saw extensive sterilisation programmes as an answer to many social problems. In 1935 Leon Whitney suggested sterilising "the lowest fourth of our population" [Whitney; 1935; 104]. The idea was condemned in the once orthodox Journal of Heredity [JofH; 25 (1934); 415-8].

This general belief in the need to sterilise about ten percent of the population was based on little scientific data, and was derived from and for convenience. In 1931 when the British Medical Journal reviewed Gosney and Popenoe's article "The Number of Persons Needing Sterilization" the reviewer commented on "the disregard of the need for accurate figures, the vague guessing at percentages, the loose statements about human heredity in general, and the tendency to widen to an absurd degree the categories of those to whom sterilisation should be applied" [review at WIHM SA/EUG E1; 01-viii-1931].

The period up to 1927 is characterised by legislation being not passed, vetoed, overturned or never used. A question mark hung over eugenic sterilisation until the mid-1920s. Firstly many people saw it as incompatible with Christian ethics, not just fanatical Christian or Catholic ethics, but the Christianity of ordinary people and the ruling elite. Several laws were rejected on grounds of religious ethics, including Pennsylvania (1905), Vermont (1913), Nebraska (1913), Idaho (1913). Secondly there was the question of the constitutionality of the laws and whether eugenic sterilisation was "cruel and unusual punishment" as proscribed by the Bill of Rights (section 9 article 1). A number of laws were either not passed in the first place, declared unconstitutional in the state's Supreme Court or not used because of such doubts (including New Jersey, Vermont, Nebraska, Idaho). Meanwhile, others were
upheld as being within the constitution - Washington, California, Connecticut [ERO Bulletin 10B; 49-72].

The American laws were hampered by the indifference of many of those who could have applied them. Whereas the German law set in motion a chain of events which compelled each individual to either move individuals towards sterilisation or face criminal charges, the American laws were discretionary [Noakes & Pridham; 1991b; 458]. In the words of Paul Popenoe this created problems in the USA because an institutional superintendent could “do as much or as little sterilisation... as he desires. In some cases the hospital superintendent either represents a hostile school of thought or has felt that public sentiment would not back him, so has failed to make any sterilizations” [WIHM SA/EUG D276 I; 23-xi-1932]. In effect a law could be passed and then through fear, hostility or indifference never be applied. The statistics on sterilisation bear this out. A few states such as California and Virginia were enthusiastic, but they were outweighed by those who either did not use their laws, or used them so rarely that they may as well have not existed. States that did not make any sterilisations within three years of passing laws include Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Mississippi, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota and West Virginia. Those which had passed laws in the 1920s and had sterilised less than one hundred people by 1933 include the above, plus Iowa, Maine, Montana, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Utah, Vermont and Washington. [figures from Whitney; 1935; Appendix C]. The often trumpeted claims of eugenicists that a majority of states in the USA had eugenic sterilisation legislation in place hid a reality in which half of them all but ignored that legislation.

Controversy over the laws in the early 1920s led to a massive slow down in the number of sterilisation operations, and the virtual suspension of many laws. Much of this rested on the question of the laws’ constitutionality. This was finally settled in the 1927 case of Carrie Buck, which went to the United States’ Supreme Court, and tested the Virginia sterilisation law. The case was actually heard on the question of whether the law contravened the constitution on the question of “due process” and
“equal protection” of the law [JofH; 25 (1934); 25]. The court upheld the sterilisation principle. The most famous quote of the judge’s decision: “three generations of imbeciles is enough” reveals that at least one eye was on perceived social and economic realities, rather than purely legal and constitutional matters. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes’ ruling in Buck versus Bell was based partly on what he would have liked the law to be and partly on his own understanding of social issues. The legal grounds cited were that “the principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes” - which is at best a weak connection. The decision upheld the state’s power to sterilise its citizens on eugenic ground and confirmed that this did not constitute cruel or unusual punishment, in that it was not a punishment at all. The decision also declared that sterilisation laws did not contravene the concept of equal protection of the law and that they did comply with the requirements of due process of law [EugN; XII (June 1927) 74]. (The court ruled eight to one in favour - the majority decision is partly reprinted at Chase; 1980; 313-6). Carrie Buck’s moronism had initially been proved by her score on Terman’s IQ test. Harry Laughlin and Arthur Estabrook both submitted evidence to the court, in support of Carrie Buck being sterilised [Kevles; 1995; 110]. Henry Goddard’s work was also of importance in the success of the state’s case [Lombardo; 1985; 59].

In the USA, even after Buck versus Bell affirmed the constitutionality of the eugenic principle, question marks still hung over several laws, because each law was framed separately and therefore had the capacity to be unconstitutional, in areas like the requirements of due process. This led to a certain amount of hesitancy in several states. Five years after Buck versus Bell Paul Popenoe bemoaned the fact that “the legal status of some of these laws has also been questionable, since several earlier and badly drawn laws were thrown out as unconstitutional” [Popenoe; WIHM SA/EUG D276 I; 23-xi-1932]. It was exactly these issues that Laughlin’s Model Law and Popenoe’s numerous publications tried and failed to address. Popenoe was not

* A full account of Buck versus Bell is given in Paul Lombardo’s “Three Generations, No Imbeciles: New Light on Buck v. Bell”. Lombardo’s article asserts that Buck versus Bell was a “friendly suit” designed to prove the constitutionality of the sterilisation principle. See also Kevles; 1995; 96-112.
alone in his complaints. In the early 1930s eugenicists of all shades - Rice, Laughlin, Huxley, Frederick Osborn - were still bemoaning the fact that the laws were underused, undervalued and misunderstood. They proposed education and a complete overhaul of sterilisation legislation.

The introduction of the German law seems to have spurred calls in the USA for more sterilisation. In 1934 a Human Betterment Foundation report suggested that “attention has been aroused by the inauguration of eugenic sterilization on a large scale by Germany” [WIHM SA/EUG C277 II; 13-ii-1934]. In 1934 and 1935 alone the Human Betterment Foundation was advising Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Maryland, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Texas on new legislation [Popenoe: WIHM SA/EUG D277; 15-v-1934 & 12-ii-1935]. But this all came at a time when there were question marks over the scientific rationale for sterilisation (unit character, environment), over its effectiveness (the number of years needed to eliminate a trait) and a growth in opposition from groups such as the Catholic Church. At the same time, however, the Depression was increasing pressure for sterilisation on social grounds. In its report on American sterilisation the Eugenics Review noted that “sterilisation is being applied more and more on social rather than specifically eugenic grounds” [EugR; Oct 1938; 192].

The USA and Germany had the two most influential and successful eugenics movements of all time. Because of different demographics and priorities sterilisation was the only policy which was enacted in both countries on anything like a similar basis. For this reason it is worth giving a longer description of the German sterilisation programme and its similarities to the American programme.

Hitler’s views were largely in sympathy with standard eugenic views on sterilisation and how it should be perceived by the state, public and recipient. The following could have been written by any American eugenicist. Hitler argued that the state:

must teach the individual that it is no disgrace, but only a misfortune deserving pity, to be sick and weakly, but that it is a crime and hence at the same time a disgrace to dishonour one’s misfortune by one’s
own egotism in burdening innocent creatures with it; that by comparison it bespeaks a nobility of highest idealism and the most admirable humanity if the innocently sick, renounc[es] a child of his own.

[Hitler; 1992; 361-2]

He went on to promote sterilisation for such individuals.

Despite initial reservations in Germany about any extensive use of sterilisation, it became one issue in Germany that eugenicists agreed on. Although the policy was ultimately introduced under the Nazi regime, and thus under the hegemony of Rassenhygiene, the Eugenik wing had also promoted it. Alfred Grotjahn had campaigned for compulsory sterilisation, and Hermann Muckermann drafted the law put before the Prussian parliament in 1932. As in the USA German eugenicists saw sterilisation as an obvious and simple solution, to what in reality were diverse and complex issues. Géza von Hoffman, Germany's early authority on American eugenics, argued for wider usage as sterilisation was “the easiest way to prevent reproduction of inferior people” [Hoffman; 1913; 69]. When Germany came to introducing sterilisation legislation much was made of American experiences - a number of historians have shown the influence of American legislation on Germany [see Kühl 1994, Chase 1980 & Allen 1996].

Sterilisation in Weimar Germany remained a proposal as the constitution and some doubts about the science were strong enough to prevent legislation being passed. A British eugenicist wrote in early 1933 of Germany that “measures for compulsory sterilisation have been avoided, because there are still many gaps in the knowledge of heredity, and... because the diagnosis in the case of many of the relevant diseases is uncertain” [WIHM SA/EUG D226; Appendix]. The scientific arguments that could prevent eugenic sterilisation, worked in Germany in the 1920s, but then declined, at exactly the time they were beginning to work in the USA. In 1932 a sterilisation law was introduced to the Prussian parliament [Kopp; 1936; 763]. Although rejected it was an important precursor to the law introduced in 1933, and was taken seriously at the time. It was the subject of a special session of the
Prussian State Council for Health which resulted in the appointment of a sub-committee of doctors and lawyers [WIHM SA/EUG D226; Appendix]. In Germany the constitution had for a long time been read so as to exclude eugenic sterilisation. A document from the British Eugenics Society reads “S.224 of the Legal Code provides... an increased punishment for bodily injury which results in the sterilisation of the injured”. The document went on to suggest that at the time (1932-3) a “reinterpretation” of the code was underway, which would accommodate eugenic sterilisation as a health matter and therefore constitutional [WIHM SA/EUG D226; Appendix]. In both Germany and the USA, it appears that the constitution provided obstacles to eugenic sterilisation, which were resolved not through constitutional amendments, but through judicial decisions based on then current political imperatives.

The sterilisation law - the Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Ill Progeny - was one of the earliest pieces of eugenic legislation in Germany, passed in July 1933. With hindsight it is not surprising that sterilisation legislation was introduced so early, but at the time it was not so obvious. When the British Eugenics Society compiled a list of sterilisation legislation in early 1933. For Germany it simply stated “no law and none yet proposed”. A few months later the law was passed and less than twelve months later over 1,000 people per week were being sterilised [WIHM SA/EUG D226]. German eugenicists themselves, including Nazi-sympathisers like Fritz Lenz were not ready for the scope and thoroughness of Nazi eugenics. In early 1933 Robert Saudek writing to Julian Huxley, quoted a Professor Muller of Berlin “the sterilisation movement gains headway here. It is especially desired now to sterilise ‘criminals’. See the discussion in April ‘Eugenik’, in which Lenz and others agree to this but say it should not be compulsory”. Like many people outside of Germany Saudek was concerned that the regime might interpret ‘criminal’ to include political prisoners [WIHM SA/EUG C185; 31-iv-33].

The July law allowed for the compulsory sterilisation of people within eight hereditary categories, plus alcoholism (which “is not assumed to be hereditary in the same way
as the other items" [Kopp; 1936; 763]. (The categories were feeble-mindedness, schizophrenia, manic depression, epilepsy, Huntington's chorea, hereditary blindness, hereditary deafness and severe hereditary malformation) [The complete legislation is printed at JofH; 25 (1934); 257-9]. It established a system of 205 Hereditary Health Courts and 26 Courts of Appeal [Kopp; 1936; 766]. Unlike so many of the American sterilisation laws the German one went straight into wide usage - 56,244 people were sterilised in 1934 (roughly half men and half women), plus another 3,692 applications which were rejected. [figures from a letter from the German Embassy in London; WIHM SA/EUG D209; 06-ii-1937]. (By the same time - 1935 the USA had sterilised 20,172 people [EugR; July 1935; 91]. In California, with America's biggest sterilisation programme, between 1927 and 1933 8,504 people were sterilised [Whitney; 1935; Appendix C]. Popenoe admitted that "all this is small compared with Germany" [WIHM SA/EUG D277; 14-iii-1935]). When Marie Kopp returned to the USA after a research trip to Germany she revealed that Nazi officials had mentioned to her sterilising one million people [Kopp; 1936; 763]. Although this is a large number it is not as large as those suggested by some American eugenicists. American eugenicists welcomed the law (many with some reservations). In The Case for Sterilisation Leon Whitney wrote that "we cannot but admire the foresight revealed by the [sterilisation] plan in general, and realise that by this action Germany is going to make herself a stronger nation" [Whitney; 1935; 96].

In the USA sterilisation of criminals was incorporated into eugenic sterilisation laws along with sterilisation of others such as the disabled. It was presented as primarily a therapeutic and eugenic measure as well as being a punitive one. In Germany on the other hand, to avoid this confusion of aims and the confusion of sterilisation being punitive in certain circumstances, separate laws were passed several months apart. The latter act - the Law Against Moral Offenders and Recidivists - for criminals, included castration as well. When Dr X of Berlin was asked about the law for criminals his reply contained the following "this law must not in any way be confused with the Sterilisation Act... Sterilisation was a sociological and eugenic
measure. The Act of 24th November 1933 was a penal measure” [WIHM SA/EUG D69; ix-1935].

America’s orthodox and racial eugenicists were supportive of the new law. Stefan Kühl sums up the reasons for the enthusiastic reception thus:

In the view of American eugenicists, the Nazi government had avoided the mistakes that were made in the formulation of sterilization laws in different states of their own nation. The German government had introduced a nationwide, well-conceived law, unlike the heterogeneous, improvised state laws in America.

[Kühl; 1994; 50]

The German sterilisation law was the earliest of a series of moves which either eroded or broke medical conventions and / or the Hippocratic oath, which had been condemned after the First World War by Hoche and Binding [Hoche & Binding; 1920; 45]. Although only a small step it was part of a process leading to involvement in the euthanasia programme, human medical experiments and selection for genocide in concentration camps. In this case it was the question of patient confidentiality. The law forced physicians to report cases within the designated categories to their district medical officer who in turn had to “induce” an application for sterilisation. Furthermore, physicians were expected to give evidence at the Hereditary Health Courts. It stipulated that “doctors... are obliged to speak out freely without regard to professional secrecy” [WIHM SA/EUG D209 & D216; §7.2]. This fact allowed the courts to always sit in closed session which on the one hand allowed the authorities to claim that they were protecting the individual’s rights and confidentiality, while on the other enabling the courts to operate secretly and free from independent observation [Kopp; 1936; 769]. (The medical experiences of Nazi Germany were to cause the first amendments to the Hippocratic oath for two thousand years [Leo Alexander in Mitscherlich & Mielke; 1949; xxxvii]).

There can be no doubting the impact that American experiences had on the German law. Harry Laughlin’s and Paul Popenoe’s work was widely read and respected. Popenoe’s name was well known in Germany, where he was praised by eugenicists
and Nazis. In 1929 the ARGB republished parts of Popenoe and Gosney’s work Sterilization For Human Betterment [ARGB; 23 (1931); 249-259]. The following year the book was published in German. Following his 1935 trip to Germany Charles Goethe wrote to Eugene Gosney praising his and Popenoe’s campaigning:

Your work has played a powerful part in shaping the opinions of the group of intellectuals who are behind Hitler in this epoch making program. Everywhere I sensed that their opinions have been tremendously stimulated by American thought, and particularly by the work of the HBF [Human Betterment Foundation]. I want you... to carry this thought with you for the rest of your life, that you have really jolted into action a great government of 60,000,000 people.

[Goethe to Gosney; WIHM SA/EUG C185; 31-iv-33]

In 1937 Ernst Rüdin was proud to declare that the German law met all the criteria that Popenoe had laid out [ARGB; 31 (1937); 367-369] (The view was also expressed by Marie Kopp; 1936; 763]. In 1936 Laughlin was awarded an honorary doctorate from Heidelberg University. Laughlin’s Model Eugenical Sterilization Law was another influence on the German legislation. Laughlin’s claim that he had more or less written the German law is a long way from the truth, but it is fair to say that it was one of the more important influences on the law. Hermann Muckermann made the same claim about his own contribution to the German law [quoted in EugR; Jan 1935; 268].

When the law was introduced there was widespread speculation that Germany’s law would be used against ethnic minorities, especially Jews and against political opponents*. (This was fuelled by the compulsory and universal nature of the law and the tone of racial propaganda in Germany). American eugenicists addressed the question often, but as the policy got underway and it was not used to these ends such fears died away and were replaced by support for the law [e.g. Whitney; 1935]. Writing as the law started to be used, the Human Betterment Foundation cautioned

* This seems to have been a highly likely course had events in the war not overtaken Germany. There had long been experimentation of various forms of mass sterilisation technique [WIHM; SA/EUG/048; Blacker]. In 1942 Himmler suggested that the "urgent tasks of our National Socialist and population policy include the prevention of procreation among racially inferior groups and persons unfit to have progeny" [Mitscherlich & Mielke; 1949; 133].
that "the German law is well drawn and in form is better than that of most American states [but] the success of any such law, of course, depends largely on its being administered conservatively, intelligently, and sympathetically" [WIHM SA/EUG C277; 13-ii-1934]. Despite concern in the USA about the German law being used against ethnic minorities or political prisoners, sterilisation in the USA increased dramatically through the 1930s. Although the scientific and eugenic rationale was under attack, sterilisation was bolstered by new rationales. In the years 1920 to 1929 7,644 sterilisation operations were carried out. From 1929 to 1939, however, numbers shot up and there were a further 22,158 operations [Reilly; 1991; 97].

One area of difference was the overt compulsion in the German law and the alleged voluntary nature of the American ones. This difference was discussed a great deal amongst eugenicists in the USA and it was used in highlighting the difference between the respectively dictatorial and democratic regimes. (Some eugenicists such as Laughlin, however, used it to press further for compulsion in the USA). In his discussion of the law that American eugenicists were so keen to claim the credit for, Leon Whitney washed his hands of the parts he did not like, "in Germany sterilisation is compulsory. But let Germany worry about that" [Whitney; 1935; 175]. He went on to reassure Americans that "we in this country need not fear lest any similar wholesale measure be adopted, since we are not living under a dictatorship" [Whitney; 1935; 96]. He goes on to argue that "persuasion and thorough education by intelligent medical counsellors... would progress just as far by inducing [Germany's] defectives and their kin to grant permission" for sterilisation [Whitney; 1935; 175]. In reality, despite all the words devoted to it there was very little difference between the levels of compulsion involved in the laws. (The big differences lay in the fact that American states and their representatives were not compelled to use the policy and the German law had universal applicability while the USA's applied only to those in institutions). In many ways the American laws at best obliged and at worst compelled people into sterilisation in a number of ways. In many instances decisions could be taken by the head of an institution, by a legal guardian or parent. The people who would be responsible for securing permission...
had an interest in persuading people who usually were badly educated, in poor socio-economic conditions and often of low intelligence to consent to sterilisation for themselves or members of their families. The vast majority of sterilisations were on grounds of feeble-mindedness or other mental defects, so either somebody else must have consented to the operation or the consent should have been invalid, as Norman Haire points out [in Whitney; 1935; 174]. Some laws, such as the Oklahoma law of 1931 gave institution superintendents the power to make sterilisation a condition of being discharged [JofH; 24 (1933); 120], which effectively gave people a choice between sterilisation and incarceration. It could be argued that people in this category were considered fit to make their own decisions (by implication of their general suitability for release), yet the institution maintained the power to make this decision. The element of compulsion in the American laws is underlined by the case of Buck versus Bell, which decided that Carrie Buck should be sterilised against her will. Paul Popenoe hinted that significant numbers of sterilisations were involuntary. "We have no information as to how many of the sterilizations in the US are really voluntary. Undoubtedly most of them are in actual effect" [WIHM SAVEUG D209; 13-ii-1934]. Most sterilisations were carried out either compulsorily, or without the full understanding or consent of the individual involved.

The German case caused many American eugenicists to urge a new approach to sterilisation, looking for an extension of sterilisation, the rationalisation of existing laws, the promotion of a more universal system and the inclusion of those outside of state institutions. Some, such as Harry Laughlin called for the introduction of overt compulsion to the laws, but most remained critical of this approach. Sterilisation in the USA did grow for much of the 1930s, but this was the result of the legal clarity provided by Buck versus Bell, and bolstering by the emergence of social rationales for sterilisation programmes. The eugenic motive for sterilisation declined and although many still promoted sterilisation, reform eugenicists by the later 1930s had put a distance between themselves and the policy. The relationships between American and German eugenicists over the sterilisation issue were typical of the relationship in general. It is easy to see the connections and to conclude that the
movements were heavily intertwined. Part of the reason that the German programme was so successful, is that it built on the experience and many weaknesses of the American programme. The influence of American eugenics was played up by the Nazi regime in order to give itself respectability and present itself as part of an internationally accepted movement. American eugenicists like Popenoe and Laughlin accepted that praise because it bolstered their seriously weakened positions and declining influence.

- Euthanasia & Genocide
Some care needs to be taken when looking at Nazism and the relationship of American eugenicists to it. On the one hand Nazism and Hitler’s Weltanschauung were firmly eugenic, as recognised by American eugenicists at the time, and historians since. Mitscherlich & Mielke argue that “Hitler’s interest in “eugenic” measures was in keeping with the whole program of the Nazi Party" [Mitscherlich & Mielke; 1949; 90].

On the other hand we need to remember that genocide was not inevitable in Germany and that eugenics was a varied movement in Germany like other countries. Richard Soloway complains that Nazi eugenics has been presented as “a horrific disaster that in retrospect seemed the inevitable outcome of pseudo-scientific, hereditary determinism run wild [Soloway; 1995; 637]. It needs to be remembered that eugenics in the USA and in pre-1933 Germany were not simply steps on a path towards Nazi genocide.(Paul Weindling argues that this is the mistake made in Daniel Gasman’s misreading of Ernst Haeckel’s work in The Scientific Origins of National Socialism (1971) [Weindling; 1989; 322]). There were those (von Verschuer) who appear to have been compliant with the full range of Nazi eugenics. Some eugenicists were sympathetic to the early Nazi regime, but went on to oppose genocide and euthanasia (Rüdin) and others supported only some aspects of Nazism from the outset (Muckermann). An important difference between the two countries, was that for much of the period under discussion
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euthanasia and genocide were topics of serious discussion in Germany, unlike in the USA.

Nazi policy was widely praised by American eugenicists in the early years of the regime as being eugenic in nature. Hitler had always depended on Rassenhygiene thinking, a fact acknowledged by supporters, and included his reading the Baur-Fischer-Lenz book before writing Mein Kampf [JofH; 25; (1934); 257]. Paul Popenoe argued that Nazism was the “application of biological principles to human society” [JofH; 25 (1934); 257]. Eugenical News and the Journal of Heredity praised the eugenic foundations of Germany’s regime in 1933 to 1935 [e.g. JofH; 26 (1935); 485-89]. Nazism was underpinned by eugenic thinking. Gisela Bock describes eugenics as “a vast field... which became the core of population policies throughout the Nazi regime” [Bock; 1983; 401].

The policy of genocide (and euthanasia) grew out of standard eugenic policies. Donald Dietrich argues that eugenics always “implied the potential destruction of human beings... extermination and rationalization were coupled together” [Dietrich; 1991; 73]. Nazi genocide was consonant with eugenic programmes and it was the logical conclusion of the Nazis constant radicalising of eugenics after 1933. The opening sentences of Henry Friedlander’s book The Origins of Nazi Genocide read: “Genocide was only the most radical method of excluding groups of human beings from the German national community. The policy of exclusion drew upon more than fifty years of scientific opposition to the equality of man” [Friedlander; 1995; 1]. Stefan Kühl too sees genocide as firmly rooted in eugenics, he refers to “the Nazi use of eugenics - including mass sterilisation, the killing of handicapped persons, the murder of ethnic minorities and the extermination of Jews” [Kühl; 1994; xvi]. Conceptually policies were built upon each other and upon previous experiences (including experiences outside of Germany). Policies widened out and took on racial dimensions, such as the move from a non-ethnically motivated euthanasia policy to
one in which institutionalised Jews were killed on an ethnic basis and no longer because of any social or economic rationale [Mitscherlich & Mielke; 1949; 98, 117-23]. Genocide grew out of more traditional eugenic policies in terms of the personnel used, the technology employed and the administrative organisation of policies [see Friedlander; 1995]. The victims of genocide were killed to a significant degree using the same scientific rationale that allowed ethnic separation and sterilisation of the disabled. Kühl refers to the "personal and ideological links between eugenics and mass sterilization and extermination" [Kühl; 1994; 105].

Contemporary eugenicists have continually tried to distance eugenics from policies of genocide and euthanasia. An article in Eugenics Bulletin by Stephen Saetz argues that the genocide of the Jews “had absolutely nothing to do with eugenics, nor was it justified or implemented in terms of even pseudo-eugenic considerations”. He argues that the euthanasia programme “was pragmatic, not eugenic”. On the other hand he associates eugenics strongly with the Lebensborn programme, the SS selection and marriage criteria and the sterilisation law [Saetz; 5-v-1999; 1-19].

The USA, unlike Germany, did not resort to euthanasia or genocide. For Americans there was no equivalent to Hoche and Binding's Die Freigabe Der Vernichtung Lebensunwerten Lebens*. The killing of unwanted population groups did not enter eugenic discourses except when eugenicists wished to distance themselves from such policies in pre-1933 eugenics. American eugenicists conceded that genocide and euthanasia was compatible with eugenic goals, but rejected it on ethical and pragmatic grounds, rather because it was outside the scope of their work or because it could not be done. Thurman Rice wrote in 1929 that the movement was not calling for a "Spartan system for the exposure of weakly children" or an "easy death" or "the lethal chamber" [Rice; 1929; 11]. It is possible to argue that the

* This is a widely cited ‘fact’. It is, however, called into question by Paul Weindling who traces the claim back to Fritz Lenz himself. Weindling suggests that it is otherwise unsubstantiated [Weindling; 1993; 647].
essential difference between Rassenhygiene under Nazism and the USA’s racial and orthodox eugenicists, is simply that the former were freed of moral constraints. In the preface to the British edition of Leon Whitney's The Case For Sterilization Norman Haire, who is highly critical of Nazism and American attitudes towards it wrote that infanticide “is out of consonance with our ethical views” [Haire in Whitney; 1935; vii]. Similarly Harry Laughlin believed that introducing euthanasia would be “an effective eugenic agency... purchased at altogether too dear a moral price” [ERO Bulletin 10A; 55]. As a policy he saw it as sound eugenics. Regarding infanticide by the poor and less intelligent, Huntington and Whitney argued, that “biologically it is sometimes beneficial, for in general the more the children of such parents are reduced in number, the better will be the herditary [sic] constitution of future generations, but infanticide is extremely degrading socially” [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 127]. Others openly welcomed high death rates. Theodore Robie related the story of “a woman who had just had her 25th baby - thirteen of the brood, however, had luckily died” [TICE; 1934; Robie; 204]. On the ultimate eugenic policy of genocide Davenport wrote, perhaps hyperbolically, in April 1925 to Madison Grant that “we have no place to drive the Jews to... [and] it seems to be against the mores to burn any considerable part of our population” [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 7-iv-1925].

Like others at the time Thurman Rice said that it was better to prevent the birth of defectives, but that if they were born they had to be cared for properly. Even the racial eugenicist Madison Grant took this line, “the individual himself can be nourished, educated and protected by the community during his lifetime, but the state through sterilisation must see to it that his line stops with him” [Grant; 1922; 51]. (These views echo those from the Journal of the American Medical Association cited on page 63). Grant’s ambivalence on the subject is revealed in the same book. He stressed that “human life is valuable only when it is of use to the community or race” [Grant; 1922; 48]. He bemoaned the fact that there was a “mistaken regard for

* Information on the German euthanasia programme is available in Ernst Klee (1983), Burleigh (1994), Friedlander (1995). Documents are available in Noakes and Pridham;
what are believed to be divine laws and a sentimental belief in the sanctity of human life [which] tend to... prevent the elimination of defective infants... The laws of nature require the obliteration of the unfit”. He also wrote that “no ethnic conquest can be complete unless the natives are exterminated” [Grant; 1922; 48-9 & 71].

That is not to say that there were not those who supported the idea of a government sponsored euthanasia programme in the USA. In 1942, after Hitler had at least publicly called a halt to *Aktion T4* because of public concern, Foster Kennedy writing in the *American Journal of Psychiatry* still gave his support to the idea of euthanasia, although even he was critical of the German policy. He supported it for those “who should never have been born”, but not for the terminally ill. It would also be for parents and guardians to give and withdraw their consent as they wished, rather than being state-directed [Kennedy; 1942; 13-4]. (Kennedy received an honorary doctorate from a German university in 1936, at the same time as Laughlin received his). His views, however, were largely out of sync with the bulk of American eugenicists, who had opposed any form of euthanasia throughout the period under discussion. Almost alone Lothrop Stoddard on his return from Germany, as Nazi genocide was becoming a reality, wrote coldly that the Jewish question was “soon to be settled by the physical elimination of the Jews themselves from the Third Reich” [Stoddard; 1940; 189].

American eugenicists were not supportive of euthanasia or genocide either in theory or in practice, at least partly because of the ethical dimension that German eugenicists under Nazism managed to free themselves of. In one of the most important early eugenic texts Davenport wrote that eugenics “does not imply destruction of the unfit either before or after birth” [Davenport; 1912; 4]. Many eugenicists while opposing actively killing any part of a population, seemed to go as close as possible by welcoming deaths through disease and other agencies for some people. Davenport came as close as any orthodox eugenicist would to promoting euthanasia when he suggested that “one may even view with satisfaction

---
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the high death rate in an institution for low grade feeble-minded" [TICE; 1934; Davenport; 21].
(i) NAZISM

There have been a number of reasons advanced for the disappearance, or at least the decline of American eugenics in the 1930s. The most frequent explanation is some combination of the example given by Nazi eugenics and the emergence of a scientific opposition to eugenics. The emergence of a serious scientific opposition in the USA and the corresponding lack of opposition in Germany is highly pertinent, but the example provided by Nazism is, at best, a peripheral issue. The factors that explain the demise of American eugenics were in evidence before the Nazi party came to power and certainly before the mass of Americans (or even scientists) became horrified by Nazism. The older parts of the movement were dead by 1933 and the remainder started on a course of transformation. This chapter will demonstrate that looking to Nazism is fruitless as an explanation.

Nazism's effect on American eugenics could be manifested in two inter-connected ways, and has been referred to by historians of eugenics in both ways. On the one hand there is the public support offered to at least some aspects of Nazism by American eugenicists. The argument runs that because the American public already opposed Nazism they then rejected eugenics. On the other hand there is the claim that the example provided by the Nazi eugenics programme revealed to the American public and/or scientists the real nature of eugenics, or at least its possibilities. While it is not in question that many eugenicists in the USA publicly endorsed Nazi policy, the 'Damascus road' effect of Nazism on the American public and/or scientists seems highly unlikely. It is my contention that neither of these effects was either sufficient or necessary for the demise of the American movement, and that in the final analysis Nazism could not have been a factor, as the timing of events makes this impossible. Since 1945 Nazism has served to discredit eugenics, but it does not follow that it did so in the days before knowledge of Nazi genocide and other policies.
It is easy to see how this assumption about the role of Nazism has gone for so long without question. While historians have added other reasons, none has seriously examined Nazism in this context. Nazism was blamed by people who had been active in the eugenics field in the 1920s and 1930s. In a letter to Donald Pickens in February 1962, Paul Popenoe suggested that “the major factor in the decline of eugenics was undoubtedly Hitlerism. The contributing factor was a movement in psychiatry which tended to deny the importance of heredity”. Pickens himself concurs with this view, following Popenoe’s remarks with “no doubt Hitlerism contributed to the decline of American interest in eugenics and sterilization” [Pickens; 1968; 99].

In the 1960s Frederick Osborn offered a more complex explanation than Popenoe, but Nazism seems to have been central to his thinking. “Was it because some of the early eugenicsists [sic] placed a false and distasteful emphasis on race and social class?... Was it because of the emotional reaction to Hitler’s excesses and his misuse of the word “eugenics”?” [AESP; History of the AES; 4]. This appears to contradict his own earlier beliefs, which did not mention Nazism at the time. When Frederick Osborn wrote to Blakeslee at Cold Spring Harbor in 1940 and spoke of the decline of American eugenics, even when he spoke of the racism of the orthodox and racial eugenicists, he did not mention Nazism, Hitler or Germany. Instead he blamed the unscientific nature of much of the work and race and class bias [CBDP1; Frederick Osborn to Blakeslee; 23-iv-1940]. It seems that at that time - immediately before American entry into World War Two and the emergence of genocide as state policy in Germany - the USA’s leading eugenicist did not see Nazism as a significant factor in the decline of the movement. It was only years after the war (and the widespread knowledge of Nazi genocide) that Frederick Osborn mentioned the example of Nazism as a possible factor. Similarly in the immediate post-war years an obituary of Ellsworth Huntington in 1947 stated that “the financial condition of the Society, coupled with the tone of “eugenics” abroad, prevented adoption of any such [eugenic] plan” [AESP; Huntington]. ‘Abroad’ was clearly a reference to Nazi Germany.
Historians of science tend to agree with this view that Nazism was one of two or three factors which led to the demise of the American movement. The generally accepted timing of events (outlined on pages 36-7) makes Nazism a possible cause. Mark Haller suggests that as developments in genetics, psychiatry and mental testing attacked eugenics from one side "Hitler in Germany demonstrated the uses that might be made of some of the eugenics doctrines. These new developments stripped the eugenics movement of its trappings of science" [Haller; 1963; 7]. Ludmerer says of condemnation of Nazism, racism and eugenics at the 1939 genetics congress that "geneticists renunciation of the eugenics movement at this time contributed to the movement's ultimate downfall" [Ludmerer; 1969; 358]. William Provine in 1973 argued that "the application of Nazi race doctrines before World War II" was "more important than new biological evidence" in tackling opposition to race crossing on biological grounds. Provine at the end of the article confuses the timing in the arguments surrounding Nazism. He argues that the most important factor in the shift of opinion in thinking on race crossing was "the revulsion... to Nazi race doctrines and their use in justifying extermination of Jews. Few geneticists wanted to argue, as had the Nazis, that biology showed race crossing was harmful" [Provine; 1973; 794-6]. But he argues before that, that the change from condemnation to agnosticism came in the 1930s and that the second change to not seeing race crossing as harmful happened before Americans were generally aware of Nazi genocide.

More recent historians of the American eugenics movement have continued to see Nazism as an important factor. Elazar Barkan in *The Retreat of Scientific Racism* writes that around 1935 "the pendulum shift against the simplistic misconceptions of the old eugenics was enhanced by the Nazi aberrations which forced many more to recognize racism as abhorrent" [Barkan; 1992; 275]. (Barkan appears to contradict this on the opening page of the same book when he writes that "by 1938 only a small segment of the educated public had reformulated its attitude on the question of race" [Barkan; 1992; 1]). Garland Allen suggests that American eugenics went
into decline because of advances in genetics and anthropology, the Depression and "the rise of Nazi race-hygiene, with its explicitly American - and most notably Cold Spring Harbor [ERO] - connection" [Allen; 1983; 125-6 & 1986; 250]. In a later article he argues that it was primarily because of changes in the needs of America's ruling class elite, supplemented by the movement's lack of scientific credibility and its connections with Nazism [Allen; 1987; 201]. Daniel Kevles cites a number of other factors from before 1933 but includes Nazism as a powerful reason. He also suggests that Frederick Osborn's work was attempting to rescue eugenics "from the discredit brought upon it by the Nazis" [Kevles; 1995; 175]. In 1996 Marouf Hasain argued that eugenic policies declined, amongst other reasons because "more and more Americans became aware of the abuses that took place under the guise of medicine after Germany passed its sterilization laws in the early 1930s" [Hasain; 1996; 108]. But sterilisation increased rather than decreased over this period, and as suggested on page 253 it remained a popular policy with the American public.

This study does not reject Stefan Kühl's research. There were of course strong personal relationships between members of the German and American communities - almost exclusively with the orthodox and racial camps. Like other commentators though he has assumed a link between Nazism and the decline of American eugenics: "Through their comprehensive and uncritical support of Nazi race policies, mainline [orthodox] eugenicists had made their own standing in the United States partly dependent on the reputation of Nazi Germany. As Nazism grew more unpopular with the American public, mainline eugenicists were no longer able to distance themselves from Nazi race policies" [Kühl; 1994; 82].

Popular accounts of the eugenics movement have also given the same interpretation of events. An article about eugenics on the PBS web-site argues that "the eugenics craze was already fading when the horrors of institutionalized eugenics revealed in Nazi Germany... doused it entirely as a movement" [1999. PBS; 2].
If it is possible to characterise the beliefs of a whole nation regarding another, then views of Nazism and its eugenic policies from the USA went through three phases. From 1933 to the Nuremberg Laws of September 1935, there was support for a large amount of Nazi policy and a ‘turning a blind eye’ to the rest (indeed, support for Nazi policy even came from people like German émigrés Goldschmidt and Fraenkel who had suffered under Nazism). From 1935 to the Reichskristallnacht of November 1938 there was period of ambivalence, but still mostly silence. Thirdly, from 1938 onwards there was a rapid build up of condemnation and a total rejection of Nazism. So in the context of American eugenics and Nazi Germany 1933 isn’t necessarily the critical year. It was late 1935 onwards (or possibly slightly later) that was the important period. Edward Larson argues that “Nazi abuses of eugenics had barely begun in 1935” [Larson; 1995; 146].

Despite the existence of competing understandings of events, whether one accepts Kevles’ or Allen’s interpretation, Nazism appears as a factor in the decline of American eugenics. (“The barbarousness of Nazi policies eventually provoked a powerful anti-eugenic reaction” [Kevles; 1995; 118]. Eugenics’ “decline may be attributable to a number of factors, not the least of which was the growth of the Nazi eugenics” programme [Allen; 1976; 120]). The Kevles timeline shows the mainline group dominant until the early 1930s (although under attack from geneticists and others), followed by the emergence of reform eugenics. In the Nazi period the mainline group died off for a number of reasons (including Nazism), while the reform group tried to defend an abstract notion of eugenics from the discredit wrought by Nazi eugenics. The Allen time-line suggests that the old movement dominated until 1925, when the new movement emerged. They ran in tandem until the end of the 1930s when the old movement reached closure (partly due to Nazism). The new group went on to develop fields like population control and human genetics. This chapter argues that both of these are wrong. The orthodox and racial groups had effectively expired by 1933. The reform group, which had emerged in the mid to late-1920s, voluntarily vacated the eugenics field through the 1930s, taking parts of the old ideology with them into their chosen new areas.
Elazar Barkan speaks briefly about the shift from what I have termed orthodox and racial eugenics towards reform positions. He doesn’t see the explanations of the changes that had been offered before publication of his book as convincing. He suggests that “the subtle internal politics in the eugenics movement during the years between 1929 and 1933 ought to be the focus of any reconstruction of the shift” [Barkan; 1992; 272]. This chapter is broader than the one suggested by Barkan, but nevertheless events inside American eugenics and its organisations are central to this work. Relations between individuals and organisations within the movement, as well as relations with outside factors like the economy and the mainstream scientific community are where the explanations of eugenics’ demise will be found, rather than in the obvious, but irrelevant, area of events in Germany.
(ii) SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS

The scientific (and social scientific) opposition to orthodox and racial eugenics was four-fold. Firstly, there was the advancing knowledge of genetics which worked against it. Secondly, there were the direct attacks from anthropologists and social scientists like Franz Boas and others, especially on racial aspects of eugenics. Thirdly, there were the question marks over intelligence testing and psychometrics which had in the past done so much to support eugenics. Finally, there was the acknowledgement that the environment and social conditions played a significant role in human development.

This all contributed to the growth of reform eugenics and the destruction of orthodox and racial eugenics. Scientific changes cannot provide a total explanation of the history of eugenics, because although eugenics was a science in the 1920s and 1930s (rather than a pseudo-science or political ideology) it had such strong non-scientific dimensions that other factors must necessarily have been in play (internalist and externalist factors). Garland Allen summarises this suggestion, as put forward by Ernan McMullin: "a debate that is nonepistemic (that is, nonscientific) to begin with cannot really be closed by the resolution of epistemic (that is, substantive, scientific, or technical) arguments, however powerful they may be" [Allen; 1987; 170]. Following these debates on science are sections on religion, birth control and economics.

• Genetics

In the 1920s evidence from the often aloof genetics community reached wider debates, and began to undermine orthodox and racial eugenics in particular. Many of these scientific arguments had existed for a considerable time but had failed to reach the general debate surrounding eugenics, or be used to oppose eugenics. (Philip Reilly generously suggests that this is because geneticists were simply too busy to be involved in debates on genetics and humans, rather than plant and
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*Drosophila* (fruit fly) genetics [Reilly; 1991; 112]). Through the 1920s relations between genetics and eugenics became increasingly strained. Kenneth Ludmerer claims that it was during the First World War that geneticists broke with eugenics. He argues that there was a "two stage repudiation", with a decline of interest in eugenics and occasional criticism from 1915 to 1923, followed by years of sustained attack well into the 1930s [Ludmerer; 1969; 338]. This is simply not correct as evidenced by the synchronising of the 1921 and 1932 congresses of genetics and eugenics and the fact that it wasn’t until 1939 that geneticists passed a resolution formally opposing eugenics, racism and Nazism. It is my belief that the period 1926-1932 was the important one in the relationship of genetics and eugenics, although the evidence goes back a long way before this. In May 1928 the front page of *Eugenical News* commented on recent criticism and stated that "it is a serious matter when leading students of heredity such as Bateson, Castle, Morgan, Jennings and Pearl attack the principles and programme of Eugenics" [EugN; XIII (May 1928); 61]. The attacks listed over four and a half pages are from 1925 to the end of 1927. Three of the four Americans named (Bateson was British), and many others still broadly supported some version of eugenics and certainly accepted many of its underlying assumptions long after Ludmerer claims geneticists had broken with the movement (Ludmerer’s assertion is correct for Morgan, who broke with eugenics during the First World War). In Europe the ambivalence of geneticists was mirrored in men like Johannsen and Baur whose substantial contributions to genetics did not dampen their enthusiasm for eugenics.

Work on the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* by T H Morgan and his colleagues - Muller, Bridges and Sturtevant - at Columbia University had shown that given characteristics were not necessarily determined by single gene-pairs - eugenics had always depended on what it termed the unit character theory of inheritance. If traits were determined by a number of genes then accurate prediction became more complicated and less reliable. This called into question categorisations like feeblemindedness. If intelligence was distributed on a normal bell-curve, and was thus a continuum, it was highly unlikely that an arbitrarily chosen point would reflect a
genetic change. The category of feeble-mindedness was an either/or (i.e. unit character), while intelligence was distributed on a smooth curve [Barker; 1989; 355]. Furthermore, before the war the work of Wilhelm Johannsen in Denmark had shown that one set of genetic characteristics (a genotype) produces a spread of physical characteristics (phenotypes), thus demonstrating the interaction of heredity and environment. Without a simple form of inheritance and with environmental input, the solutions offered by eugenics would be irrelevant. (Raymond Pearl rated Johannsen’s work alongside Mendel’s, and used it to attack orthodox eugenicists for failing to recognise that “heredity does not mean that like produces like” [Pearl; 1927; 258 & 261]).

As well as their belief in the influence of environment, geneticists (and reform eugenicists) were sceptical of just how many traits were genetic in origin or had a genetic component (whether one or more genes were involved). Until the late 1930s orthodox eugenics still claimed that almost all traits were genetic in origin. When it was closed in 1939 the ERO was still recording information regarding traits such as ‘holding a grudge’ and ‘loyalty’ for genetic research. The committee found the ERO’s work to be “unsatisfactory for the study of human genetics” [Allen; 1986; 252]. These were the kind of traits that geneticists and reform eugenicists had long ago left to non-genetic research in sociology and psychology and found it embarrassing that eugenicists still believed they were of genetic origin. These and thousands of other characteristics had first been listed as unit characters in Davenport’s Trait Book [ERO Bulletin 6; 1912]. If so many characteristics were genetically determined the work of August Weismann showing that genes could not be changed by environment (Lamarck’s inheritance of acquired characteristics), all but ruled out the environment as a factor in human development and change.

There had long been genetic research which suggested that breeding out defectives would be a slow process - even assuming that the target defect was wholly genetic and dependent on a single gene. The separate work of the Briton G H Hardy and the German Wilhelm Weinberg demonstrated in the 1908 Hardy-Weinberg law that
“eliminating of a trait from a population is an extraordinarily long and complex process and thus belies eugenicists’ claims that breeding for or against a particular trait is an easy task” [Ludmerer; 1969; 347]. As early as the First World War Hardy’s work had been used by Reginald Punnett to show that reducing feeble-mindedness from a hypothetical 3/1,000 to 1/100,000 by sterilisation, would take 8,000 years (or over 250 generations). This assumed that feeble-mindedness was caused by a single recessive gene) [JofH; 8 (1917); 465].

Ludmerer claims that these developments were the cause of geneticists disillusionment with eugenics in the period up to 1915. Geneticists, however, largely remained supporters of eugenics at this time, and scientific knowledge was not sufficient to dampen the enthusiasm of many. A large number of geneticists in many countries remained active in eugenics well into the 1930s - Muller, Haldane, Jennings, Little, Johannsen, East etc. More remained interested or very low key supporters. The obvious question, which is outside of this dissertation, is how did they reconcile the tension of what they must have known about genetics with their support for eugenics.

Discoveries in genetics remained largely ineffectual in combating eugenics, partly because of the different ways that geneticists and eugenicists defined their positions within society. Geneticists such as Morgan saw themselves as working on a value-free and neutral science, and while having private doubts about the growing eugenics movement, believed that a public involvement in debates about eugenics and social policy would compromise their perceived neutrality and was outside the scope of their position. When Boas started campaigning against eugenics and scientific racism, scientists like Morgan and Pearl argued against these attempts to influence anything other than pure sciences. Earlier, when Morgan resigned from involvement in eugenics, he told Davenport that “I have been entirely out of sympathy with their method of procedure... the reckless statements, and the

* For a fuller discussion of the relationship of Morgan and eugenics see Garland Allen’s 1975 article “Genetics, Eugenics and Class Struggle” in Genetics.
unreliability of a good deal that is said”. Yet he still believed that “if they want to do this sort of thing, well and good; I have no objection... I have no desire to make a fuss” [CBDP1; Morgan to Davenport; 18-i-1915]. (Morgan seems to have been influenced by Bateson in his opinions and he maintained a very mildly eugenic vision that probably made his views compatible with that part of reform eugenics which eventually went into human genetics [e.g. CBDP1; Morgan to Henry Osborn; 14-vi-1920]). The dilemma for geneticists was a long standing one, outlined by Raymond Pearl, when he launched the first serious attack on eugenics from within the movement. He argued that “no scientific man ever likes to admit that he is engaged in enterprises which savor in the smallest degree of propaganda” [Pearl; 1927; 260].

Eugenics, by its very nature ‘applied biology' was a science in which involvement in social questions was integral [Pearl 1908; 9818]. Eugenicists were not shy of stepping outside of perceived value-free science, into propaganda, although many tried to keep a clear distinction between the two. Men like W E Castle, Irving Fisher, Herbert Spencer Jennings, Aleš Hrdlicka, Edward East and E G Conklin, and even Davenport and Laughlin bridged the gap between academia and involvement in public affairs. All worked in universities (or scientific centres) and campaigned for eugenic policies. (Davenport was more sceptical about campaigning for specific policies and believed that his role was in educating the public on eugenic matters, telling Charles Goethe that the ERO “was organised for research and not for propaganda [CBDP1; Davenport to Goethe; 24-iv-1924]). So scientists, and geneticists in particular, who had never been supportive of eugenics would find it harder to campaign against it, than those who had once supported it and thus had already used scientific research in campaigning on social issues. This difference between geneticists and eugenicists was reflected in their publications. While eugenicists published much of their work in popular magazines, geneticists (and other opponents of eugenics) used special interest and technical journals [Allen; 1987; 182].
It is this difference in relationship to involvement in public or social debate which makes it hard to characterise geneticists’ attitudes to eugenics. Ludmerer’s phases attribute a widespread change of heart and full-scale rejection of eugenics by the mid 1920s. The reality is a little more complicated. In the period up to around 1920 geneticists were largely in favour of eugenics. From the early 1920s to 1927 there were incidental attacks. Geneticists did not launch full-scale critiques of eugenics and often did not mention it by name. They merely tried to correct inaccurate interpretations of scientific knowledge. The work of Jennings, Morgan, Castle, Muller and others, dealt with details of genetic knowledge. Castle challenged the idea that race crossing was dangerous by re-examining Mjöen’s work with rabbits. Castle argued that it was impossible to say anything with certainty in biological terms regarding any particular instance of race crossing [JofH; 15 (1924) 365]. Herbert Spencer Jennings attacked the idea of unit character inheritance in *Prometheus or Biology and the Advancement of Man* [Jennings; 1925; 15-16]. From 1927 work like Pearl’s “Biology of Superiority” began to seek a full scale re-evaluation of the scientific basis of eugenics and engaged in an open debate with the movement by name. From 1927 onwards the debate was a more serious one with geneticists and other scientists no longer simply concerned with the presentation of genetic knowledge, but also with the social implications and uses of science. Most of those who carried out both the ‘incidental’ and ‘engaged’ debates still accepted the aims of eugenics and accepted its underlying assumptions. They were merely trying to redirect or reconceptualise the movement and make clear what fell within and what without the remit of science. Raymond Pearl asserted bluntly in “The Biology of Superiority” that “the orthodox are going contrary to the best established facts of genetical science” [Pearl; 1927; 266].

Kenneth Ludmerer has argued that geneticists were shocked by the eugenicists’ “apparent endorsement of the race theories of Nazi Germany, [and] reacted against the movement by renouncing it”. This seems unlikely to be true, as the rejection of eugenics by geneticists was not that straightforward or that late, and they only formally rejected Nazism and eugenics in 1939. Thus neither the scientific rejection,
nor the formal rejection coincided with the revealing of Nazi eugenics. Although many geneticists had ‘engaged’ debate with orthodox and racial eugenics since the later 1920s, on scientific grounds, the reform group contained a number of prominent geneticists, who often supported aspects of Nazi policy. Reform eugenicists, geneticists and other scientists were in no hurry to publicly reject Nazism and its racial science. Criticism of orthodox and racial eugenics positions does not appear to have grown after 1933 and nor does Nazism seem to have especially informed geneticists’ work or debates. Geneticists were no more eager than any other group of scientists to publicly condemn Nazism. It was 1938 when some geneticists signed the Scientists’ Manifesto and 1939 when geneticists condemned eugenics and Nazism at their International Congress, in the Geneticists’ Manifesto. L C Dunn seems to have been one geneticist who took an early stand against Nazism. His letters, however, also condemn large parts of American eugenics and it is unclear whether Nazism helped shape his views or was simply another example of the “perversion” of science [see Dunn’s letters in Ludmerer; 1969; 359]. One of the few pieces of evidence offered by Kevles for the effect of Nazism on American eugenics is the fact that the Carnegie Institution of Washington’s committee examining the ERO added to the end of its second report (see page 199) that human genetics work should not be carried out under the eugenics banner due to events in Nazi Germany [Kevles; 1995; 199]. L C Dunn was on this committee, and he is one of the few people who stands out as a strong opponent of Nazism. It seems probable, that this statement was added at Dunn’s request and did not represent any deeply felt or widespread fear of the impact or direction of Nazism by the committee. Whether this is correct or not (and it is merely speculation), it remains true that the statement was an add on to the committee’s report and the ERO’s fate was sealed anyway.

Looking at the scientists who signed the Geneticists’ Manifesto, they do not represent the older generations of American geneticists, but rather British geneticists and American geneticists whose names would be made largely in the post-war world. The total list of signatures is: Crew, Haldane, Harland, Hogben,
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Huxley, Muller, Needham, Child, David, Dahlberg, Dobzhansky, Emerson, Gordon, Hammond, Huskins, Landauer, Plough, Price, Schultz, Steinberg and Waddington. This was out of a total of almost 200 American delegates. The names of the 1920s and 1930s are mostly absent, whether geneticists or eugenicist-geneticists (Muller being the notable exception). The programme condemned racism, Nazism and eugenics only by implication, but explicitly promoted birth control and social improvements and was generally left leaning. The German, Hungarian, Swiss and Scandinavian delegations left the Congress and theRussians had “withdrawn”, by the time the Geneticists’ Manifesto was signed. [Geneticists’ Manifesto and various notes at JofH; 30 (1939); 371-373].

Eugenicists had always seen eugenics and genetics (and biology) as intertwined. Mark Haller claims that to some extent geneticists steered clear of studying man, while eugenicists were perceived by many to be the human geneticists [Haller; 1963; 167]. Davenport often asserted that “eugenics is largely a branch of genetics”, and Henry Fairfield Osborn argued that “genetics is the foundation of eugenics” [CBDP1; Davenport to Jennings; 17-iv-1920 & Henry Osborn to Davenport; 22-xi-1920]. In institutional terms too they were often indistinguishable. Until the 1920s the American Genetic Association was dominated by the eugenics movement. Its immigration committee had five members, including Irving Fisher, Robert DeCourcey Ward and Prescott Hall (Irving Fisher wasn’t even a geneticist) [JofH; 10 (1919); 68]. Paul Popenoe was editor of its journal - the Journal of Heredity - until 1917 and was a key contributor until the late 1930s. The founding committee of the journal also reflected this confusion, as it contained Davenport, Castle, Conklin, East, Jennings, Morgan and Pearl [see the opening page of any volume of the successor journal Genetics]. Eugenicists were aware of the significance of having ‘serious’ geneticists onboard. The Second International Congress of Eugenics specifically tried to solicit papers from each of the Drosophila group - Morgan, Muller, Bridges and Sturtevant [CBDP1; Davenport to Henry Osborn; 6-xii-1920]. It was also proposed that the congress should pay William Bateson to attend, despite his known opposition to all forms of eugenics [CBDP1; Davenport to Henry Osborn; 10-ii-1921]. Even after their
opposition to orthodox and racial eugenics was well known privately men like Pearl and Morgan, and later Jennings, were regularly asked to participate in eugenics' activities, such as being on the AES advisory board or being asked to run state branches of the AES [CBDP2; Eugenics Committee of the US; 26-x-1923 & AES No.3 & AESP; Pearl]. Orthodox eugenicists continued to assert that their work was compatible with and even part of the current thinking in genetics into the 1930s. Davenport's early work *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics* had been something of a benchmark text in genetics when it was published. William Provine says that it "contained almost all that was then known of human genetics" [Provine; 1973; 791]. By 1930 he was flying in the face of rapidly advancing genetic knowledge when he wrote that "geneticists... in the last 25 years, have come pretty generally to the conclusion that inbreeding... is not injurious" [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 20-xii-1930]. By still supporting this idea Davenport could continue to promote his long standing belief in 'Aristogenesis' - that biological improvement amongst the best strains could be encouraged by inbreeding from a small group [EugN; III (Sept 1918); 71]. (It shouldn't be imagined that the relationship was entirely one way. Kevles and Hood argue that "some fraction of [eugenics]... contributed usefully to the early study of human genetics... But the fraction was rather small" [Kevles & Hood; 1992; 8]. For example it was work at the ERO that inspired Morgan's ground-breaking *Drosophila* work [Allen; 1986; 231]).

Within the academic world there were reasons to suppose that eugenics would decline. It wasn't just the Boas group who attacked eugenics, although they were certainly the most significant group. There, were other academics who opposed eugenics, such as Harvard's Lester Ward. In structural terms within the university system eugenics lost out in the period between the wars. Eugenics had seen itself as an amalgam of parts of a number of fields - from anthropology to zoology - and had taken this as being a strength. In the post-war years Frederick Osborn recognised this as a problem for eugenics, suggesting that eugenics' downfall was partly because "the broad field of eugenics belonged to no one field of scientific enquiry" [AESP; History of the AES; 4], or as Paul Weindling calls eugenics it was "a
heterogeneous agglomeration of sciences" [Weindling; 1989; 321]. In post-World War One America academia underwent a period of specialisation, fragmentation and institutionalisation, with subjects like psychology, social anthropology and sociology establishing themselves as separate, well defined social science disciplines. The trend emerged too within disciplines, so that genetics, biology and so on fragmented into clearly demarcated areas. Eugenics by contrast remained an amalgam and was dependent upon teaching and research in departments of medicine, biology (including genetics) and various social sciences. In 1914 of the 44 colleges offering eugenics courses sixteen were in zoology departments, eleven in biology departments and eleven in sociology departments and six in other departments. In most of these it was also taught with genetics [JofH; 5 (1914); 186]. (Germany did not reach this number of college courses until the end of 1932 when there were at least forty eugenics courses available at German universities [Friedlander; 1995; 13]). In this capacity eugenics was necessarily vulnerable to changes within a number of disciplines. There is reason to believe then that even by 1918 the broad approach of eugenics was, for the USA, an anachronism as a research or teaching discipline in American education. Edward East in 1923 used his book Mankind at the Crossroads to urge the reuniting of the newly specialised departments, as this would allow eugenics to flourish properly [East; 1923; 4].

As other disciplines advanced, eugenics was a casualty of new methodologies, changing attitudes and other people’s decisions on departmental funding. (The social sciences along with genetics would further undermine the orthodox and racial eugenicists’ assumption that alcoholism, pauperism, feeble-mindedness, delinquency, criminality and many other traits could be viewed in purely biological terms). It is perhaps no coincidence then, that the parts of eugenics which survived for longest - the ERA, the ERO and the AES - were the parts with least formal connection to these other academic fields. Jonathan Harwood states that “to be institutionally dependent on another discipline is to be intellectually dependent as well” [Harwood; 1987; 413]. (In Germany by contrast there was no significant institutionalising or fragmentation into new academic fields in the post-World War
One period. The KWG had been organised to support new disciplines like eugenics which could not be organised in the normal research institutions, meaning that German eugenics remained relatively free of contact with conventional science. Instead a spiral developed where eugenics only interacted with other KWG areas like psychiatry and physical anthropology, which were themselves saturated with Rassenhygiene thinking. This led the KWG and KWI to be progressively more eugenics oriented. The development of human genetics, like many other sciences, was stunted by its redirecting towards serving the Nazi regime's Rassenhygiene and racial-ideological priorities). In the same way that American eugenicists were “institutionally dependant”, they were also dependant in other ways. American eugenicists rarely found themselves in influential positions in terms of political position, or within public health administration. In this way they always needed to influence other people or organisations into adopting eugenic policies. Their German counterparts, especially in the Weimar years, were much more likely to find themselves in positions where they directly affected public policy, for example in state medical bureaucracies.

There is good reason for believing that advances in the field of genetics and science generally helped to undermine eugenic thinking and bring down the old-style movement, partly by limiting the scope of scientific concern. One has to be careful about seeing scientific knowledge as a sufficient condition. William Provine illustrates this point by writing that he “interviewed or wrote to ten prominent geneticists who worked on human genetics between 1930 and 1950. Not one believed that new evidence on race crossing was the primary reason why geneticists changed their minds about the effects of race crossing” [Provine; 1973; 796]. Others like Ludmerer have also argued that there was a two way dialogue, with external factors influencing the course of genetics [Ludmerer; 1969; 338]. If this was true for those working within a scientific field then it can only be a more pertinent point regarding those outside - like philanthropists and politicians - who also changed their minds on eugenic issues in general over this period. These arguments mirror the suggestion by David Barker, regarding the beginning of eugenics, that there is “good
reason to believe that the quest for a genetic theory was undertaken in part to establish the legitimacy of policies already in force but vulnerable to the criticism that they had jumped the gun" [Barker; 1989; 350].

• The Boas Group
While reform eugenicists and many geneticists were broadly sympathetic to the original aims and principles of orthodox eugenics and only sought to reconceptualise the programme along more scientific lines, there was also a scientific and social scientific group apparently opposing eugenics in its entirety. The Boas group is known after Franz Boas, a German-Jewish American anthropologist at Columbia University. Boas had been born and educated in Germany but subsequently worked in the USA. His academic power-base was his position as head of the anthropology department at Columbia University, a post which he held from 1899 to 1937. In this post he tried to introduce far greater scientific method to anthropology and move away from unsubstantiated claims and social and ethnic bias - Edward Beardsley calls him “an aggressive professional” [Beardsley; 1973; 55]. Until the end of the World War One Boas was an almost lone academic voice in his fight against eugenics and racial science in general. Following the war he established a group of sympathetic academics and students around himself at Columbia. Elazar Barkan distinguishes two generations of the Boas group (or Boasians as he terms them) - an older group who reached their peak of activity in the 1920s and a younger group who studied under him and were active in the 1930s. The latter include Otto Klineberg, Melville Herskovits and Margaret Mead. According to Beardsley, Boas had publicly stated his views on race and the environment at least twelve times before the First World War [Beardsley; 1973; 60].

Boas’ opposition to eugenics and racism and his influential position led Madison Grant to spend years on an unsuccessful campaign to have Boas removed from his...
post. Eugenicists sided with Grant in his smear campaign. Grant accused Boas' of bullying scientists so that they would not stand up for the truth, as perceived by Grant [CBDP1; Grant to Davenport; 16-ii-1917]. In 1925 William McDougall - Professor of Psychology at Harvard and racial eugenicist - placed Grant and Boas in direct opposition to each other, telling the Galton Society that Grant and Stoddard were "serious students" of race psychology, while their politically motivated opponents were a group comprising "many sociologists and Bolsheviks; also intellectual Jews" [EugN; X (iii-1925); 30-1]. The most common complaint of racial eugenicists was that their opponents were Jewish and/or socialist [e.g. CBDP1; Grant to Davenport; 2-iv-1917].

Although reform eugenics and the Boas group together undermined orthodox and racial eugenics, there was hostility between them. Boas' attempts to organise a broad opposition to racial aspects of eugenics failed because people such as Herbert Spencer Jennings saw his ideas as politically rather than scientifically motivated (this was why he refused Boas' request to draft a rejection of Nazism [HSJP2; Jennings to Boas; 13-vii-1933]). Tensions were heightened when Boas tried to organise a movement against Nazism, aspects of which some reform eugenicists continued to support until the late 1930s. (The person in Germany who did most work to undermine racial science and could have come close to the role of Boas, was Boas' old tutor Rudolf Virchow, but he had died in 1902.) The importance of Boas rests not only on his ground breaking research - aspects of eugenics had already been undermined by others - but from his willingness to work against eugenics within a scientific, political and social context, rather than just in the academic world. Thus he was prepared to challenge eugenics on all fronts and through channels that were previously seen as outside the scope of science. He was one of the few scientists, outside of eugenics, who was prepared to be involved in social and political issues and had been sceptical of eugenics from its very outset in the USA at the turn of the century.
One of Boas' lines of attack regarded the area of environment. Boas pointed out that the eugenicists' dogmatic belief in heredity had blinded them to the influence of the environment. Throughout the period Boas' work attempted to demonstrate that what eugenicists saw as heredity, especially in the area of race, could as easily be explained in environmental terms (usually including prejudice, poverty and education) [e.g. Boas; 1916]. Boas also strongly believed that strictly scientific investigations would prove him correct on racial matters and while others bemoaned the dangers of race-crossing Boas was calling from the early years of the century for proper studies. These were slow in coming as has already been noted. In the latter 1920s two investigations of importance began.

The IFEO organised its first full investigation of race crossing under Davenport and Fischer (see pages 86-7). Even into the 1930s this orthodox / Rassenhygiene committee was using intelligence testing work to argue that there were undoubted differences in the mental ability of races [EugR; Oct 1934; 218]. Despite his opposition to eugenics, Boas saw engagement as his best method. In some ways he went to the heart of eugenics through his good contacts with Davenport and some others within the orthodox camp. In the late 1920s he participated in the Committee On A Study Of The American Negro, with Charles Davenport and others. To some extent his strategy worked. When the committee published its four page list of proposals in 1931 they defined the essential question as "how far race mixture and race contact may affect our civilisation" and proposed using a range of methods including "full consideration of the environmental conditions" - this must have been a big compromise for Davenport, the arch-hereditarian and opponent of environment. The committee mixed the Boas and Davenport camps and included Davenport's colleague Morris Steggarda and Boas' colleagues Otto Klineberg and Melville Herskovits. The committee also included more maverick elements such as E A Hooton and Aleš Hrdlicka [CBDP1; Committee On A Study Of The American Negro]. (Hooton's ambiguous positions include the fact that while he was trying to organise a condemnation of Nazi racism for Boas, he was still subscribing to a number of German journals, including a government sanctioned one edited by the racial
anthropologist von Eickstedt [CBDP1; Hooton to Davenport; 16-ii-1935]. He was also a member and regular participant at the racial eugenicist Galton Society. Both Hooton and Hrdlicka were still on the advisory board of the AES [Huntington; 1935; vi]). Later on in the 1930s Boas again formed a committee to investigate “racial behaviour”. This committee was free of the orthodox eugenicists but contained younger eugenicists like Frederick Osborn and Harry Shapiro as well as Hooton. It included a number of people sympathetic to Boas’ general outlook including Dunn and Klineberg [Barkan; 1988; 197].

The relationship of Boas to eugenics is more complicated than has so far been presented. His opposition to eugenics was not so clear cut as many writers have presented it. As well as working on committees together Boas and Davenport kept up a lengthy and civil personal correspondence, in which Boas was able to voice his criticisms of Davenport’s work [see for example CBDP1; Boas to Davenport; 3-iv-1929]. Boas was listed as one of the 338 “active members” of the Third International Congress of Eugenics [TICE; 1934; 513]. He must have seen potential in the institutions of the orthodox movement as from 1924 his will left his papers to Davenport’s ERO [CBDP1; Boas No.’s 1 & 2]. The same is true of Morgan, who after leaving the eugenics movement due to its poor standards, made two small donations to Davenport’s ERO [CBDP1; Morgan to Davenport; 25-v-1915 & 13-iv-1917].

The work of Boas and those around him demonstrates that the evidence against eugenics and racial and social prejudice on scientific grounds was available for those who wanted it long before 1933. The writing of articles and carrying out of research was only one side of Boas’ work. The other side consisted of trying to organise formal rejections of racism and Nazi race theories (although not of Nazism in general). The attempt that he orchestrated through Hooton in 1935 was wholly unsuccessful as were his other efforts in this period, even to get a mild condemnation. He failed to interest Pearl, Hrdlicka or Jennings in attempts to condemn Nazi racism at this time. Although the 1935 Nuremberg Laws brought
about some serious suspicion of Nazism, it was only after the resurgence of militant Nazi anti-Semitism and racism in 1938 (e.g. *Reichskristallnacht*) that American scientists were prepared to go public in their criticism of Nazism. It was in late 1938 that the Scientists Manifesto was published, in which over 1,200 scientists condemned scientific racism. Similarly it was only in 1939, on the days that war broke out, that the Geneticists’ Manifesto at the Seventh International Congress of Genetics in Edinburgh was passed giving an implied condemnation of eugenics, racism and Nazi policy. Such late condemnation by anything other than a small group of campaigners reveals something of the view of Nazism in the scientific community at this time. By the time that scientists began formal condemnations of Nazi policy, orthodox eugenics was long dead and the reform project had largely split and changed direction. Boas commented in 1937 that for scientists “the whole question of an intimate relation between race and behaviour is dead. This, however, does not mean that in the general attitude of the American people the question is dead” [quoted in Barkan; 1988; 203]. (It also does not mean that racism on a cultural basis was dead, as evidenced by the views of Pearl, Castle and many others). Thurman Rice had made a similar point some years before this when he wrote that “human performance always lags behind human knowledge. The majority of physicians are now practising the knowledge discovered five or ten years ago, [while] the public is largely using the medical philosophy of thirty or forty years ago” [Rice; 1929; 316]. (As the example of geneticists and eugenicists demonstrates, even scientists could not be relied on to utilise current scientific knowledge in framing their views).

The excuses of some scientists and their behaviour reveal a certain ambivalence on Nazi eugenics at this time. Raymond Pearl seems to have been somewhat ambivalent on this point because although he argued against taking a role in what he regarded as non-scientific matters such as eugenics or anti-Nazism, he became a leading propagandist on birth control. Garland Allen argues that after the mid-1920s he became “one of the leading spokespersons in the United States on the issue of population growth and “overpopulation”’’ [Allen; 1980; 22]. This suggests
that when it suited him, Pearl could see his way to involvement in what were not
strictly scientific matters - Nazism then, was simply not a major concern for him.
There is not so much tension in the position taken by Jennings, but it is worth noting
that while he refused Boas’ request to condemn Nazism, he had previously, and
would later contribute to the debate on science and race in *Prometheus or Biology
and the Advancement of Man* (1925), *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (1930)
and *Scientific Aspects of the Race Problem* (1941, edited by Jennings) [plus HSJP2;
Jennings to Boas; 13-vii-1933]. T H Morgan, who had been so reluctant to be drawn
into eugenic or racial propaganda on either side did occasionally allow himself to be
drawn into public debate. Indeed one of the important early attacks on the racial
dimensions of eugenics came from Morgan, in his 1925 book *Evolution and
Genetics*, in which he concluded a section on genetics and race with the paragraph:

> If within each human social group the geneticist finds it impossible to
discover, with any reasonable certainty, the genetic basis of behavior,
the problems must seem extraordinarily difficult when groups are
contrasted with each other where the differences are obviously
connected not only with material advantages and disadvantages
resulting from location, climate, soil, and mineral wealth, but with
traditions, customs, religions, taboos, conventions, and prejudices. A
little goodwill might seem more fitting in treating these complicated
questions than the attitude adopted by some of the modern race-
propagandists.

[quoted in Pearl; 1927; 262]

Despite this attack on race science in the mid-1920s, Morgan, like most other
scientists, remained silent on the topic through much of the 1930s.

Boas’ lack of success in organising opposition to Nazism accords with the view that
Nazism was not unpopular in the USA until the later 1930s, and it was not seen as a
important enough for scientists to step outside of their perceived value-free work.
Stefan Kühl pin-points the highpoint of German eugenics to the 1935 International
Congress for Population Science in Berlin. [Kühl; 1994; 32-3].

- The Environment
As opponents in science and other areas destroyed much of the ground upon which
the rationale for eugenics was built, and the reform eugenics movement took hold, a
change in the overall brief of the movement in the USA occurred. Reform
eugenicists began to bring in the hated enemy of orthodox and racial eugenicists -
the environment. In the early days of the movement American eugenicists, much
more than their German counterparts, saw environmental work (euthenics) as
outside the scope of eugenics. The environment was seen as a poor second in
promoting human welfare - real benefit could only be brought by changes in heredity
and selection (this included the cases of diseases such as pellagra and tuberculosis
which had already been proved to be linked to the environment, specifically
poverty).

Henry Fairfield Osborn wrote in 1916 in the preface to Madison Grant's *The Passing
of the Great Race* that environmental changes “have an immediate, apparent and
temporary influence, while heredity has a deeper subtle and permanent influence”
in Grant; 1922; vii]. Grant himself called a belief in the role of the environment
“fatuous” [Grant; 1922; 16]. In the opening lines of a 1908 lecture Alexander
Graham Bell, a leader of the early movement made it clear that eugenics was not
concerned with the environment [Bell; 1908; 119-23]. Orthodox eugenicists saw their
belief in heredity over environment as confirmation of their superior racial and
intellectual position and of their forward thinking. Davenport lamented the fact: “how
rare are the persons interested in eugenics and human heredity, as contrasted with
those who would like to spend millions in improving conditions of life”. Madison
Grant responded “we should do everything we can to impair the influence of the
environmentalists... we have against us the natural antagonism of all those masses
or races who, conscious of their own inferiority, bitterly resent any claim of racial or
social superiority” [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 10-xii-1929 & Grant to Davenport;
12-xii-1929]. Yet Grant would use environmental arguments as it suited his purpose.
He wrote that Massachusetts produced fifty times as much White genius as Georgia
because of the “numbing presence in the South of a large stationary Negro
population”, who it appears could lower the intelligence of White people by their very proximity. [Grant; 1922; 99].

While many later eugenicists such as Frederick Osborn saw environmental improvement (euthenics) as either part of or complementary to eugenics, early eugenicists such as Laughlin and Davenport, conceding that it had a role, saw the environment mainly in terms of contributing to the counter-selectivity and degeneration that eugenics was trying to combat. In 1914 Laughlin wrote that:

It is held by some schools of social workers that better schools, better churches, better food, better clothing, better living and better social life will remedy almost any social inadequacy in individuals. The studies of this committee point strongly in the opposite direction. They prove conclusively that much social inadequacy is of a deep-seated biological nature, and can be remedied only by cutting off the human strains that produce it... It is the bolstering up of the defective classes by a beneficent society that constitutes the real menace to our blood, because it lowers the basis of parenthood.

[ERO Bulletin 10A; ii-1914; 54]

(The older generation of what would become reform eugenicists, such as Raymond Pearl, had in the early years also accepted the orthodox position. Pearl wrote that “the evidence indicates that mental and moral characters are inherited”, which by implication played down the significance of the environment on such characteristics [Pearl; 1908; 9821]). At the other end of the period Davenport was still condemning environmental improvements, “I think too much emphasis has been laid on housing and the standards of living. In my view, the high standard of living is one of the important causes of sterility in the United States today” [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 11-ix-1935]. His views brought him into direct conflict with the re-launched AES. Frederick Osborn and Ellsworth Huntington’s 1937 statement argued that “the children of the US must be born to parents who will provide the biological inheritance and the home conditions necessary for the development of character, physique and intelligence”. According to Frederick Osborn, Davenport and other “early eugenists” objected that this downplayed heredity in favour of environment [AESP; Frederick Osborn - History of the AES; 13].
Orthodox and racial eugenicists would dismiss as superficial and temporary the benefits of better housing and nutrition while at the same time viewing rural poverty and alcohol as contributing to the permanent deterioration of the ‘human seed stock’. Davenport had told the National Conference of Charities and Correction that social reform was pointless as “the only way to secure innate capacity is by breeding it” [quoted in Haller; 1963; 67]. Huntington and Whitney (who later came round to more environmentalist views) labelled as dysgenic such features of the environment as free school buses, washing machines, “vacuum sweepers”, electric sewing machines, cars, trams, heating, janitor services and telephones [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 138]. Such views of heredity and environment went to the core of orthodox and racial eugenics thinking, and impinged directly upon ideas of social and racial equality. Madison Grant saw heredity as the cause of supposed Black inferiority when he derided the “view that the Negro slave was an unfortunate cousin of the white man... it has taken us fifty years to learn that speaking English, wearing good clothes and going to school and to church do not transform a Negro into a white man.” [Grant; 1922; 16].

At the end of the 1920s and in the early 1930s there was a realisation, particularly amongst reform eugenicists that environmental improvement could be used for long lasting change. The view of the benefits and costs of good and bad environment began to accord with each other. Pauline Mazumdar highlights this, as does Robert Nye who states that “this development finally permitted contemporaries to imagine the environment as a positive and progressive influence in human change” - thus they were free to usefully promote environmental improvement. Mazumdar and Nye date the turning point to around 1930 citing Lancelot Hogben’s 1931 statement that the “increasing complexity of cultural achievement may proceed in human society independently of any change in man’s inborn equipment” [Nye; 1993; 697]. This timing appears to be a little late. Correspondence between Davenport and Rüdin, shows that Rüdin had previously noted “the strong trend toward the omnipotency [sic] of environment” in the USA [CBDP1; Davenport to Rüdin; 13-v-1930]. A report in the *Journal of Heredity* on the 1930 First International Congress of Mental
Hygiene describes the session on "Heredity and Mental Hygiene". Davenport and Rüdin were lone voices in support of genetic (unit character) bases for "mental disease". They were "met by a barrage of verbal brickbats and emotional smokescreens" by those who supported ideas of "intangible psychological and environmental factors" [JofH; 24 (1933); 122].

The introduction of environment in assessments and programmes of eugenics worked in two ways. Firstly, there was the question of whether environmental improvements - to housing, for example - could effect significant changes in populations and their eugenic worth. Secondly, there was the use of environmental factors to explain what many eugenicists would previously have explained in purely hereditary terms - crime, for example.

As early as 1928 Thurman Rice made a call to reconceptualise the whole programme including a change of name. He wrote that "racial hygiene is the science which undertakes to determine the natural and social laws governing the propagation of a healthy, sane, moral, happy, intelligent, industrious and progressive human race... it is more than eugenics which seeks to have the race well born, and it is more than eugenics which seeks to have it well nurtured" [Rice; 1929; 8-9]. Rice as others did a little later sought to integrate environmental and genetic (hereditary) concerns into a single movement.

Acknowledgement of the power of the environment was, however, used by many eugenicists to strengthen their calls for a eugenic programme. Samuel Holmes, a reform eugenicist was typical in declaring that "bad heredity makes bad environment and... good heredity makes good environment" [quoted in Chase; 1980; 308]. Frederick Osborn in 1940 suggested that there was a strong correlation between those with good heredity and those who provided a good environment [FOP; AES; 16-v-1940]. As the scientific rationale for sterilisation was eroded the argument was supplemented with the question "as to whether these classes are fitted to discharge the rather intricate responsibilities" of parenthood. This question circulated orthodox
and reform eugenics in the early 1930s. [JofH; 24 (1933); 121 & TICE; 1934; Robie; 202]. Leon Whitney argued that no mistakes were possible in eugenic sterilisation programmes because even if a given trait were not inherited, people exhibiting it, howsoever it was caused, could not provide a suitable environment to raise children in [Whitney; 1935; 105] (Hoche and Binding, using different reasons, had similarly argued that no mistakes would be possible in their scientifically and legally based euthanasia programme [Hoche and Binding; 1920; 37-40]). Eugenicists blamed bad home environments on bad heredity. It was not a new idea, however, as Laughlin had long ago argued that "bad ancestral germ-plasm will add to the degenerate hereditary gifts of its offspring a poor environment" [ERO Bulletin 10A; ii-1914; 54]. It the 1930s though the argument was useful to support a policy - sterilisation - whose scientific justification was being eroded. When the AES was relaunched by Frederick Osborn this kind of rationale became central to the new eugenics programme, although unlike their predecessors the reformers did also promote environmental improvements like better housing and nutrition.

A similar argument was used with regard to what were seen as positive traits. In discussing the idea of extra money paid for each child born to teachers, researchers and scientists, Frederick Osborn attempted to blur the importance of scientific evidence on heredity and environment. He argued that, "the problem/question is simple "do teaching and scientific work tend to run in family lines?" And put in this way the force of any facts in the study need not be weakened by the arguments as to whether the relationships which may be indicated are the result of "Nature" or whether they are the result of "Nurture"" [CBDP1; Frederick Osborn to Davenport; 14-xi-1929]. Davenport, like most orthodox eugenicists argued that environment was subordinate to and therefore less important than heredity: "what the external factors do is determined in a large degree by the internal factors upon which they act" [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 14-ii-1930].

Many within the orthodox camp simply never changed their views. Charles Davenport, for example, refused to acknowledge anything but a minimal role for the
environment, even after his retirement in 1934. Theodore Robie used a slightly more sophisticated argument to reject the environmental dimension. He suggested that while environment and heredity interacted in the development of "normal" people, with the feeble-minded and other defectives it was the heredity dimension that was the overwhelming factor [TICE; 1934; Robie; 201]. This argument, if accepted, left the orthodox sterilisation programme untouched.

As noted below in the section on Franz Boas many characteristics which eugenicists explained in purely hereditary terms could also be explained in environmental ones. Davenport’s often quoted discovery that love of the sea - *thalassophilia* - was caused by a sex-linked recessive gene still provides the clearest example of this. Davenport’s evidence was that seafarers were almost always men and that they often produced sons who also went to sea. While the older eugenicists (and organisations like the ERO) stuck to the idea that heredity accounted for all traits, reform eugenicists, geneticists and many others began to reject this. In 1924 for example Samuel Holmes rejected Laughlin’s idea that disproportionate levels of criminality and insanity amongst immigrants were caused by heredity. Instead he analysed the age distributions and argued that “most immigrants are over twenty years of age when they land and this itself would tend to swell their quota for insanity and crime” [HSJP1; Holmes to Jennings; 29-i-1924].

- **Intelligence Testing**

Until the later 1920s orthodox and racial eugenics and been strongly supported by psychometric and intelligence testing. It was from the work of Lewis Terman, Robert Yerkes, Carl Brigham and Henry Goddard in particular that eugenics had obtained much of its scientific credibility and each became deeply involved in eugenic work. Intelligence testing was important to both social and racial eugenics, with Yerkes’ test supplying data mainly on racial issues and Terman’s research and Goddard’s work in the Vineland Training School for Feeble-Minded Girls and Boys providing
information on feeble-mindedness and other mental traits. Large amounts of the evidence which justified the key eugenic policies of the USA - the 1924 Immigration Act and the eugenic sterilisation laws - came from intelligence testing. Their work was specifically cited in evidence to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization before the 1924 Immigration Act and at the 1927 court hearing of Buck versus Bell. Intelligence tests also bolstered other eugenic policies such as anti-miscegenation laws and eugenic marriage restrictions. The work of psychometricians had given a social scientific basis to the standard racial hierarchies and to simple inheritance of feeble-mindedness and other mental health problems. It was vital in giving numerical values on a linear scale to complex phenomena and thus allowed people to be ranked in simple hierarchies either as individuals or as groups. From before the First World War a close relationship between eugenicists and psychometricians developed. Advances in this field, as with genetics, would begin to undermine the credibility of previous intelligence testing work, especially the widely quoted army tests.

From early on psychometricians were unanimous in agreeing that immigrants and Blacks were mentally inferior to American born Whites, and that amongst Whites, Slavs, Italians and frequently Jews were inferior to Nordics and Anglo-Saxons. This had been shown by the early interpretations of Terman’s Stanford-Binet tests. Goddard had proven the high level of feeble-mindedness amongst immigrant groups (see page 93). Yerkes’ tests and the subsequent studies by a number of academics - Yerkes, Yoakum, Brigham, Terman and others - had proven the existence of racial hierarchies and caused alarm at the degeneration of average American intelligence. The findings of intelligence tests (especially the army tests) which demonstrated that nearly half of Americans would never reach a mental age higher than the average ten year old were loudly trumpeted in immigration debates, by both psychometricians and individuals like Laughlin and Stoddard. Such studies were

* For a detailed criticism of Goddard’s early work on feeble-mindedness, using the genetic knowledge of the time see Barker; 1989.
taken seriously enough to be repeatedly cited in work by eugenicists and others through the period from Davenport, to Whitney, to Perkins.

For a new area of science, intelligence testing became accepted extremely quickly - by scientists (including eugenicists), by business, the public and most importantly by legislators. Lewis Terman made reference to this in early 1919 [CBDP1; Terman to Davenport; 3-ii-1919]. Yerkes had been flooded with requests for details of his tests, and when he drew up his National Intelligence Test in 1919, it sold over 500,000 copies in less than a year [Kevles; 1995, 82]. Increasing numbers of schools, colleges and universities used intelligence tests to assess students. If intelligence testing had won so many supporters, then the conclusions drawn by researchers, many of them the tests' inventors, were by implication also accepted.

(Some eugenicists went so far as to question the wisdom of a democratic system in which mental ages were so low and allegedly only 4.5% of the population had an adult intelligence [Stoddard; 1922; 68]. It even prompted the book Is America Safe for Democracy? by William McDougall).

The leading psychometricians - Terman, Goddard, Yerkes and Brigham - were committed eugenicists and were undoubtedly anti-immigrant, in the mould of orthodox eugenicists, with personal connections to those in the movement, particularly Davenport and Laughlin. Robert Yerkes had been chair of the ERO's Committee on the Inheritance of Mental Traits, and Henry Goddard had been secretary of its Committee on the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness, from the committees' founding before the war [ERO Report 1; vi 1913; 9]. Eugenicists and psychometricians frequently published work in each others' journals and in support of each others' causes. At various points each of them had called for selective immigration restriction. When the AES was formed in 1922 Terman, Yerkes and Brigham all accepted places on its advisory board. Psychometricians supported eugenicists and eugenicists supported psychometricians. For years eugenicists had warned of the inferiority of south and east Europeans, and intelligence tests gave
them clear, indisputable scientific evidence of that inferiority. By 1924 they and their work were an integral part of the eugenics movement.

The Binet test which Terman had worked with to show the inherited, fixed lack of intelligence and ineducability of certain groups had been designed by Binet to measure achievement rather than potential. Otto Klineberg, the only psychologist in the Boas group [Barkan; 1992; 91] and Boas’ colleague at Columbia University, showed that psychometric testing was fundamentally flawed. Intelligence testing and Yerkes’ army tests in particular were shown not to measure innate intelligence. Klineberg demonstrated that scores in Yerkes’ test correlated to years spent in college, state of origin ranked by expenditure on education, length of time spent in the USA and whether English was the mother tongue or not. Such correlations pointed to the test simply measuring environmental factors, especially educational opportunity within the American system [Klineberg; 1935]. In the same way that there had long been some geneticists (such as Morgan and Bateson) who opposed eugenics, there were always, even at the height of eugenics in the early 1920s, those who questioned the validity of the findings of leading psychometricians. These opponents included academics like Margaret Mead as well as the New Republic journalist Walter Lippmann. It was Lippmann who summed up the contradiction of the psychometricians’ and eugenicists’ claims that the average ‘native born’ American had the IQ of a child under fourteen, with the statement that “the average adult intelligence cannot be less than the average adult intelligence” and that it was “as silly as if he [Stoddard] had written that the average mile was three quarters of a mile long” [quoted in Chase; 1980; 304]. The attack on the intelligence tests used in eugenics propaganda was based primarily on two ideas. On the one hand they attacked the concept of measuring intelligence at all, arguing that something as complicated as intelligence could not be brought down to a single numerical value, and on the other hand showing that intelligence tests thus far had only actually measured environmental factors such as social status and education.
Symbolic of the loss of faith, Carl Brigham, one of Yerkes' original army testers and an enthusiastic supporter of the work, publicly rejected his own work as fundamentally flawed. In his 1930 article “Intelligence Tests of Immigrant Groups”, he declared that the army tests could not be used to compare racial or national groups, and that the tests were largely based on education and familiarity with American culture. In short they were meaningless [Brigham; 1930; 158-65]. Stephen Jay Gould says that Brigham “apologised with an abjectness rarely encountered in scientific literature.” [Gould; 1997; 262]. A year earlier Brigham had suggested to Davenport that it was unbiased research that was needed and not politically motivated campaigning [CBDP1; Brigham to Davenport; 8-xii-1929]. Orthodox and racial eugenicists, like Whitney, Stoddard, Laughlin and others continued to cite the army tests, but should have been aware of the question marks over them. Brigham had presented a strong critique of his and others’ work on the army tests to the Galton Society and his paper was reprinted in Eugenical News - a journal with which both Laughlin and Whitney were closely associated at the time. The minutes include the statement that Brigham “stated that the discoveries of these inconsistencies in the army tests completely upset his previous analysis of the foreign born in the white draft” [EugN; XIII (May 1928); 67-9].

Like Brigham, Goddard published an article “Feeble-Mindedness: A Question of Definition” which poured doubt on the whole of his and others’ work, questioning the very conception of feeble-mindedness itself. His article highlighted the central tensions in the army tests and definitions of feeble-mindedness which would classify half of the USA and the vast majority of immigrants as feeble-minded [Goddard; 1928; 219-27]. (Goddard had in the past supported some rather eccentric ideas himself, including an almost typological view of the feeble-minded. A 1915 study, supported by Davenport, tried to establish whether the feeble-minded had a different type of hair to the non-feeble-minded [CBDP1; Goddard No.4]). This questioning of intelligence testing undoubtedly influenced orthodox and other eugenicists. In a 1933 letter echoing Goddard’s doubts, Popenoe questioned the concept of the feeble-minded as both a statistical and social grouping. The sentence “there is a
great deal of confusion growing out of the use of the term feebleminded and similar terms with varying meanings" shows that his concerns were part of a general rethinking [WIHM SA/EUG C238; 29-iv-1933]. Like Popenoe those who became associated with reform eugenics and the emerging population control movement rejected this earlier work of psychometricians. Albert Wiggam confessed in the late 1930s, that regarding Terman's work "of course we were fantastically wrong" [FOP; Wiggam to Frederick Osborn; n.d. ca. 1937].

By this time, however, eugenic immigration controls had been introduced (1924) and tightened (1927), and the constitutionality of sterilisation confirmed in Buck v Bell (1927). The retraction of their own work, which had been used so extensively in these laws did not prevent eugenicists like Robie [TICE; 1934; Robie; 201-209], Laughlin and Whitney [Whitney; 1935; 100-1] continuing to use the earlier work and results, of Goddard, Brigham and other psychometricians.
(iii) CATHOLICISM

Due to the nature of the USA in the period 1918-1945 much of the relevant material on the relationship of eugenics and religion in the USA concerns Christianity. With a ruling elite and a eugenics movement made up primarily of Protestants, plus the nature of immigration and the structure of American society, Catholicism was of crucial importance in a number of ways, as both a target of eugenics and as a powerful opponent of it. Whereas German Catholics were roughly the social, political and economic equals of their Protestant co-nationals, Catholics in the USA were generally poorer, more urbanised and newer to the USA. This had an important effect on the way that eugenicists viewed Catholics and their proposed methods of treating them.

American eugenicists tended to hold ambivalent views on religion. Whilst condemning as fanatics those who objected to aspects of eugenics on religious grounds, most realised that it was not in their interests to alienate the churches completely. Eugenicists frequently labelled the churches as sentimentalist, traditional or irrational (even condemning their charitable work as dysgenic) as it suited them and then attempting to show how religion and eugenics were compatible at other times. Leon Whitney claimed in the 1960s that "we tried to interest the large religious organizations" but admitted that by and large they failed [LWA; 199]. When the AES had set up its advisory board it had appealed specifically for clergymen (and succeeded in attracting some, as well as a few rabbis) [HSJP2; Eugenics Committee of America; n.d.]. There was a constant search for ground that would make Catholicism and eugenics compatible. In 1927 when Joseph Mayer published Gesetzliche Unfruchtbarmachung Geisteskranker (Legal Sterilisation of the Mentally Ill) Eugene Gosney wrote that "if the Catholics will go as far with us as these views indicate I think we shall have little difficulty" in implementing sterilisation laws [CBDP1; Gosney to Davenport; 21-x-1929]. (Mayer's views found a voice in the USA in the AES journal Eugenics [Eug.; 3 (1930) 2; 43-51]).
Even Hitler attempted to court the churches and could see a potential for active participation by them in eugenics. He believed that "our two Christian churches... [should] teach our European humanity that where parents are not healthy it is a deed pleasing to God to take pity on a poor little healthy orphan... [rather] than themselves give birth to a sick child who will only bring unhappiness and suffering on himself and the rest of the world" [Hitler; 1992; 367]. This is a somewhat more liberal attitude than that of American eugenicists - like reformers Samuel Holmes and Ellsworth Huntington - who believed that the hereditarily defective could not provide a sound environment for bringing up children (see pages 150-155).

Yet despite the propagandising about how eugenic policies were in accordance with Christian teaching, the churches in the USA were influential in opposing eugenics. Although Catholic opponents were ultimately more significant, Protestant opposition should not be dismissed, as it too played an important part. It was Protestant Christians (but not Protestant institutions) who forced Buck versus Bell to the Supreme Court in 1927 in the hope of having eugenic sterilisation declared unconstitutional.

In the USA Catholics came to be seen as one of the most pressing eugenic questions. The Catholic population of the USA had expanded dramatically since the 1880s with large scale immigration from countries like Italy and Poland. (Catholics had been present in the USA before this with a large number of Irish immigrants since the 1840s). In an Anglo-Saxon Protestant dominated country like the USA at that time, the Irish represented the worst kind of Catholic dregs of Europe. The presence of the Irish, rather than making society accustomed to a Catholic population, strengthened anti-Catholic prejudice. This prejudice in the early years was social and economic rather than eugenic, but eugenicists were quick to turn their science on America's Catholic population. Catholics (along with Slavs and Jews) became ethnic synonyms for poverty, urbanisation, radicalism and lower cultures alien to America's ruling elite. Their church was seen by eugenicists across
the USA and northern Europe as having a "declared Papal policy of anti-scientific obscurantism" [EugR; July 1933; 77].

Catholicism generally had greater difficulties with orthodox and racial eugenics than with reform eugenics. The main prongs of the orthodox programme attacked Catholicism on two levels. While sterilisation was anathema to Catholic doctrine, the rhetoric around immigration threatened a church made up largely of immigrants, and devalued Catholics in human and biological terms. The reform programme, which demoted racial concerns and immigration questions, and in the mid-1930s became increasingly sceptical of sterilisation programmes, would prove less problematic for Catholics. (The links between reform eugenicists and the birth control movement did add an issue on which the church, like orthodox eugenicists, came into conflict with the reformers).

Scanning American eugenics journals of the 1920s and 1930s reveals that Catholicism was seen as a major problem and as an anti-Progressive, unscientific force. The negative view was multi-layered. It focused on Catholic doctrine, the power of the church and the lack of eugenic worth of Catholic individuals. It is not simply the volume of space devoted to the issue, but the venom of the attacks and the violence of the rhetoric directed against Catholics. Many racial eugenicists - including Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard - incorporated anti-Catholicism into the centre of their world-view, as did orthodox eugenicists like Harry Laughlin. Madison Grant saw Catholics as essentially submissive and Protestants as leaders and lovers of freedom. He allied all good and bad qualities with Protestants and Catholics respectively [Grant; 1922; 227-9]. Furthermore he asserted that "the Church of Rome has everywhere used its influence to break down racial distinctions" [Grant; 1922; 85] - a powerful criticism at the time. A not atypical editorial in Margaret Sanger's Birth Control Review stated that the Catholic Church was trying to force "the legislatures of many countries to embody the ideas of the hierarchy at Rome in laws governing the lives of Catholic and non-Catholic alike. The constitutional rights of non-Catholic Americans mean nothing to it" [BCR; iv-
In 1924 it offered a list of proposed solutions to overpopulation, including the statement “let all the Protestants kill all the Catholics” [BCR; ix-1924; 270]. In 1930 Norman Himes used the same journal to accuse “some over zealous Catholic” of removing his articles from the shelf of a public library - he admitted that he had no proof [BCR; i-1930].

There were some other areas of eugenic concern which contributed further to tensions with the churches, especially the Catholic Church. Eugenicists did not keep quiet in their criticisms of church charity projects. They viewed charity as valuable and honourable in the pre-eugenic age. The knowledge that eugenics had given to the world demanded that the churches re-evaluate their charitable work, because of its inadvertently dysgenic function. Madison Grant summed up the widely held belief as early as 1916 when he wrote that “the church assumes a serious responsibility toward the future of the race whenever it steps in and preserves a defective strain... Before eugenics were understood much could be said from a Christian and humane viewpoint in favour of indiscriminate charity for the benefit of the individual” [Grant; 1922; 49]. Similarly orthodox eugenicists attacked the caring role of religion - and especially Catholicism - for its contribution to counter-selectivity and degeneration.

religion has in many instances helped to cause people to cling to beliefs which in due time come to rank as gross superstitions. One of the most pernicious and tenacious superstitions is that God made defectives, and therefore they are a special charge upon the most faithful of his children. Did God make them? Perhaps, but only in the same way that he made murder and rape and arson and syphilis and slums and drunkenness... It was not God who made the defectives. We made them, or our forefathers did. God kills them off, for that is Nature's way; we make them by disregarding the laws of heredity, by preserving the weak and imbecile, and by making it easy for defectives to reproduce their kind.

[Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 136]

The question of the celibacy of Catholic priests, monks, nuns and others also came under the eugenic microscope and was declared to be a dysgenic practice and thus undesirable. Madison Grant made the observation in The Passing of the Great Race [Grant; 1922; 52], (as did Hitler in Mein Kampf [Hitler; 1992; 393]). The belief was
that while Catholic priests were amongst the eugenically fittest members of society, celibacy selected out their potential offspring and was thus counter-selective. The result was the constant erosion of the better classes amongst Catholics. Leon Whitney calculated that the practise had, in one generation, meant the loss to the US of 1,185 men [sic], who should have been in Who's Who [BCR; iv-1932; 103].

The high eugenic quality of the ministry was evidenced by another work - The Builders of America - by Whitney and Huntington. Their calculations demonstrated that by profession, the groups whose children appeared most frequently in Who's Who were: Unitarian clergy (1 entry for every 7 people), Congregational clergy (1/8), Episcopal clergy (1/9), Presbyterian clergy (1/11), followed by sea captains and pilots (1/42). For unskilled labourers the figure was 1 entry for every 42,000 people.

Using a broader definition of eugenically valuable than in the 1932 article the authors declared that in the USA alone Catholic celibacy led to the loss of 200,000 "builders of America" per generation [Huntington & Whitney; 1928; 26 & 132]. Such a position allowed eugenicists to attack Catholic practice and at the same time justify their belief in the eugenically inferior position of Catholics and Catholic national groups like Poles and Italians.

The lack of understanding of Catholicism and the hatred felt for it was probably contributed to by the backgrounds of the eugenics leadership. In the USA the leading eugenicists were drawn from a homogeneous group, in religious terms, being exclusively from 'old-stock' middle-class Protestant families. In Germany, however, despite the anti-Jewish prejudice of Ploetz and other leading figures of the Rassenhygiene wing, Ploetz could boast that the Society for Race Hygiene contained Protestants, Catholics and Jews [ARGB; 6 (1909); 278]. German Catholics included Hermann Muckermann (a Jesuit priest and Eugenik leader) and Fritz Lenz and Eugen Fischer (leaders of Nazi Rassenhygiene). (The first editor of the ARG was Jewish, as was Richard Goldschmidt).

The problem of religious attitudes to eugenics was widely discussed. In 1933 a document compiled by the British Eugenics Society on sterilisation listed Islam in
Egypt, Catholicism in Austria and the Orthodox Church in Greece as likely to scupper any attempt to introduce eugenic sterilisation [WIHM SA/EUG D226]. Although historians who claim that eugenics was a Protestant phenomena are wrong, it is true that eugenics had a much harder time making headway in non-Protestant societies. The differences between the churches in the USA had long been a concern to eugenicists and from early on the Catholic Church had been cold towards eugenics. In February 1921 Henry Fairfield Osborn wrote to Leonard Dan/vin that he saw “the church as a very important ally. I have numerous promises of Protestant support but still have to hear from the Roman Catholics”, and again in May “our Protestant Churches are very intelligent, very liberal, and very progressive… I have not thus far made any advances with the Roman Catholics” [WIHM SA/EUG D109; 08-ii-1921 & 11-v-1921].

Looking at Austria and Germany strengthens this point. When Davenport was trying to secure invites to the Second International Congress of Eugenics for the former enemies of World War One, he told Henry Fairfield Osborn that “I do not know of any [eugenicists] in the reduced Austria” [CBDP1; Davenport to Henry Osborn; 9-vi-1920]. In January 1935 the Eugenics Review carried out a survey of eugenics in Austria and concluded that Austrians showed almost no interest (the only significant eugenicist was Hans Reichel). While Austria’s neighbour, Germany, was engaging in the most radical eugenics programme ever, Austria could claim no national eugenics society, a failed university course and no eugenic legislation. It described Austria as a “Catholic authoritarian” state and cited this as the reason for the complete lack of racial policies similar to Germany’s [EugR; Jan 1935; 260-1]. In 1933 a British Eugenics Society document discussing sterilisation stated that “in a country where the Catholic Church is as strong as it is in Austria it is almost impossible to propose any legislation of this character” [WIHM SA/EUG D226]. It is often claimed that in Germany the more Protestant north lent more support to the Nazi party and its eugenic policies, while the Catholic south offered significantly less support to Nazism in electoral terms [e.g. Noakes & Pridham; 1991a; 81-3]. (The greatest experiment in French eugenics was the eugenic suburb of Les Jardin
Ungemach in Strasbourg, which was created and funded by a Protestant Huguenot businessman [Goethe; 1946; vii]).

In December 1930 Pope Pius XI issued the encyclical Casti Connubii, the last section of which dealt with eugenics and sterilisation. It referred to “that pernicious practice... which closely touches upon the natural right of men to enter matrimony but affects also in a real way the welfare of the offspring.” It complained that eugenicists “put eugenics before aims of a higher order” and that they were “losing sight of the fact that the family is more sacred than the State”. It also condemned birth control and the idea of preventing marriage for those who, according to eugenic “investigations would through hereditary transmission, bring forth defective offspring.” It pointed out that eugenics effectively treated as criminals those who had committed no crime. Its harshest criticism was reserved for eugenic sterilisation - whether voluntary or compulsory - which it condemned in totality. Casti Connubii quoted St Thomas on the matter of eugenic sterilisation. “No one who is guiltless may be punished by a human tribunal either by... death, or mutilation” [Casti Connubii: WIHM SA/EUG D228]. (By implication Casti Connubii condemned subsequent German euthanasia and genocide, to which "corporately neither the legal profession nor the Churches protested" [Burleigh; 1990; 13]). Like many other critics of eugenics the Papal encyclical objected to the methods of eugenics, but not to its basic aims. (In the cases of the euthanasia programme and the sterilisation programme, although the institutions did not protest individuals did. In the euthanasia programme Bishop Graf von Galen is the most famous of a number of Catholic priests who spoke out. In the sterilisation programme, some Bavarian Catholics encouraged appeals in all cases to clog up the legal system [EugR; Jan 1936; 285].

For two decades before the issuance of Casti Connubii there had been debate within the Catholic Church regarding eugenics. Many Catholics accepted large parts of the basic eugenic paradigm, and so the church needed to formulate a response. Some argued for segregation, others for the integration of a mild form of eugenics
and Catholic teaching and a few like Samuel Donovan of Saint Bonaventure's, New York supported sterilisation. Many, adopted the apparently scientific language of the eugenics movement, speaking of race betterment, degeneration, race suicide and so on. The AES for a number of years ran an annual competition for the best sermon on eugenics, and received considerable numbers of entries. A 1928 document from Paul Popenoe demonstrates that the Catholic hierarchy needed to establish clearly its position on eugenics, and sterilisation in particular. Popenoe wrote that "because the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to contraception, many people, and even many Catholics, erroneously suppose that it is also opposed to sterilisation". The lack of clarity had allowed eugenicists to propagandise that sterilisation was acceptable to Catholicism. In California, where Popenoe worked, "Archbishop Hanna of San Francisco... has protected the sterilisation law from the start, by a policy of benevolent neutrality". (California at this time had sterilised more people than all the other states of the USA put together, and according to Eugene Gosney had no Catholic opposition [CBDP1; Gosney to Davenport; 21-X-1929]). Popenoe goes on to relate a story which apparently shows that Catholics could accept eugenics. He claimed that the superintendent of a Californian hospital was "a good Catholic, and when he assumed the position he went to his spiritual advisor and asked whether he could conscientiously continue sterilisation; he was informed that he could, and he has since been much more energetic than his Protestant predecessor, in pushing this policy" [WIHM SA/EUG D276 I; 03-i-1928]. (There is of course no way of verifying the truth of this story).

The effect of the encyclical varied from country to country. The USA was one of the countries where it was most influential (Germany by contrast, was one where it was least effective). As such it marked an important point in relations between Catholics and eugenicists with the strengthening and sharpening of Catholic attitudes. In 1935 Marion Norton referred to the Church's "strangulating power" on all forms of population control [quoted in Kühl; 1994; 58]. Leon Whitney wrote that:

before the Pope's encyclical, many Catholic divines favored sterilization. Now all must oppose it. Instead of sterilization, they would have clergymen tell imbeciles, low grade morons, and other
defectives... 'You must practice marital continence', which is equivalent to pouring water into a sieve, telling it not to run through and expecting results

[BCR; iv-1932; 104]

From early on the Catholic Church in the USA, perhaps for self-interested reasons, provided serious opposition to eugenic programmes. As we have seen in chapter 1 the immigration debate of the early post-war years had established an antipathy between Catholicism and eugenics. The Catholic Church's greatest conflict with eugenics arose over the sterilisation laws introduced from 1895 (unsuccessfully in Michigan) onwards, and which reached a climax in 1927 with Buck versus Bell (Hasain argues that the Buck versus Bell decision "energized not only the American Eugenics Society but the opposition as well" [Hasain; 1996; 109]). The 1930 encyclical drew a sharp division between eugenics and Catholicism in the USA, resulting in the entrenchment of Catholic positions against eugenics. Following the Papal encyclical the Catholic Church became a major obstacle to the progress of the agenda of the already struggling eugenics movement. Meanwhile the growing momentum of the birth control movement could only be slowed, but not stopped by Catholic opposition. The fact that the church could organise an effective opposition led to resentment of it. Eugene Gosney like others argued that "a Catholic is entitled, as is anyone else, to accept or reject sterilization on his own judgement, but not to oppose it in the name of his church [CBDP1; Gosney to Davenport; 21-10-1929].

In 1934 Paul Popenoe wrote to C P Blacker emphasising how influential the Catholic Church had become: "it appears very likely that Georgia may actually adopt a sterilization law. Active campaigns are also being carried on in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and elsewhere, but as the Roman Catholic influence is very strong in the states named there is not much likelihood that any bill will get out of committee. Georgia is... white, Protestant, Nordic" [WIHM SA/EUG D277; 15-v-1934]. Roswell Johnson agreed with this view, suggesting that Catholicism had prevented the passing of sterilisation laws in New York and Connecticut [Eugenics;
2 (1928) 4; 64]. A Protestant majority, however, was no guarantee of success. As noted in chapter 1 a number of states in the USA rejected sterilisation legislation on religious grounds. Eugenicists were especially worried about Catholic attitudes, but many of these had been vetoed by non-Catholics. Even in the far less Catholic south, Edward Larson argues, “religion acted more as a brake than a barrier” i.e. it was still effective but on a lesser scale [Larson; 1992; 168]. (The less powerful Catholic Church would have been supplemented by more active and fundamentalist Protestant Churches).

American eugenicists had successfully taken the debate into the Catholic camp for many years, questioning the religious and moral arguments offered. As scientific advances began to destabilise eugenics scientifically, the Catholic Church widened out the scope of its attacks so that in the 1930s it could fight eugenics on its own territory. As well as questioning the ethical and religious dimensions of policies like sterilisation, Catholics could also attack its scientific credibility. Marouf Hasain quotes one Catholic writer: “modern scientific findings do not support the eugenicists’ claim that the births of feebleminded children will be greatly reduced by the sterilization of all mental defectives” [Hasain; 1996; 105]. In Germany Catholics used Haldane’s calculations (based on Punnett’s work) to argue against sterilisation as an effective policy [EugR; Jan 1936; 285].

German eugenics could not afford to alienate Catholics in the same way that the American movement did. Catholicism and Nazism came to an accommodation as regards eugenics policy. The clearest example of this was the 1933 Concordat between the Catholic Church and the Nazi state, based on the Italian model, which guaranteed the future of Catholic organisations. Nazi planners faced alienating huge areas of south Germany with their earliest eugenics legislation - the sterilisation law. It is unclear whether anything was learnt specifically from America’s problems, but in order to accommodate Catholic opinion the German law contained an exemption for those facing sterilisation. The Eugenics Review reported that “Catholic institutions are faced with the necessity of much larger accommodation, as it is proposed that
the scruples of Catholics should be met by the opportunity of evading sterilisation by their permanent incarceration". This sits uncomfortably with the coercive nature of Nazi race and health policy and was a way of allowing Catholics to avoid breaking with their religious beliefs. Also Catholic medical staff and legal professionals were exempted from compulsorily taking part in sterilisation operations [EugR; October 1934; 187 & JofH; 25 (1934); 260]. Surprisingly, in 1934 the German state which carried out proportionately the most sterilisations was Baden - in the heart of the Catholic south [Muckermann quoted by Popenoe; WIHM SA/EUG D277; 12-ii-1935]. Similarly the euthanasia programme allowed Catholics to avoid direct involvement with the killing operations. In return for such exemptions the Church found theological and practical arguments allowing Catholics to participate indirectly in the programmes [e.g. EugR; Oct 1935; 287]. The compromise emerged even before the Nazis rose to power. In May 1933 C P Blacker commented to Hermann Muckermann that "the Roman Catholic church in this country [Britain] apparently adopts a much more uncompromising attitude towards voluntary sterilisation than that which it adopts in Germany" [WIHM SA/EUG C238; 01-v-1933]. Richard Goldschmidt believed that "the Kaiser-Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology and Eugenics... was more or less forced upon the sponsoring Kaiser-Wilhelm Society by the Catholic-Centrist party which at that time (1925) held the purse strings of German science" [JofH; 33 (1942); 215]. None of this is to suggest that the relationship was totally smooth - there was frequent hostility between church and state. Some Catholics in Germany were clearly willing to reject eugenics as the case of the sterilisation law shows. Although ultimately overruled by Hitler, the Catholic vice-Chancellor von Papen had strongly protested at the introduction of Germany's sterilisation law [Noakes; 1985; 16].
(iv) BIRTH CONTROL

The birth control (or neo-malthusian) movement had emerged in the USA around the time of the war and was always under the powerful leadership of Margaret Sanger. Sanger was a socialist progressive who established America's first birth control clinic in Brooklyn in 1915 (it was immediately closed). Her first permanent clinic opened in 1923. By 1928 she had 25 clinics in the USA and by 1938 373 [CBDP1; Sanger to Davenport; 28-viii-1928 & AESP; Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control; 28-i-1938]. She promoted her birth control ideas through the American Birth Control League and the journal the Birth Control Review. The birth control movement operated in semi-legality until 1936, when the 1873 Comstock Law was repealed. The law had placed severe restrictions on the use of and information about contraception, even for medical research, and so contributed in large measure to the disrepute of the movement in many eyes.

Since the earliest days Sanger and other birth control campaigners had seen their movement as compatible with and ultimately integral to any programme of eugenics. Leon Whitney wrote to Davenport in 1928 that Sanger felt “very strongly about eugenics and seemed to see the whole problem of birth control as a eugenical problem” [LWP; Whitney to Davenport; 03-iv-1928]. This straightforward belief was not reciprocated by the eugenics movement which debated the issue continuously. Thurman Rice complained that “The newspaper reports of the International Eugenics Conference [sic] held in New York in 1921 would have us believe that the entire time was spent in the discussion of birth control” [Rice; 1929; 338]. To some extent the birth control issue was one for which eugenicists were not prepared. When the movement had been conceptualised in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, birth control had not been a factor that needed consideration. Frederick Osborn argued in the 1960s that “no one foresaw that birth-control would come into extensive use” [FOP; Frederick Osborn to Johnson; n.d. ca. 1960s]. The relationship of birth control and eugenics was one of the issues which finally led to the emergence of a separate reform eugenics movement. As will be seen below
tensions between the birth control and orthodox eugenics movements were underpinned by snobbery and mistrust on both sides (especially from orthodox eugenicists), and the belief that the other was a disreputable movement. Madison Grant referred to the birth control movement as “hardly respectable” [CBDP1; Grant to Whitney; 15-iv-1928].

The question of absolute population increases was a big difference between the American and German eugenics movements. Since the late nineteenth century the issue of Germany’s numerical strength compared to countries around her had caused concern for many Germans. German eugenicists supported policies that would cause an absolute increase in Germany’s population, rather than just promoting improvements in the quality of the population. This was not a periphery issue, but was one of the key aims. The Baur-Fischer-Lenz book suggested that a strong population policy was the only way to prevent Germany’s decline - in terms of genetic health and in absolute numerical terms. From the 1890s onwards, scientific literature, social scientific literature, popular and academic literature, and eugenic literature made numerous references to the comparative decline of Germany’s population and the need for remedial action. In the USA by contrast raw numbers were not the concern, as many believed that the USA had either reached or exceeded its optimum population level. The usual thought was that “a million more babies is no blessing unless they come from proper families” [Rice; 1929; 327]. Theodore Robie put the point more forcefully at the Third International Congress of Eugenics when he claimed that America’s “population has already attained a greater number than is necessary for the efficient functioning of the race as a whole”, so a numerical increase would be dysgenic. Instead the population should be skewed in favour of the fit [TICE; 1934; Robie; 208]. Madison Grant made the same point in 1916 when he wrote that “what is needed in the community most of all is an increase in the desirable classes... not merely an increase in the absolute numbers of the population” [Grant; 1922; 47]. As most early eugenicists opposed widely available birth control, they were left with sterilisation and immigration restriction to control the USA’s population level.
Orthodox opponents included Davenport, Laughlin, Grant, John Kellogg, Fisher, Popenoe, Clarence Campbell and Henry Fairfield Osborn [CBDP1; Grant to Whitney; 15-iv-1928 & Davenport to Grant; 21-iv-1928]. (while the racial eugenicist Madison Grant opposed birth control in theory, Lothrop Stoddard was on the editorial board of the Birth Control Review). Orthodox eugenicists opposed birth control on a number of grounds. They believed that it was concerned with quantitative not qualitative issues, that it simply sought to restrict family size regardless of the eugenic worth of the individuals concerned [e.g. CBDP1; Davenport to Roswell Johnson; 4-vi-1927]. They followed this with the argument that it was used to limit family size only by people who should be having large families (i.e. the middle and upper-middle classes), while defectives and the working class were wholly unable or unwilling to utilise birth control and at the same time had far higher sex drives [EugN; X (Oct 1925); 132]. They invoked the morality argument that, freed of fears of pregnancy defectives “could become a menace to the morality of other members of the community... and they can serve as an artificial object of lust without there being any danger of conception” [Rice; 1929; 322]. Birth control would encourage sexual activity amongst the unmarried. Orthodox objections to birth control never moved from the central argument offered by Harry Laughlin that “we condemn Neo-Malthusianism because in it we fail to find an agency able to cut off the supply of defectives” [ERO Bulletin 10A; ii-1914; 59]. (Orthodox opposition certainly was not based on the fear of declining numbers. In 1920 Davenport had expressed concerns that the USA’s population might reach one billion by 2020 [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 3-v-1920]). There was the further problem for orthodox eugenicists that even if they did theoretically support birth control, they felt it would be a politically risky strategy to do so in public. This view was expressed by numerous people from Paul Popenoe to Thurman Rice. Davenport referred to birth control as “a quagmire, out of which eugenics should keep” [LWP; Davenport to Whitney; 5-iv-1928].
Amongst reform eugenicists older men like Pearl, Jennings and Huntington supported birth control, as did younger ones like Frederick Osborn and Henry Perkins. It was this combination of generations that steered eugenics in general and the AES in particular towards positions where birth control and population control were central to their programmes. Hermann Muller supported birth control because of its theoretical compatibility with eugenics: “it would bring reproduction under the direction of reason... [and it] increases the potential control of man over natural forces”. In this way humans could use it to direct their future [TICE; 1934; Muller; 140].

Reform eugenicists argued that birth control could be used to reduce the numbers of defective offspring and that many of the unfit could easily be educated to understand the importance of contraception. In 1932 a World Telegram quoted Raymond Pearl as saying that “there is no support to the often repeated criticism of birth-control that only the ‘upper’ or ‘socially desirable’ classes practice it” [RPP; Birth Control Federation of America No.1; 27-vii-1932]. Some went further and argued that birth control was not just not dysgenic, but that it was eugenically valuable. The National Committee on Federal Legalisation of Birth Control argued that the population scientist Friedrich Burgdörfer in Germany had “discovered that in large cities... where birth control knowledge has reached all economic and social classes, the higher income groups have the largest families” [RPP; Birth Control Federation of America No.1; 21-xii-1935]. If the statistics of Margaret Sanger’s clinics can be believed then there’s reason to suppose that the orthodox eugenicists should have supported birth control, as it was eugenically valuable, within their terms. According to figures published in 1923 31% of women at Sanger’s clinic wanted birth control for what might be termed eugenic reasons - for ancestral reasons such as insanity, epilepsy and alcoholism (all grounds for sterilisation according to orthodox eugenics). The other 69% requested it on grounds of economic hardship (or the woman’s health). Orthodox eugenicists had always held that “selection on the ground of social position and wealth has a rough eugenic value since success means the presence of certain effective traits in the stock”
[Davenport 1912; 8]. So such statistics would suggest a strongly eugenic dimension to birth control, which presumably would have increased after the onset of the Depression. In Davenport's 1912 book *Hereditv in Relation to Eugenics* he argues that halving the US's birth rate would allow all children to be looked after properly and achieve more. To many, this would justify birth control, but to a man as conservative as Davenport, who rejected the notion that the environment could have a positive impact this was not enough, and he still rejected it [Davenport; 1912; 3].

Pro-birth control eugenicists did not drop the old policies. For those beyond the hope of education, or with specific conditions, there remained the twin weapons of sterilisation and segregation. There were the more sceptical reformers like Raymond Pearl who were afraid of endorsing the orthodox programme too strongly. In 1924 Pearl warned Sanger not to "do anything more than express a lack of opposition to a sterilization program. I feel sure that it would be a tactical error for the Birth Control League to get actively behind a sterilization program" [RPP; Pearl to Sanger; 14-i-1924].

The morality argument put forward by orthodox and racial eugenicists in their rejection of birth control were countered with the argument that the availability of contraception did not encourage sex outside of marriage (something Davenport had called "repugnant to strictly normal persons" [Davenport; 1912; 2]). The 1932 World Telegram claimed that 93% of those attending the John Hopkins Medical School Bureau for Contraceptive Advise were married (and to counter any birth rate arguments it was stated that on average they already had 4.84 children each) [RPP; Birth Control Federation of America No.1; 27-vii-1932].

Pragmatic answers to the issue of birth control were offered, but these could be used in support of either position. Although an opponent of birth control, Madison Grant argued that "regulation of the number of children is, for good or evil, in full operation among the better classes and its recognition by the state would result in no further harm among them". Allowing birth control and promoting it would
encourage the inferior to start limiting the size of their families as well. In Grant's view birth control was a fact that could not be made to go away, and it should be harnessed for whatever eugenic benefit it could bring [Grant; 1922; 48]. Conversely, Thurman Rice saw no point in courting unnecessary controversy, arguing that “there is a tremendous prejudice against the teaching of birth-control, and since it is a minor plank in the platform of race hygiene we can well afford to let it drop” [Rice; 1929; 33].

Roswell Johnson was one of the first eugenicists to work within the birth control movement in the hope of giving it a eugenic dimension. He claimed his first success as early as 1921 [CBDP1; Roswell Johnson to Davenport; 2-xii-1921]. A premature attempt to link birth control and eugenics more formally did not work, and caused some rupturing in the relationship being established. The 1925 Sixth International Birth Control Conference was held in New York, which in itself heightened interest in birth control because it was the first time the conference was held in the USA [CBDP1; Sanger]. At the conference Roswell Johnson and Francis Sumner introduced a controversial resolution, subsequently passed, urging selective birth control to give a eugenic dimension to contraception.

Resolved: That this Conference believes that the persons whose progeny give promise of being of decided value to the community should be encouraged to bear as large families, properly spaced, as they feel they feasibly can.

[Printed in EugN; X (May 1925); 58]

The subsequent issue of the Birth Control Review contained a lengthy editorial, by Margaret Sanger, condemning this resolution as contrary to the idea of birth control [CBDP1; Popenoe to Grant; 14-iv-1928]. At the same time the orthodox Eugenical News tried to draw some clear lines between the aims and methods of birth control and eugenics [EugN; X (April 1925); 42-3]. Although strongly worded Sanger's editorial was careful not to totally alienate eugenicists (by agreeing that those with defective traits should not have children), as a letter to Raymond Pearl reveals. The whole issue was responsible for stepping up the debate on the relationship of birth control to eugenics in future years and brought the problematic relationship to a
broader public, as Sanger acknowledged [RPP: Sanger to Pearl; 13-v-1925]. Margaret Sanger had been astute enough early on to realise that eugenics and birth control could be made compatible even though the early eugenicists were totally opposed to the birth control movement on practical and ideological grounds. Sanger began her attempt to link the movements early. In 1921 she told Raymond Pearl that "we need the help of each person who believes that Birth Control will mean the improvement of the race" and then suggested to Irving Fisher a "round-table" discussion on birth control and eugenics [RPP; Sanger to Pearl; 29-xii-1921 & 9-iii-1925]. The birth control definition of improvement of the race meant limiting the children of the unfit and then providing better social, educational and welfare conditions for children in general.

As the orthodox eugenicists maintained their opposition to birth control, reformers moved closer to it. For many reform eugenicists (including Leon Whitney who straddled all shades of eugenic opinion) a merger with the birth control movement was desirable as birth control conformed to their vision of eugenics. By the late 1920s Whitney, like many others believed eugenics was about "sterilization, segregation, birth control for all" [LWP; Whitney to Davenport; 03-vii-1928]. In his memoirs Whitney stated clearly his belief that "race improvement is impossible without birth control" [LWA; 200]. Overpopulation (of the world and of the USA) was a common theme in support of birth control by reformers and others, including Pearl, Jennings, Castle and East. At the end of 1924 Jennings argued that "overpopulation is the greatest danger that humanity has to meet" and that the priority was "to prevail upon our government to abolish its ignorant and suicidal suppression of methods of birth control" [HSJP2; Jennings to Goethe; xii-1924]. His close friend Pearl had estimated that saturation point for the USA was two hundred million people, which would be reached by the year 2000 [CBDP1; Davenport to Albert Johnson; 27-i-1921]. Two years after Johnson and Sumner's resolution caused such controversy the reform eugenicists and the birth control movement seemed to have struck a balance and sent delegates to the 1927 World Population Congress (and the subsequent International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population
Problems) who reflected this new accommodation. The Geneva congress was organised and headed by Pearl, East and Little, with Margaret Sanger as secretary [EugN; XII (Oct 1927); 133]. Delegates included men like, Pearl, Henry Pratt Fairchild, C C Little and Edward East (Pearl succeeded in having the orthodox eugenicists Henry Goddard and Harry Olson excluded [RPP: Sanger to Pearl; ca. April 1927]). While the reformers were moving towards the birth control movement, orthodox eugenicists held onto their traditional views or believed that the issue still was not settled. At this time Davenport, the most prominent opponent of birth control, warned Roswell Johnson, its most prominent supporter that “in a complete darkness it is often wiser to stand still until some light comes” [CBDP1; Davenport to Roswell Johnson; 4-iv-1927].

Emerging divisions within the American movement were reflected in the international context. The orthodox and Rassenhygiene wings dominated the conservative IFEO, while reform eugenicists, the Eugenik wing and birth control supporters met in the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems.

Although there was, in general, no love lost between orthodox eugenicists and the Catholic Church there was some common ground between them on this issue. In 1935 Cardinal Hayes delivered a sermon in which he attacked birth control from the eugenic position that it caused race suicide and immorality [RPP; Birth Control Federation of America No.1; 20-xii-1932]. (Indeed, Cardinal Hayes had given his public approval of the 1921 eugenics congress, which appeared in both The Times and The Catholic World [CBDP1; Henry Osborn to Davenport; 26-xi-1921]). Part of the Catholic church’s worry must have stemmed from figures released by Sanger’s American Birth Control League, claiming that Catholics represented 25%-30% of women attending her clinic in the 1920s [RPP; Sanger No.s 1, 7 & 9]. Quite possibly, if Catholics had not been using birth control then the Church would have been more accepting of it. To the further chagrin of orthodox eugenicists the Protestant Churches were coming round to a pro-birth control position. In 1934 the traditionally conservative Episcopal Church’s House of Bishops voted to support “the
efforts now being made to secure for licensed physicians, hospitals and medical clinics, the freedom to convey such information as is in accord with the highest principle of eugenics, and a more wholesome family life" [EugR; Jan 1935; 256]. At the same time the Rabbinical Assembly of the USA urged Congress and state legislators “to permit the dissemination of contraceptive information by responsible medical agencies” [EugR; Apr 1935; 23].

In practical terms then, realignment was well underway, but prospect of a formal merger sharpened divisions within the eugenics camp, and the crisis in the relationship of the two parts of eugenics came in 1928. It is charted in a series of letters between Leon Whitney and Charles Davenport. Whitney was sure enough of Sanger’s eugenic position that, following an informal meeting, the pair proposed merging the two movements’ most important journals - the Birth Control Review and Eugenical News. This would have almost certainly signalled the beginnings of a full scale merger between the eugenics and birth control movements (as indicated by a letter from Paul Popenoe to Madison Grant [CBDP1; Popenoe to Grant; 14-iv-1928]). Davenport was unambiguous in his opposition, which rested not just on practical and ideological grounds, but also on personal and political grounds (he may also have worried about losing his dominant position in any merged movement):

I have grave doubts whether she has any clear idea of what eugenics is... [she] feels that birth control does not taste in the mouth as well as eugenics and she thinks that birth-control is the same as eugenics and eugenics is birth control. Eugenics and birth control are far apart in their methods and aims. The whole birth control movement is a quagmire, out of which eugenics should keep.

[LWP; Davenport to Whitney; 05-iv-1928]

This view was echoed exactly by Paul Popenoe [CBDP1; Popenoe to Grant; 14-iv-1928]. (Davenport was not the first to complain of the liberal use of the word eugenics by those outside the movement. Roswell Johnson had made the same complaint fourteen years before [JofH; 5 (1914); 388]). Davenport finished his letter to Whitney with a threat to sever relations between his orthodox ERO and the AES, which at the time was setting out on its transformation into a reform organisation. He
wrote "I am interested in the work of the American Eugenics Society but I am more interested in preserving the connotation of eugenics unsullied and I should feel that if the Eugenics Society tied up with the birth control movement that it would be necessary for the Eugenics Record Office... to withdraw its moral support" [LWP; Davenport to Whitney; 05-iv-1928]. Paul Popenoe, Irving Fisher, Henry Fairfield Osborn and Madison Grant reacted similarly to the proposal. Popenoe argued that "we have everything to lose and nothing to gain by such an arrangement". He believed that Sanger's Birth Control League of America was based on "agitation and emotional appeal" rather than research, and that it came with a lot of "ready-made enemies" [CBDP1; Grant to Popenoe; 15-iv-1928 & Popenoe to Grant; 14-iv-1928. Also CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 21-iv-1928].

Whether Sanger had "any clear idea or not" of what eugenics was, her journal the Birth Control Review frequently addressed eugenic issues and published articles by prominent eugenicists, especially British ones. Prominent American eugenicists who published in her journal included Norman Himes, C C Little, Leon Whitney, Roswell Johnson, Samuel Holmes and Hermann Muller. Likewise birth control conferences organised by her contained lectures such as "Crime and Heredity" by Harry Olson (of the ERA and Galton Society). Conferences were also regularly attended by the eugenicists named above [RPP; Sanger No.s 3 & 6].

In the end the sheer weight of the new generation of eugenicists and the reform movement tipped the balance in favour of birth control. This process was helped along by the Depression and the apparently irrefutable logic of the argument put forward by Senator Austin that the need for birth control amongst the defective and lower classes was urgent "especially in these days of unusual economic distress" [RPP; Birth Control Federation of America; 10-i-1931]. This argument was also central to campaigns of the National Committee on Federal Legalisation of Birth Control, who during their 1935 campaign argued that "during this period of economic distress and unemployment, with millions of families upon Federal relief, wives and mothers should be able to obtain thru responsible medical channels, this form of
constructive relief" (other arguments included the confused nature of the then current laws and the 15,000 deaths per year from illegal abortions) [RPP; Birth Control Federation of America; 1935].

Broadly speaking the older generation of orthodox eugenicists such as Davenport and Laughlin tended to oppose birth control on the grounds that it was dysgenic, while reform eugenicists saw birth control as a potentially powerful tool. Birth control became integral to the programme of the reform movement only gradually, at least in part because it took a while to break fully with Davenport's orthodox eugenics wing and to develop the self-confidence to go against his advice. By the mid-1930s birth control had become integral to reform eugenics. Raymond Pearl promoted it through his International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems, many reform eugenicists were active in the World Population Union and others worked closely with organisations like the American Birth Control League. In 1937 the AES held a meeting on the issue, the minutes of which include statements such as “without the general extension of birth control it is difficult to imagine any generally effective application of eugenic measures” and “the eugenist is entirely committed to the best aspects of the birth control programme” [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.8]. The following year the annual conference was devoted to the issue of birth control and eugenics. In his address as president Ellsworth Huntington stated that “Birth Control is one of the methods of eugenics” [AESP; Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control; 28-1-1938].
There can be no doubt that one of the driving forces of eugenics in the USA (and other countries) was the desire to save money, and thus to protect the middle-class tax-payer. Eugenic texts and arguments from the outset linked money to calls for eugenic policies and justifications for eugenic thinking. Thus early in Davenport's book *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*, after the list of numbers of defectives of all types in the USA comes the line "at a cost of over 100 million dollars per year" [Davenport; 1912; 4]. The files of the ERO include six on blindness including one labelled "Cost of Blindness for the Government" [EROP; Series X]. There was a desire to spend such money as had to be spent, in the most efficient way possible. Lewis Terman, for example, pointed out that "more than 10 per cent of the $400,000,000 annually expended in the United States for school instruction is devoted to re-teaching children what they have already been taught but have failed to learn" [Terman; 1919; 3]. When Ellsworth Huntington published *Tomorrow's Children* (1935) to replace Whitney's *A Eugenics Catechism* (1923), question two spoke of the $3,000,000,000 cost of education [Huntington; 1935; 1]. Family studies often referred to the amount of money spent by various authorities on the families of defectives. Citing the two most famous family studies, Theodore Robie made reference to the amount allegedly spent on the Kallikaks and Jukes when he addressed the Third International Congress of Eugenics [TICE; 1934; Robie; 207].

The connection between eugenics and money was also about preserving the economic status quo. While most eugenicists were at pains to point out that eugenic desirability did not simply equate to wealth, the reality of the argument often amounted to exactly this [e.g. Whitney 1935; viii]. Firstly many eugenicists believed that eugenic fitness correlated with wealth because wealth would often be the result of favourable and desirable characteristics. (Eugenicists saw wealth as the result of virtues such as industriousness, intelligence and ability, rather than greed, ruthlessness and exploitation). William McDougall gave a paper on this theme at the Second International Congress of Eugenics in 1921, entitled "The Correlation
Between Native Ability and Social Status" [SICE; 1923; 373-6]. Secondly the counter-selectivity of modern living was in part to blame for the eroding of the position of the wealthier classes through what was perceived to be an unfair, burdensome taxation system and growing demand for welfare and charity. This was preventing many births amongst the desirable classes. Eugenicists, especially in the USA, saw their role as being to bolster these pressurised wealthy middle-classes and thus preserve their economic and social position. This in turn would re-skew the birth rate in favour of the wealthy. Madison Grant wrote that “we have nearly succeeded in destroying the... intellectual and moral advantage a man of good stock brings into the world with him. We are now engaged in destroying the privilege of wealth; that is, the reward of successful intelligence and industry” [Grant; 1922; 10].

Eugenicists interpreted their findings according to their own class (or race) prejudices and then used them as scientific validation for their ideas. When Lewis Terman divided children by socio-economic status he found that intelligence, according to his results, was higher amongst the “superior” than amongst the “laboring” classes. He took this as evidence of the innate intelligence of the wealthy upper middle-classes “the social class to which the family belongs depends less on chance than on the parents’ native qualities of intellect and character”, which linked wealth and class to eugenic value [Terman; 1919; 115]. The alternative point of view would have been to question the validity of the test and to look for cultural bias in it. Schemes like Yerkes’ army tests unconsciously contributed to bolstering the middle-classes. The tests actually measured education and social status rather than inherent intelligence, so in the distribution of army jobs they ensured that officers were overwhelmingly White, middle-class and American born, while the lower ranks were disproportionately, immigrant and poorly educated. Henry Goddard encapsulated the eugenicists position (and the psychometricians’ embracing of it) when he argued in 1919 “how can there be such a thing as social equality with this wide range of mental capacity?... As for an equal distribution of the wealth of the world, that is equally absurd” [Goddard quoted in Rose et al; 1990; 86].
Economic aspects are not just about the economic concerns and priorities of eugenicists, but more importantly about the role economics had, both directly and indirectly, in supporting and then destroying eugenics. Steven Selden sees economics as underpinning changes in eugenics when he suggests that “academic and ethnic resistance was not nearly as effective in constraining eugenics as was the impact of the social forces loosed by the economic collapse of the 1930s” [Selden; 1988; 65]. Garland Allen, however, believes that economic aspects of the decline of eugenics are “an aspect that generally gets neglected in any of these historical analyses” [Garland Allen to this author; 1-ix-1998]. Allen’s work, including “The Eugenics Record Office, Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940” has contributed significantly to redressing this balance.

The stock market crash of 1929 and the subsequent economic Depression had a two-fold impact on American eugenics. On the one-hand it led to a reappraisal by many people of what eugenics meant, who its targets were and the influence of political, economic and social factors on people’s lives. It also contributed to a crisis of funding for the eugenics movement, from which most organisations would never recover. The way that the Depression made people, especially the philanthropists reassess their priorities is demonstrated by a letter received by Davenport about funding the Third International Congress of Eugenics “there is so much demand for money to feed, clothe and house the unemployed, and for the care of children, that I am not at all interested in contributing funds to an International Congress of eugenics at this time” [CBDP1; Couzens to Davenport; 30-vi-1932]. The congress itself had severe funding problems as Davenport told Ploetz that the Americans “were very much grieved by the circumstances that the depression will make it impossible for us to raise funds to help our European colleagues to come to America” [CBDP1; Davenport to Ploetz; 19-ii-1932].

In the USA eugenicists had always utilised class, including questions of chronic poverty, ne'er-do-wells, unemployment, homelessness and pauperism. Some
American eugenicists saw the Depression as the delayed result of the low genetic standard of people in America and as evidence of the long feared race suicide. They blamed individuals for their unemployment, bankruptcy and poverty, rather than looking for structural reasons for the economic situation. When the crash put millions of families into poverty, increased homelessness and unemployment (as well as increasing related issues like the incidence of diseases like tuberculosis and the number of orphans) it should have become harder to condemn these people on a genetic basis. For many it became easier to see them as victims of economic and social circumstances beyond their control. America's orthodox eugenicists did, however, continue their claims. Comments such as that by Theodore Robie that "a major proportion of this vast army of unemployed are social defectives" would aid opponents of eugenics in their attempts to show the biases of eugenics [TICE; 1934; Robie; 208]. He suggested that sterilisation would provide an answer in dealing with the unemployed and the poor - an idea supported by many orthodox and racial eugenicists.

Eugenicists in the USA had always argued that eugenics was a long-term investment and that it was not necessarily the cheapest option in the short-term. The Depression meant that eugenic policies moved down the list of priorities for many people, as Paul Popenoe illustrated in 1934. In his annual report of the Human Betterment Foundation he wrote that “the California legislature failed to pass the revised sterilisation bill which was before it. This was probably inevitable since the attention of every legislature nowadays is taken up largely with the financial situation”. Looking at the availability of books on eugenics for the general public the report said that “the much reduced budgets of the [public] libraries have made it impossible for them to get the books they need” [Report at: WIHM SA/EUG C277 II; 13-ii-1934]. This failure in respect of sterilisation and the libraries went deeper than simply finances, but a lack of funds would certainly have contributed to the situation.

A personal symbol of the discredit brought on the eugenics movement was Yale University economist Irving Fisher. One of the central figures of pre-Depression
eugenics, he was on many of the most important committees and had often funded the movement himself. Daniel Kevles describes Fisher as “the prime mover in the American Eugenics Society” and one of the main figures in its founding [Kevles; 1995; 60]. Leon Whitney suggests that “before the depression of the thirties, Professor Fisher wrote that the country was sound and that the stocks priced so high were worth it... Thousands took his opinion to heart... when the crash wiped them out they blamed Professor Fisher”. A little later he says that “after the crash Irving Fisher’s name lost its magic” [LWA; 187 & 189]. So the eugenics movement suffered twice over from this. People were less inclined to trust the judgement of Fisher and other eugenicists and Fisher’s financial contributions to the movement declined considerably.

The decline in funding for eugenics has often been blamed on the Depression alone. Leon Whitney (echoing the sentiments of Paul Popenoe, above), wrote that “it became obvious that people were not going to contribute money during the depression to a long-term cause like Eugenics” [LWA; 221]. There is an element of wishful thinking on the behalf of some eugenicists, because it was easier for them to believe that funding dried up because of the economic circumstances than because of a general loss of interest in eugenics, or the emergence of new priorities. Yet the latter seems more likely, as many of the big funders - especially Rockefeller - had either withdrawn or reduced their funding before 1929. In 1928 George Eastman had complained to Leon Whitney that there were no longer enough wealthy people contributing to eugenics [CBDP1; Whitney to Davenport; 3-viii-1928]. Garland Allen notes that the proportion of the Carnegie Institution of Washington’s Department of Genetics expenditure going to the ERO steadily declined from 29% of total expenditure in 1918 to 13% in 1939 [Allen; 1986; 263]. Frederick Osborn was more realistic than some others when he wrote in 1933 that the “financial collapse was contemporaneous with the depression” [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2; 24-v-1933 2]. He does not suggest that it was caused by the depression - just that they coincided. A year or so before the onset of the financial crises in eugenics people were confident that money would not be a problem. Albert Wiggam told Raymond
Pearl that “within a year they [eugenic organisations] may come into several millions of money” [RPP; Wiggam to Pearl; 17-i-1927]. There had also been praise for the fund-raising of Leon Whitney and a belief that large donations from philanthropically minded individuals would continue. By early 1933 Leon Whitney complained that “the money which was furnished by... business men, to carry on work which scientists and enthusiasts wanted to carry on, has dropped off so materially that there is practically nothing left to work on” [JofH; 24 (1933); 150].

Rockefeller money had long been the major source of funds for American eugenics. It helped fund the early years of the AES and published family studies like *The Hill Folk* and *The Nam Family* [CBDP2; ERA Committee on Policy and Research]. In 1927 John D Rockefeller Junior contributed $84,000 to Henry Perkins’ Vermont Commission on Country Life (a subsidiary of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont) [Dann; 1991; 18]. The Rockefeller interest in eugenics slipped away from traditional racial and orthodox projects in the 1920s. The Bureau of Social Hygiene was a Rockefeller project, which in its early days relied heavily on Davenport, the ERO and its field workers. Throughout the 1920s Rockefeller interests moved more towards population control and a more reformist agenda, even refusing to have a financial connection with Laughlin’s influential book *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States* [Mehler; 1978; 9]. When the ERA applied for a grant in 1928 to fund its major research project on influences on the population such as race mixture, mate selection and differential fecundity, the application was turned down flat, no offer of a smaller amount was made and no explanation was given [CBDP2; ERA Committee on Policy and Research]. In the same year Rockefeller substantially cut his funding to the AES. In the early 1930s, when Perkins’ organisation had spent its $84,000 the grant was not renewed, even though this meant the collapse of the Vermont Commission on Country Life [Dann; 1991; 26]. Rockefeller turned down requests from both Laughlin and Davenport to help fund the Third International Congress of Eugenics, when it was on the point of collapse [CBDP1; Rockefeller’s secretary to Davenport; 8-iv-1932]. (The Rockefellers had stopped funding work at
the ERO as early as 1921, but before this John D Rockefeller Junior had given $21,650 of his own money [Allen; 1986; 241]).

This, however, was not the end of the relationship between the Rockefellers and eugenic issues and agendas. In 1933 Rockefeller money began to fund research in the emerging field of scientifically advanced human genetics (rather than its more eugenics fore-runner). They had shifted towards funding causes related to population - for example sponsoring the 1927 World Population Congress [RPP; Sanger to Pearl; 27-x-1927] as well as to research on birth control, including money for Margaret Sanger’s clinics. (In the early years of the century both Rockefeller and Carnegie had turned down funding requests from Franz Boas to help establish an African Museum, which would include an academic department to carry out non-partisan research into Black biology. The explicitly expressed motive of the museum was to undermine prejudice.) While Rockefeller money dried up for American eugenics it continued to support its German counterpart. Rockefeller money funded the establishment of the eugenics section of the KWI in 1927. It also continued to fund German scientists within the KWI and other centres as well as individual scientists, well into the Nazi years [Harwood; 1987; 402].

The AES had serious money problems from around 1927. When it began in the mid-1920s it was generously funded by John D Rockefeller Junior ($5,000 in 1925), George Eastman ($20,000 in 1925) and others [LWA; 188]. In 1924 the fore-runner of the AES (the Eugenics Committee), like the ERA, had a surplus of funds [CBDP1; Davenport to Roswell Johnson; 14-i-1924]. Yet within a few years the AES, like other organisations, was struggling. In 1928 Leon Whitney wrote to Davenport telling him that the AES had barely enough money to last it two months. Furthermore, even if George Eastman renewed his funding the society would still run $10,000 short for the year [LWP; Whitney to Davenport; 23-iv-1928]. Although Eastman came up with

---

* Whitney’s autobiography tells a story, which may have coloured Eastman’s opinion. After his contribution he received a letter, from a director of the AES which should have gone to Irving Fisher. The letter said of Eastman “if he is handled right we should be able to get a lot of money out of him” [LWA; 189].
the funding that year, the AES found itself in the same position the following year. In the intervening period the AES had passed the expensive fitter family competitions on to John Kellogg’s Race Betterment Foundation (they had cost $5,000-$7,000 a year to run, with, for example seven in 1925 [LWP; Whitney to Davenport; 26-iii-1929 & EugN; X (Oct 1925); 130]). AES finances must have been bad, because fitter family contests were central to eugenic promotions. Leon Whitney claimed “no activities of the [American Eugenics] society got so much publicity” [LWA; 195]. By March 1929 there was only one month’s money left in the AES bank account and it had been announced that Rockefeller was drastically reducing his contribution [LWP; Whitney to Davenport; 26-iii-1929]. That year Eastman did not renew his contribution. Thus six months before the onset of the Depression the AES was in the worst financial position it would be in, from its founding up to the end of the Second World War. It was partly due to finances that the AES established the journal Eugenics, which caused so many problems between the ERO and AES, and which helped to prise the eugenics movement apart. The AES hoped to replace the financial burden of Eugenical News, with income generated by a financially solvent journal - Eugenics. This project failed and the new journal folded. In the end Frederick Osborn saved the AES, by bringing to it money and a more reformist tone. Even then the AES dropped from a high of seven full time staff before the financial problems to just one in 1933 [JofH; 24 (1933); 150].

Eugene Gosney and Paul Popenoe’s organisation - the California based Human Betterment Foundation - suffered financial problems almost from the outset. Founded in 1929 it had been funded by the philanthropic businessman Eugene Gosney [JofH; 25 (1934); 22]. Gosney was hit by the 1929 crash and subsequent depression and the 1934 annual report of the Human Betterment Foundation referred to the “unfavorable economic conditions which have adversely affected this organisation as everyone else” [WIHM SA/EUG C277 II; 13-ii-1934]. By then, however, Popenoe and Roswell Johnson were devoting more of their energies to their own organisation, the Institute of Family Relations, which was moving gradually towards being a movement for population control and birth control and less of an
overtly eugenic organisation. (Popeneoe had been expressing his doubts about orthodox eugenics since 1930. See p236). In 1937 Popeneoe formally resigned from the Human Betterment Foundation [EugR; July 1937; 129].

To judge the rise and fall of American eugenics only by economic considerations and by the fate of eugenic organisations is misleading, as a good source of funding could help organisations to survive when they might otherwise have been expected to die. Henry Perkins' Eugenics Survey of Vermont (as distinct from the subsidiary Vermont Commission on Country Life) is a case in point. It survived the Depression years without a reduced budget, as it was receiving around $6,000 per year from a wealthy supporter. When that support stopped the Eugenics Survey of Vermont folded immediately [Dann; 1991; 8 & 25]. It should also be remembered that there were many wealthy people within the movement itself - Wickliffe Draper, Irving Fisher, Eugene Gosney, Madison Grant, Frederick Osborn, Charles Goethe - and that these people to some extent could prop up organisations when conventional sources became problematic. The Depression seems to have hit some, but not all of them hard, as many testify to in various letters. Randall Bird and Garland Allen comment that "Laughlin relied upon the wealthy and politically active Grant as a financial and legal consultant for the ERO" [Bird & Allen; 1981; 343]. Frederick Osborn had brought enough money to the AES (and the ERA) to re-launch it and subsidise its activities. This dimension to the question of funding in part obscures the fact that finances were dire by 1929, and that by 1933 almost anybody who could be described as a conventional source of funding had distanced themselves from eugenics. After 1929 a much more significant proportion of funding was 'internal', in that it came from the people who were actively involved in eugenics and who based their careers around it.

A combination of the Depression and the loss of status of eugenics led to a decline in the popularity of eugenics in American universities. American universities and colleges had long offered courses on eugenics, usually within the context of medicine, sociology, biology or genetics courses. As early as 1914 eugenics
courses were offered at 44 American universities including some of the country's most prestigious - Harvard, Pennsylvania, Cornell and MIT [JofH; 5 (1914); 186]. Jonathan Harwood writes that in 1916 there were 51 universities in the USA offering genetics courses so growth in genetics and eugenics in the early decades of the century was parallel [Harwood; 1987; 396]. (Germany's first chair of eugenics was established in 1923 in Munich). Many of the leaders of the eugenics movement were university teachers by profession - East, Fisher, Conklin, Castle, Huntington - often in genetics but also in economics (Fisher), sociology (Huntington) and other fields. By 1925 eugenics was taught (almost exclusively within other disciplines) at 116 universities and colleges [EugR; July 1925; 117]. There was a change at the end of the 1920s combining the onset of financial crises and the decline in status for eugenics. In 1927 Harvard University turned down a sizeable legacy to establish a course in eugenics [EugN; XII (July 1927); 84]. When Roswell Johnson told Charles Davenport in 1932 that he wished to teach eugenics at university, Davenport warned him that "most universities have been hard hit and are not making new appointments and often are not filling vacancies as they arise. The present is, and probably the next two years will be, a bad time for securing appointments" [CBDP1; Davenport to Johnson; 2-iv-1932]. Later in the decade when an attempt was made to establish a chair of Nordic history using Madison Grant's money, Dartmouth College turned the offer down [LWA; 218].
Orthodox eugenicists promoted the idea of selection along two lines - ethnic and social. An individual's value was determined by membership of an ethnic group - Nordic, Black, Jewish etc. - and/or membership of a socially constructed and defined group - the feeble-minded, the disabled, the morally degenerate etc. For orthodox eugenicists group membership was of overriding importance. The central tenets of orthodox eugenics never changed from the twin policies of ever stricter immigration controls and sterilisation of the disproportionately foreign-born "submerged tenth". In 1911 Prescott Hall, the racial eugenicist and founder of the IRL, wrote that "if we can shut up [segregate] or sterilise all defectives, and the immigration people would do their duty... it might be possible to improve present conditions a good deal" [CBDP1; Hall to Davenport; 14-iv-1911]. It was exactly against this two pronged analysis and policy programme that the first salvo was fired by reform eugenics [Pearl; 1927; 261]. By 1931 the programme remained unaltered, a leading article in *Eugenical News* described the "two instruments" of eugenics as "the control of immigration, making race conservation...the dominant motive, and, second, the establishment of eugenical sterilization on a legally sound basis" [EugN; XVI (April 1931); 45].

In the years up to the mid-1920s there was one general position on eugenic questions. The orthodox position was eugenics, with the racial eugenicists focusing more on the racial aspects, but based on the same assumptions. It was only after this point that a broad variety of thought emerged. Differences had existed but not on the scale that they did within reform eugenics. Men like Raymond Pearl, who would go on to develop a distinctive reform position rejecting the orthodox position, had once fully accepted it. Pearl's 1908 article "Breeding Better Men" had supported the idea of genetically determined morality and intelligence, of the equating of class with eugenic value and of immigrants as a major source of degeneration [Pearl; 1908; 9823].
CHAPTER 3

The late formal halting of the work of orthodox eugenics in the late 1930s would suggest that the orthodox position was accepted for a lot longer than it actually was. The formal closure of orthodox eugenics can be dated to 1939 with the closing of the ERO and the transfer of Eugenical News to the AES. There had been attempts at closure ten years previously. Eugenical News had only survived at Davenport’s personal insistence. In reality orthodox eugenic institutions lingered on long after the movement was effectively over.

Criticism of the ERO and Charles Davenport had first come to a head in 1928 when John Merriam of the Carnegie Institution of Washington established a committee of investigation, which got nowhere. This was at least partly due to Davenport’s personal standing within eugenics and science generally. A second committee was appointed in 1935 almost as soon as Davenport retired and was more effective. It recommended closing the ERO as soon as current projects had come to an end, and in the meantime severing links with Eugenical News. Both committees had been appointed by Merriam and both contained geneticist L.C. Dunn, but while the first committee had included eugenicists such as Laughlin, Clark Wissler (curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History) and E.L. Thorndike (a psychologist at Columbia University), the second was more hostile, even though it contained people such as Hooton, who was still on the AES advisory board but distanced from orthodox eugenics [Huntington; 1935]. The ERO and Eugenical News had narrowly escaped closure in 1928, and both had survived due to Davenport, but remained under scientific siege for the rest of the 1920s and the entire 1930s until closure. In the short term Davenport may have appeared to have won a victory for eugenics, but in the longer term, his refusal to allow his branch of eugenics to change assured its increasing irrelevance and ultimate demise. By the mid-1930s Raymond Pearl and others argued that eugenicists like Laughlin and Grant were simply not taken seriously in the USA [FBP; Pearl to Boas; 3-x-1935]. In the same year Davenport finally realised the situation of the movement when he

\* For the full story of the committees see Allen; 1986; 250-254 & Barkan; 1992; 274-5.
expressed his doubts about its future, in a letter to Frederick Osborn [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 11-ix-1935].

Merriam’s investigations and ultimate closure of orthodox eugenics was not due to an opposition to eugenics per se. He remained a committed eugenicist, but like many other mainstream scientists joined the reformers. At the time of the first inquiry Davenport told Frederick Osborn that “there is no question at all about his interest in eugenics” [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 25-iii-1929]. Merriam showed his continuing interest by remaining on the advisory board of the AES from its founding in 1923 until the late 1930s. Although he retired in 1938, Merriam set in motion a chain of events which led to the closure of the Carnegie Institution of Washington’s involvement with orthodox eugenics and began its move into human genetics on the Cold Spring Harbor site.

Orthodox and racial eugenicists continued to utilise discredited scientific methods. They used the unit character theory of heredity, found all traits to be genetic in origin, ignored the environment. As well as use of these ideas, they still used the family studies to conflate all forms of degeneration. Arthur Estabrook’s work, starting from Mongrel Virginians, continued into the 1930s and Henry Perkins’ Eugenics Survey of Vermont was in the style of the family studies. Theodore Robie referred specifically to the Kallikaks and Jukes at the Third International Congress of Eugenics and even added some families of his own [TICE; 1934; Robie; 201 & 203-5]. They were even being used in the pages of the Birth Control Review to support sterilisation and birth control methods amongst “American Gypsies” and other defectives [BCR iv-1933; 96].

As well as changes in science and rise of various forms of opposition leading to the demise of orthodox and racial eugenics, the immigration half of the eugenics platform became less relevant in the post-1929 world. As is noted in chapter 1, the 1924 and 1927 Immigration Acts had already drastically reduced immigration levels. It was not just the numerical decline that eugenicists considered important.
Immediately after the 1924 act, according to eugenics propaganda, Nordic / Anglo-Saxon immigration from Europe rose from 15% of the total to 85%, while south-east European immigration declined from 85% to 15% [EugN; X (June 1925; 70]. In the wake of the 1929 crash and subsequent Depression (and the introduction of tougher immigration law enforcement methods) the USA actually became a country of net emigration (i.e. more people left the country than arrived). In January 1931 for example the USA allowed in 12,815 people, but 21,566 left voluntarily, while another 1,517 were deported. *Eugenical News* reported such statistics gleefully, and cautioned against relaxing immigration controls, predicting that the economic circumstances would have produced a flood of migrants if tough restrictions had not existed [EugN; XVI (Apr 1931); 49]. This decrease was partly caused by the ever shrinking number of visas available to migrants and partly by people no longer being able to afford transportation costs. 1931 saw the smallest number of immigrants since before the civil war and was about 10,000 lower than in 1918 (a previous low point caused by the war) [EugN; XVI (June 1931); 90]. The ethnic breakdown of the arrivals in 1931 compared to previous years were significant. The national group showing the biggest rise was Germans while the biggest decrease was Mexicans. *Eugenical News* commented that "trends now show a considerable slowing down of the former rate of change in our population structure from the old stock toward the new" [EugN; XVI (Nov 1931); 196-76]. By 1933 there was not much change in the migration situation, with many countries still unable to fill their much reduced immigration quotas [EugN; XVIII (July/Aug 1933); 74]. It was also at this time - 1931 - that Laughlin's post as eugenic expert witness to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization expired [Allen; 1987; 196]. Between 1930 and 1935 the USA, by Bureau of Census figures became a net exporter of people to the tune of 251,000 people over the period [EugR; Apr 1936; 54].

Despite the reversal of the migration situation orthodox and racial eugenicists continued their assault on immigrants and demands for more controls. At the same time that *Eugenical News* was reporting this change, the number of articles which one way or another attacked immigrants and potential immigrants increased. The
period 1929 to 1932 was possibly the most racially obsessed for the journal (counting articles on miscegenation and the Black population). The three month period (April to June 1931), when some of the statistics above were reported, saw articles on a bureau of criminal alien investigation, citizenship and residency, voluntary deportations, Hans F K Günther's views of Jews, alien representation, smugglers of aliens, temporary immigration and racial trends of the south. Orthodox and racial eugenicists had for so long built their programme around immigration restriction, that in the post-1929 world where immigration almost ceased to exist, they either found it hard to, or were unwilling to, adjust to the new situation and alter their programme accordingly. An issue like immigration control, which in the years after World War One had proved so popular in some quarters was no longer such a guaranteed 'crowd-pleaser', especially as the biological basis of racial thinking was no longer so certain.

If Nordicism was to bring down eugenics, it would not need the example of Nazi Germany. There were plenty of people working within a broadly eugenic framework who rejected Nordicism before Hitler's ideas were even known in Germany. There were plenty of others willing to promote it - Grant, Laughlin, Stoddard and Campbell. Raymond Pearl, despite his anti-Semitism and racialism cautioned that "the reactionary group led by Madison Grant and with Laughlin as its chief spade worker were likely, in their zeal for the Nordic, to do a great deal of real harm" [HSJP1; Pearl to Jennings; 24-xi-1923]. By the end of the 1920s there was an almost total lack of interest in Nordicism in the USA, outside of racial and orthodox eugenics circles. In 1928 Wickliffe Draper had put up $1,200 prize money for an essay competition on the declining fertility of Nordics. After a year only one competition entry had been received from the entire USA (plus three from Europe, including two from Germany) [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 10-iv-1929].

* Australia went a stage further than the USA and banned immigration outright (excluding Britons) in 1931. Like the USA Australia became a net exporter of population with many
At around the same time as Davenport retired - 1934 - his generation of orthodox and racial eugenicists largely came to an end, as they died or retired. For example, Robert DeCourcey Ward died in 1931 [EugN; XVI (Nov. 1931); 204], Henry Fairfield Osborn died in 1935 and Madison Grant died in 1937. Commenting on the hundred person advisory board of the AES in 1935, Davenport commented to Ellsworth Huntington that it would need considerable revising “to take account of many deaths” [CBDP1; Davenport to Huntington; 12-viii-1935]. Laughlin’s career struggled on at the irrelevant ERO. In the late 1930s he was an embarrassment to the Carnegie Institution of Washington and he became increasingly ill. Many of the financiers of orthodox eugenics either died (Mrs Harriman, Cleveland Dodge), had financial difficulties (Eugene Gosney) or moved on to other interests (Charles Goethe).

In a letter probably written in the 1960s Frederick Osborn summarised the differences between his reform brand of eugenics and the older orthodox and racial brand:

the name eugenics was kept alive in the United States by a group of people... [who] accepted the pseudo-scientific theory prevalent at that time, that the white race was superior to other races, and they gave eugenics a strong racist tinge. They under-rated the effect of bad environments in causing low IQs, delinquency and crime. They proposed sterilization for all sorts of people who in the light of today's knowledge would not be considered in any way genetically inferior.

[FOP; Frederick Osborn to Johnson; n.d. ca. 1960s]

The letter ends by arguing that the racial dimension in American eugenics led to the American public rejecting all eugenics, once they saw Nazi eugenics in action. But, as noted on page 128, Frederick Osborn only developed this argument years after World War Two had ended.

\* He suffered from epilepsy - one of the conditions he had labelled as degenerate and campaigned to end through sterilisation [Allen; 1986; 254]. Similarly Henry Perkins campaigned for sterilisation of alcoholics, but himself died an alcoholic in 1956 [Dann; 1991; 26]. Neither man offered himself up for sterilisation.
• Davenport

An important factor in the decline of orthodox eugenics in the USA was Charles Davenport. Until his retirement in 1934 the eugenics movement could not function without his approval and even after this date he remained influential. This was because of his personal standing and the position that he had created for himself where he exerted influence in almost all the significant eugenic organisations, as well as on the individuals who made up those organisations. Since before the war Davenport had been the most important person in American eugenics. In 1911 Jennings had commented on his all powerful position “anyone would make a great mistake... to show a disregard for the fact that Davenport is in charge of that work [eugenics] for the [Carnegie] institution, or to seem to reflect in any way on his management, past or prospective” [RPP; Jennings to Pearl; 2-ii-1911]. From the late 1920s the AES tried to extricate itself from his grip which in the process caused a great deal of resentment. It proved almost impossible for any group to gain independence of Davenport against his will. Many people’s private complaints about Davenport reveal how by the late 1920s he had lost the private respect of many people, and was simply preventing any development or change within the eugenics movement.

By the end of the 1920s many within the eugenics movement believed there was a pressing need for streamlining, to reduce the number of organisations and journals and to reduce the level of duplication. This was due to funding problems, changes within science, generational changes resulting in a general crisis in eugenics. Some privately hoped for a redirecting of the movement rather than a simple repackaging. Frederick Osborn’s suggested remedy to the problems of eugenics was “a considerable period during which an attempt is made to bring together the more valuable elements” of the AES, ERO and organisations such as Henry Pratt Fairchild’s birth control-oriented Population Association [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2; 24-v-1933 5]. Ultimately Frederick Osborn was looking to full scale mergers. Davenport prevented any reorganisation of the movement. In 1928 the
AES founded a new journal in place of *Eugenical News*. Leon Whitney wrote to Paul Popenoe at the time that "it was a pity that he [Davenport] was able to block the discontinuance of Eugenical News... Laughlin was for giving it up, I know, and so was practically every other person, but they had to toady to Davenport" [AESP; Whitney to Popenoe; 21-ii-1929]. When others in the movement wanted to begin merging organisations, Davenport again prevented it. The first stage of this could have been the merging of the ERA and the AES (who were jointly running *Eugenical News* and held joint annual conferences), but any merger was again stopped by Davenport. This particular merger had been on the cards almost since the AES's founding - being discussed at a meeting in 1925 [EugN; XI (Feb 1926); 28]. Whitney complained to Popenoe that "it was a great shame that Dr Davenport was able to block the desires of almost all other members in seeing that the Eugenics Research Association and the American Eugenics Society do not combine" [AESP; Whitney to Popenoe; 21-ii-1929]. In his private report to John D Rockefeller Junior in May 1933 Frederick Osborn complained that the ERO - Davenport's power base - could no longer function properly because of him. Meanwhile, even though relations had cooled considerably, Davenport was still trying to control the AES. In 1932 he instructed Frederick Osborn that the AES would have to make do with a reduced budget, should use *Eugenical News* as its official publication and get rid of Leon Whitney [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 8-vi-1932].

It was not just his organisational style that people questioned, the quality of his scientific work was also in doubt. As has already been mentioned the Carnegie Institution of Washington had its doubts about Davenport's work and as early as 1928 investigated the ERO. Scientists who had to varying degrees supported Davenport's eugenics began to distance themselves from him. This group includes scientists such as Raymond Pearl and W E Castle. (Raymond Pearl had voiced concerns about Davenport as early as 1910. He wrote that Davenport's work was "very careless and slipshod... It seems to me a pity that Davenport cannot be more critical of his material, and more careful and thorough in regard to details in his work" [RPP; Pearl to Jennings; 9-vii-1910]). Public criticism of Davenport's ERO
work stretched back a long way. In 1915 the ERO data had been described as "in
many cases wholly superficial" at a meeting of the orthodox eugenics oriented
American Genetic Association [quoted in Mehler; 1978; 9]. W E Castle turned on
Davenport's work, demonstrating how science had left Davenport behind. Castle
had used the analogy of breeding horses to argue against race-crossing, in his 1916
book Genetics and Eugenics [Castle; 1916; 233]. When Davenport used the same
argument in his 1930 report on race crossing, Castle attacked him for it both publicly
and privately - by 1930 such simplistic extrapolation from animal to human was no
longer acceptable or scientifically valid [Castle; 1930 & HSJP2; Davenport to
Jennings; 17-vi-1930]. Despite the condemnation Davenport continued to use the
dog analogy to condemn race crossing, for example at the Third International
Congress of Eugenics [TICE; 1934; Davenport; 22]. (He also continued, into the
1930s, to see Black people as more closely related to gorillas than to White people
[see the review of his 1932 article on foot arches in EugR; July 1933; 127]).

Raymond Pearl's great confidant on his problems with old-style eugenics - Herbert
Spencer Jennings - was less condemnatory of Davenport (he also shared some of
Davenport's views, such as those on race crossing). While undoubtedly critical of
him like many others, unlike many others he continued to regard Davenport as a
serious scientist, keeping up a good correspondence with him until into the 1930s.
As late as 1932 he advised a colleague to consult "men experienced in work on
man: Dr Pearl, perhaps, and Dr C B Davenport" [HSJP2; Jennings to Baker; 12-xii-
1932]. Morgan too remained on good terms with Davenport and respected him
enough that when he resigned as chair of the Sixth International Congress of
Genetics in 1929 he nominated Davenport to the post [CBDP1; minutes of congress
meeting; 27-iv-1929].

As well as these eugenically sympathetic scientists there were those like Franz Boas
who had never supported Davenport's eugenics work plus a new generation of
scientists including L C Dunn and others who were highly suspicious of his research.
Davenport's views never progressed from those of the early eugenics movement,
with a simplistic version of inheritance, no scope for environmental influence, crude racial attitudes and less than rigorous methodologies. Davenport appears to have wilfully neglected to update his ideas. To use one example, the issue of the unit character theory of inheritance had been taken to the heart of the movement when Hermann Muller addressed the ERO in 1929 and outlined "the death of the unit character theory". Notes of the evening in Davenport's files show that he was present at the lecture [CBDP1; Muller; 25-vii-1929]. As well as Muller, this theory had been destroyed in books by Jennings, East and Morgan - all scientists whose work he would have been familiar with. Yet Davenport continued, to the end of his life, to suggest that unit characters determined phenomena like intelligence, stature and temperament. At the Third International Congress of Eugenics Davenport was promoting the idea of research on genetic foundations of ability in "music, mathematics, invention, organization and the rest" [TICE; 1934; Davenport; 20]. Even Madison Grant had consciously dropped the idea from the second edition of his Passing of the Great Race because of the uncertainty surrounding the idea, and told Davenport this [CBDP1; Grant to Davenport; 20-xi-1917]. The other half of the orthodox axis suffered the same problem of intellectual and scientific paralysis. Randall Bird and Garland Allen, who organised the Laughlin archives, suggest that Laughlin "was saying virtually the same sorts of things in the late 1930s that he had said before World War I" [Bird & Allen; 1981; 353]. As early as 1924 Jennings saw Laughlin as the main problem for eugenics [HSJP; Jennings to Fisher; 27-ix-1924].

Davenport's positions seem to have been cemented around the First World War. His 1912 book Eugenics in Relation to Heredity, although not totally supportive of immigration, he assigns good racial characteristics to various immigrant groups - including the Poles and the Irish - and praises the eugenic value of immigration generally to bring in pioneering and resourceful genes. He defines the immigration problem in terms of importing mental illness and feeble-mindedness, but argues that "nor can the immigration problem be solved by excluding on the ground of race or native country" [Davenport; 1912; 213-8, 221]. By the end of the First World War his views had come more into line with orthodox and racial eugenicists and the IRL. He
wrote to Madison Grant "can we build a wall high enough to keep out these cheaper races". He feared that it may be necessary "for our descendants to abandon the country... and seek asylum in New Zealand" [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 3-v-1920]. Once Davenport accepted the need for ethnically based immigration quotas, he, like the rest of the racial and orthodox wings never shifted from the position. Other positions, such as on sterilisation underwent the same change, and then stayed fixed for the rest of his life.

Davenport's dominating position within eugenics and the growing group of scientists whose work conflicted with his meant that when serious problems arose for eugenics in the latter half of the 1920s Davenport would be an obstacle in the way of any restructuring of the eugenics movement. It was the question of birth control and practical organisational issues that ultimately broke the AES away from the old, Davenport dominated, orthodox movement and gave it the freedom to reorganise itself into a more modern reform eugenics organisation (for example, Davenport refused to have anything to do with the AES journal *Eugenics*).

The AES and Frederick Osborn never renounced the word eugenics but their later work reflected scientific and other changes in reform eugenics. Under the leadership of orthodox and racial eugenics, claims had become ever greater with progressively less evidence and an ever fainter link to what was scientifically justifiable [see Pearl; 1927]. From the mid-1920s onwards reform eugenicists questioned the scientific validity of claims and thus put question marks over much of orthodox eugenics. On an institutional level the ERO and other areas associated with the Davenport-Laughlin axis* remained firmly orthodox, the AES moved towards a more reform position as people like Frederick Osborn and Ellsworth Huntington came to prominence in the organisation, and Harry Laughlin, Madison Grant and others lost

---

* According to Garland Allen part of the reason that Davenport and Laughlin worked so well together is that both men "were highly energetic and serious about their work, utterly humorless and rigid in their approach to life, and totally dedicated to the cause of social reform through eugenics" [Allen; 1986; 236].
favour. Paul Popenoe, Irving Fisher, Roswell Johnson and others also moved away from strictly orthodox positions.

Davenport continued to promote the old programme, long after it had been discredited, called into question or become irrelevant. His presidential address to the Third International Congress of Eugenics condemned race crossing, promoted sterilisation and applauded immigration restriction [TICE; 1934; Davenport; 17-22]. These were exactly the ideas being promoted at the end of World War One.

• Eugenical News

Eugenical News was founded in 1916 and was the leading journal of American eugenics until 1939. (The Journal of Heredity being the other significant journal, mixing genetics and orthodox eugenics). Throughout this period Eugenical News remained a tool of the orthodox and racial eugenicists, especially of Charles Davenport (after 1939 it was taken over and reorganised by the AES). At various points it was “the official organ” of a number of bodies ranging from the Galton Society, the ERA and AES to the Third International Congress of Eugenics and the IFEO. Eugenical News has been cited by a number of writers in support of the idea that Nazism was of importance in the downfall of the American movement. Such historians have argued that the journal was a vocal supporter of Nazism and that it was used by Davenport and Laughlin in endless praise of Nazi policy, which in turn discredited American eugenics. Garland Allen sees the support offered to Nazi policies and the Rassenhygiene wing in general by Eugenical News, as vital to the demise of the ERO [Allen; 1986; 252-3].

As an instrument of Davenport's version of eugenics, Eugenical News reflected his concerns, such as immigration restriction. As with Davenport's reputation, respect for Eugenical News declined as science progressed. Frederick Osborn writing in May 1933 described the journal as "a small monthly or quarterly bulletin... which has little scientific value" [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2; 24-v-1933 3]. Its
editorial board, like its conception of eugenics did not really change very much in the period up to 1939.

Until 1928 Eugenical News had been the official publication of both the ERA (part of the ERO) and the AES. Recurrent financial crises in the AES meant that it could no longer afford the journal's $200 per month loss. Instead the AES proposed a new, more popular and financially self-sustaining journal. Davenport took exception to this idea and insisted that they run both journals - Eugenical News and Eugenics. He also refused to have any connection with the new journal or to go on its editorial board [LWP; Davenport to Whitney; 28-ix-1928 & CBDP1; Davenport to Whitney; 17-xii-1928]. (See pages 236-9 for details of the split between the AES and Davenport).

Eugenical News' circulation had been falling for years and by the early 1930s it was essentially 'preaching to the converted' in that it was read mainly by those who were already within the racial and orthodox camps. In 1931 Davenport informed Frederick Osborn that the journal's circulation was 400 [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 13-iii-31]. By coincidence the membership of the ERA was also around 400 (the same as in 1925 [EugN; X (Aug 1925); 89]). As this was one of the two bodies which published Eugenical News, it would seem probable that the ERA membership formed a large part of the readership of the Eugenical News (others would have included members of the Galton Society and the IFEO which it also spoke for). It is highly unlikely that it was read by a significant number of other scientists, members of the public or influential people from well before 1930. By 1931 Eugenics had closed and Eugenical News was marginalised, such was the lack of interest in eugenics.

Both had been superseded by other journals like Raymond Pearl's more scientifically rigorous Quarterly Review of Biology (established 1927), which covered much of the same ground "physical and general anthropology, anthropometry, vital statistics, human heredity and eugenics, prehistory, human anatomy, sociology,
constitutional pathology, and sociobiology" [CBDP1; Pearl to Davenport; xi-1927].

Like Germany's *ARGB* the Quarterly Review of Biology had a reciprocal reviewing arrangement with Eugenical News when it was founded. Pearl had also founded the journal Human Biology, which he edited. The board of that journal was an international one which was generally *Rassenhygiene* / orthodox oriented. It included Davenport and Edward East from the USA, Kretschmer of Germany, Gini of Italy and Lundborg of Sweden [CBDP1; Pearl to Davenport; n.d. ca. 1928].

Demand for journals dealing exclusively with eugenics was on the decline. By the early 1930s people who wanted a serious eugenics journal tended to read the British Eugenics Review, which opposed Nazism and Nazi eugenics. The other orthodox journal The Journal of Heredity was comprehensively overhauled in 1933, and supposedly put on a more reformist and scientific footing (although this is hard to detect from reading it).

Davenport recognised the position of Eugenical News long before 1933. By 1931 he was arguing that the main eugenics journals were the *ARGB*, Eugenics Review, Quarterly Review of Biology, American Journal of Physical Anthropology and Human Biology but not his own journal [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 13-iii-31]. He bemoaned the lack of readers of Eugenical News and the much better quality of the other journals. In the same letter to Frederick Osborn he seems to regret having even kept Eugenical News going and it reveals that Davenport was trying to off-load it (along with the financial burden). He told Frederick Osborn that Laughlin and himself "have been carrying the "News" now for 15 years and are not sure that it is worth the while" [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 13-iii-31].

The major period of racially oriented articles in Eugenical News came not immediately after the rise of Nazism, but after the split with the AES at the end of the 1920s. Issues in 1928 and 1929 were packed with a scientifically outdated programme including articles about immigration, Nordicism, Black inferiority and the dangers of race-crossing.
The racial prejudice of *Eugenical News* in the period before 1933 is not to be denied, but unlike in the latter period, some of the more extreme racial views within the movement were eliminated from the journal's pages. A letter from the prominent businessman and eugenics enthusiast DuPont contained such lines as "let us hope that this [eugenics] Congress will cut off the immigration of all undesirables! In this country, the influx of Russian Jews, Poles, Orientals, Arabs, Indo-Chinese is appalling... Niggers are already members of the French Chamber of Deputies". Davenport deemed it "so emotional that it would hardly serve for printing" [CBDP1; DuPont to Grant; 22-iii-1929 & Davenport to Grant; 22-x-1929]. A year later Davenport rejected the idea of publishing a letter from Hans F K Günther writing that "on account of its political bearings [i.e. anti-Semitism] the letter could not be printed" [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 7-x-1930].

The American eugenics movement had its open anti-Semites such as the racial eugenicists Lothrop Stoddard and Madison Grant, and its more discreetly anti-Jewish members like Laughlin and Davenport. Stefan Kühl believes that "although most mainline [orthodox] eugenicists were anti-Semitic themselves, they were careful not to be too blatant in supporting Nazi discrimination against the Jews" [Kühl; 1994; 73]. The anti-Jewish aspects of Nazism were one of the earlier reservations that Americans felt about Nazism, but it seems that the link to public pronouncements by American eugenicists was hard to make. Amongst the USA's most anti-Semitic eugenicists was Stoddard, whose work on the *Birth Control Review* and the American Birth Control League continued unaffected into the war years.

Garland Allen suggests that between 1928 and 1933 Laughlin "published strongly adulatory articles about Nazi race-hygiene in the *Eugenical News*" [Allen; 1986; 251]. Such articles did appear, but later than Allen suggests. In the years up to 1933 there were only two articles about Nazism and in 1933 there was a single four page article on the new sterilisation law [EugN; XVIII (Sept/Oct 1933); 89-93]. Many other journals also gave coverage to this law, including *Nature*, the *JAMA* and *Science*. It
was in 1934 that Nazism became a major focus for Eugenical News. At the beginning of the year the approach was quite cautious. The January / February edition was devoted to eugenics around the world - from France to Brazil to Africa to Australia, but not Germany. The March / April edition was specifically about eugenics in Germany, containing for example a five page article by Wilhelm Frick (Minister of the Interior) [EugN; XIX (Mar/Apr 1934); 33-8]. The same issue contained an article on editorial responsibility, which ended with the words of Voltaire “I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it” [EugN; XIX (Mar/Apr 1934); 46]. By the end of the same year, however, articles were being published without any kind of disclaimer or criticism, including anti-Jewish ones, such as one supporting reductions in the number of Jewish physicians [EugN; XIX (Sept/Oct 1934); 126]. Many of the articles were simply translated, unedited reprints of German ones. Articles in support of various aspects of Nazi policy continued through 1935 and by 1936 Clarence Campbell was writing lengthy articles calling for a “correct understanding [of] the great importance of the German racial policy” [EugN; XXI (Mar/Apr 1936); 25]. In 1936 Falk Ruttke - eugenicist to the SS - joined the editorial committee as a German representative, along with Rüdin and Fischer [EugN; XXI (Jan/Feb 1936)]. It appears then that support for Nazism came after 1934, rather than early on as some writers have suggested. By this time Eugenical News was marginalised to the point where it was an utter irrelevance through not having a readership. It was still the representative journal of orthodox eugenics but had all but folded.

The position of Eugenical News regarding Nazi policy needs to be put into a broader context. In the early years of the regime support came also from many respectable quarters, albeit usually more guardedly. The JAMA continued with its Berlin correspondence column until May 1940 and received and reviewed German journals (including some rather dubious Nazi sponsored ones) until July 1940 [Bloch; 1973;}

* Stefan Kühl suggests that this article was written representing the Galton Society, the ERA and the AES [Kühl; 1994; 35]. Eugenical News had not been the official organ of the AES since 1928.
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47]. The Berlin Correspondence was largely supportive of the regime and although it did not speak directly for the JAMA the decision to keep the column going for so long is revealing. JAMA editorials in 1934 offered little substantial criticism of Nazi policy. For example, one on sterilisation referred to the “widely different schemes” being applied in the US and Germany and the fact that “mass sterilization is presumably being carried out”. It rejected the idea of criticism or praise by the statement that “while recognizing the possible potential value of sterilization, the medical profession can perhaps serve its purpose best by retaining a scientific detachment in assessing the biologic and social results of the programs now in force” [JAMA; 102 (1934); 1502]. On the same subject the journal Nature (while cautioning of potential political abuse) supported the idea of sterilisation and wrote that “the value of eugenic sterilisation could be tested much more thoroughly and completely in Germany than in the United States, and certainly it is most desirable that its worth should be assessed” [Nature; 132 (Aug 1933); 221]. Like most other journals the JAMA for a long time remained silent when it came to condemnation of Nazism. Other journals in the eugenics field like the Birth Control Review and the Journal of heredity gave favourable coverage to events and policies in Nazi Germany.

Under Nazism many in Germany continued to treat Eugenical News as a serious scientific journal. Stefan Kühl comments that the Rassenpolitische Auslandskorrespondenz “was clearly conscious of the importance of Eugenic News [sic]. In 1935, it proudly announced that the extensive and detailed coverage of eugenic laws in Nazi Germany by Eugenic News [sic] was an “unambiguous” sign of the “highest attention” foreign scientists bestowed on Nazi Germany” [Kühl; 1994; 47]. This was at best wishful thinking and at worst a blatant distortion of reality for political purposes. By 1935 Eugenical News was far from an important journal. The view expressed by the Rassenpolitische Auslandskorrespondenz was far from that of those associated with the journal. Leon Whitney and many others had voted to close it in the late 1920s and even Davenport had lost interest in it. The evidence cited above hardly suggests that it was a thriving, popular and respected journal.
By the time that the Nazis came to power, Eugenical News was only really in existence because Davenport insisted that it continue. By the time that Eugenical News began its blatant support of Nazism's more controversial aspects it had a very low readership, was a financial drain, was seen as having no scientific worth and nobody even wanted to run it. Largely, it only spoke to people who were already sympathetic to its viewpoint. Garland Allen is correct, of course, in highlighting an instance of a resignation from the Galton Society due to pro-Nazi articles, but this is the exception rather than the rule and there is little evidence that articles in Eugenical News generated any kind of response from outside of the orthodox and racial camps. Furthermore, the broader point that Allen is making in the same article is that at this point (1934) respectable scientists, outside of Eugenical News, such as Raymond Pearl could still be sympathetic to Nazism without any loss of status [Allen; 1980; 27-8]. When the ERO closed and Eugenical News came under the control of the AES it appeared that nobody - especially the AES - wanted to have the job of looking after back issues of the journal, such was its disrepute. Frederick Osborn told Blakeslee at Cold Spring Harbor that "I feel strongly that they should not be in the hands of the American Eugenics Society" [CBDP1; Frederick Osborn to Blakeslee; 23-iv-1940].

- The Third International Congress of Eugenics

The fact that orthodox and racial eugenics were in terminal decline before the advent of Nazism is illustrated by the case of the Third International Congress of Eugenics, which was held in New York in 1932. By and large the congress was an affair of the racial and orthodox camps. The organising committee consisted of Davenport, Laughlin, Whitney, Grant, Fisher and Campbell. The only reform member was Frederick Osborn [CBDP1; International Congress (3rd) No.1]. Many reformers stayed away, and those that went, such as Hermann Muller, used it as a platform to attack the old-guard [TICE; 1934; Muller; 138-144]. According to Philip Reilly, when Davenport read Muller's paper he cut his speaking time at the congress from an hour to just ten minutes. Reilly calls the shortened paper that Muller finally
delivered "a heavy volley" against the old-guard and especially against its racial biases [Reilly; 1991; 114]. Muller's paper must have been anathema to the orthodox and racial eugenicists present. It promoted birth control and argued that there was no genetic, only environmental, basis for differences in IQ scores between social and racial groups, thus destroying the basis of their policy proposals - especially immigration restriction and anti-miscegenation laws.

The congress suffered from a lack of funding, a lack of delegates, a general lack of interest and it was still putting forward the old programme. Typical claims were that “a sterilisation law, enforced throughout the United States, would result, in less than 100 years, in eliminating at least 90% of crime, insanity, feeblemindedness, moronism, and abnormal sexuality” [TICE; 1934; Sadler; 198]. Eugenic sterilisation was promoted by Popenoe, Robie and Laughlin. W A Plecker opened his address with the sentences “it is assumed that no one in this audience will dispute the wisdom and desirability of preserving the different races of man in their purity. This is particularly true as to intermixture between the two extremes - white and black” [TICE; 1934; Plecker; 105]. This was echoed by Davenport, Campbell, and others. Stricter immigration controls were promoted by Davenport, Robie and others. But these three areas of policy had changed. These statements were in keeping with the views of orthodox and racial eugenicists, but ignored all the scientific developments of the previous two decades, from genetics to psychology. They still utilised the discredited unit character theory of heredity. They ignored changes in understanding of sociological and psychological effects of the environment on behaviour and personality. Where these statements would once have been in keeping with a large body of scientific opinion and theory, by 1932 they were a form of eugenical wishful thinking, ignoring a raft of scientific and social scientific developments from the beginning of the century onwards. Traditional scientists stayed away, including many who had been involved in earlier congresses. These included Morgan, Pearl, Jennings, Castle and Brigham.
The combination of the Depression and the loss of interest in funding eugenics meant that money was much harder to come by than it once would have been. While the Second International Congress of Eugenics had had a budget of $16,000 the third one only aimed to raise $10,000, and even then had to consider reducing that to $5,000 [CBDP1; Davenport to Rockefeller; 6-iv-1932 & Frederick Osborn to Davenport; 10-xii-1931]. Similarly, while the exhibition at the second congress cost $3,527.91 that for the third was only allocated $3,000.00 [CBDP1; Davenport to Draper; 1-iii-1932]. The final figures were even worse than the proposed amounts and allocations. The second congress spent a total of $13,016.49 on the congress, exhibition and publications, while the third one only spent $6,716.96 [TICE; 1934; 13-4].

Rockefeller money appeared to no longer be forthcoming for eugenic activities. Herbert Hoover, now President of the USA, who had secured money for the 1921 congress, rejected a request for funding [CBDP1; Secretary to US President to Davenport; 24-ii-1932]. Cleveland Dodge had donated $500 to the second congress and his widow eventually gave the same again to the third, having earlier offered $50 and an apology. Mrs Harriman had given $2,500 to the second congress and after much pestering, her philanthropic organisation gave $500 to the third. [CBDP1; International Congress (3\textsuperscript{rd}), Finance Committee No.1 & HSJP; Little to Jennings; 12-iv-1921]. In the end the third congress was funded by Harriman, Dodge, the Carnegie Institution of Washington ($1,000), Wickliffe Draper ($605) and Frederick Osborn ($500). The number of large donors dropped from eight to two between the second and third congresses, and the number of medium donors declined from nineteen to eight [TICE; 1934; 13-4]. John Kellogg gave $50\textsuperscript{*} and Irving Fisher $55. Frederick Osborn's contribution was inadvertent. He loaned the congress money to get the project up and running but Davenport subsequently refused to return the money [CBDP1; Frederick Osborn to Davenport; 6-v-1931 & Davenport to Frederick Osborn]...

\textsuperscript{*} In the 1920s Kellogg was accused by Irving Fisher and Leon Whitney of trying to buy his way into respectability within eugenics [LWP; Whitney to Davenport; 26-xii-1928]. Kellogg
Osborn; 9-v-1931]. There were also numerous donations of $5 from racial, orthodox and reform eugenicists. These include DuPont, Davenport, Morris Steggarda, E L Thorndike, Robie, Popenoe, Gosney, Terman, Yerkes, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Sanger, Huntington, Pearl, Castle and L C Dunn. There were a few donations from Britain and other countries including from C P Blacker and Leonard Darwin. There were no donations from any Germans. [Unless stated otherwise information in this paragraph comes from CBDP1; Frederick Osborn No.5].

Even the once wealthy within the movement found it hard to help out. Charles Goethe, one of the traditional sources of funding wrote to Davenport: "do wish I could help out with the underwriting. The depression has hit us badly. I have, so far, carried practically all my human betterment budget, but do not dare take any new matters just now" [CBDP1; Goethe to Davenport; 24-ii-1932]. Gosney and Fisher were both once key to eugenics' finances, but could only make small donations. Some of the earlier funders such as Charles Gould had died. Archer Huntington, Mrs W James and John Pratt had each donated substantial sums to the earlier congress, and the American Museum of Natural History had donated $1,650. None of these gave anything to the third congress [CBDP1; International Congress (3\textsuperscript{rd}) - Finance Committee No.1].

Davenport confided in Erwin Baur that "we have considered abandoning the Congress but finally decided to "carry on"" [CBDP1; Davenport to Baur; 1-v-1931]. The Congress was in a no win situation as Davenport pointed out, "were it not that we have already spent several thousand dollars which we could not hope to secure again were the congress dropped now to be taken up later, we should have been inclined to postpone" [CBDP1; Davenport to Ploetz; 1-x-1932]. After yet another rejection of a funding request by Rockefeller, Davenport complained that "from all the foundations we get similar statements of inability to help out attendance at the congress owing to the prevailing economic conditions" [CBDP1; Davenport to Just;

\textsuperscript{211} had given $500 for the second congress in 1921, plus a further $250 towards publication of the congress' papers [CBDP1; 3-iii-1922].
7-iv-1932]. While the previous two congresses had attracted 300 delegates each, the 1932 congress had only 73, and they were disproportionately American [AESP; Frederick Osborn - History of the AES]. The number of papers published as a result of the congress dropped from 108 after the second to 65 after the third [TICE; 1934; 13-4]. The organisers had long been aware of these problems. Davenport wrote "we have no knowledge of the future and are putting thru the congress even tho the number of delegates from abroad will be small" [CBDP1; Davenport to Just; 26-v-1932]. At the conference itself he declared that "we regret that so many European leaders in eugenics have been prevented from coming because of economic or political considerations" [TICE; 1934; Davenport; 17].

Financial problems did not just mean a smaller congress, it impacted directly on foreign delegates. The second and third congresses had the same problem. Europeans could not generally afford to go, because of financial problems caused by the war and the Depression respectively. But whereas the Americans could afford to pay for some delegates to come to the second congress, they could not afford this for the third [CBDP1; Davenport to Starr Jordan; 5-ii-1921]. Davenport told Eugen Fischer that "the depression at this time has interfered with our efforts to secure funds to help defray the expenses of our foreign colleagues. We know that all this means that we are going to have a highly unrepresentative international congress" [CBDP1; Davenport to Fischer; 28-i-1932]. (The political situation in Germany at this time, rather than finances prevented Eugen Fischer from attending the congress as "directors of institutions must not leave their posts in this crisis" [CBDP1; Davenport to Ploetz; 3-vi-1932]). Germany's delegates were particularly hard hit, as the delicate economic situation of Germany and German science had taken a battering from the Depression and Germany was in political turmoil. Many German delegates were in the end unable to attend including Eugen Fischer, Alfred Ploetz, Günther Just, Ernst Rüdin and Erwin Baur (this may have helped to weaken the connection of German and American eugenics in some minds). Charles Davenport had to turn down funding requests from both Just and Baur [CBDP1; Baur to Davenport; 21-iv-1931 & Davenport to Just; 7-iv-1932]. In the end no
prominent German eugenicists attended and only one German (Wilhelm Pessler) even presented a paper at the congress [TICE; contents; v-viii], despite the fact that Rüdin was President of the IFEO and Ploetz vice-president of the Congress. Rüdin was unable to attend because of “the difficulty of getting adequate funds... in these difficult days” and had to make do with sending a message of support to the congress. Ploetz was unable to attend for similar reasons [CBDP1; IFEO - Miscellaneous; 9-viii-1932 & Rüdin to Davenport; 9-viii-1932 & Davenport to Ploetz; 3-vi-1932].

On all levels the congress was an American event and Germany was almost entirely absent. Not only was there only one paper from a German. Of the eight supporting members of the congress (those who gave $500 or more), not one was from outside of the USA. Of the fourteen sustaining members (those who gave $100 to $500) thirteen were American and one was British. Of the 338 active members the overwhelming majority were American and only three were German - Alfred Ploetz, Erwin Baur and Günther Just. The seven affiliated societies and associations were the only international group, but again contained no German organisations. There were two American groups and one organisation each from France, Britain, Canada, Denmark and Mexico. [TICE; 1934; 512-520].

Whilst on the outside eugenicists congratulated themselves on the congress, they knew that it had been a failure, and that like orthodox and racial eugenics generally by then, they were speaking to themselves. Davenport had confided in Ploetz that “we should have been inclined to postpone but it is too late for that and we must go ahead, even facing partial failure” [CBDP1; 19-Ü-1932]. Davenport wrote to Eugen Fischer that “the Congress is past, for better or worse” [CBDP1; Davenport to Fischer; 4-xi-1932]. (After the Second Congress Madison Grant referred to “the really brilliant success of the Congress” [CBDP1; Grant to Davenport; 29-ix-1921]. John Kellogg had in 1921 congratulated Davenport on “the great success of the Congress... Everything seemed to be thoroughly organized and marched off in capital style” [CBDP1; Kellogg to Davenport; 27-ix-1921]).
Orthodox and racial eugenicists had used the conference to promote - largely to each other - their favourite policies of old - sterilisation, anti-miscegenation and immigration restriction. But these were no longer relevant to many people who had looked to the conference to breath life back into the movement. In this it failed. Media coverage of the event was limited, even though a great deal of effort went into trying to gain coverage. For example, the congress was assured that *Time* would run an extensive article [CBDP1; International Congress of Eugenics (3rd) Publicity; 13-viii-1932]. The promised article never appeared [Paul Lombardo to this author; 7-xii-1999]. A lack of coverage in the media for eugenics in general was widely acknowledged, for example by Henry Perkins [JofH; 24 (1933); 148]. At least one old-style eugenicist complained publicly that the congress "failed to include a single material advance in theory or a single practical plan of action" [JofH; 24 (1933); 144].

- The IFEO

Events in the international movement over this time are interesting. International eugenics had been dominated by the IFEO, which had grown out of the need for international co-operation and contacts in between congresses. In the 1920s it had reflected the spectrum of eugenic opinion, but towards the end of the decade the emergence of the reform movement led many to join the emerging international population control movements, like the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems and its World Population Congress, which were less overtly eugenic and embraced birth control.

The IFEO failed for most of its existence to include properly both Germany and the USA. In the early post-war years Germany was not included and then its representatives - Krohne and Ploetz - did not attend meetings up to 1926 (see page 76). There is evidence that in the late 1920s meetings held in Europe were either poorly attended or not attended at all by American representatives. The Davenport correspondence reveals at least two occasions when Davenport scratched around
trying, and failing, to find people to represent the USA [e.g. CBDP1; Davenport to Pearl iv-1926]. The USA was left unrepresented at Amsterdam in 1926 and Zurich in 1934. At most meetings in between the USA was represented by Davenport alone [CBDP1; IFEO - meetings]. After the emergence of the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems, the rise of Nazism and shifts in the IFEO, it was more of a forum for justifying and promoting German Rassenhygiene policies than anything else.

Reform eugenicists, across Europe and the USA seemed to have struck a balance with the birth control movement by the late 1920s and started working together internationally. The 1927 World Population Congress was made up of people who straddled the groups like, Pearl, Henry Pratt Fairchild, C C Little and Edward East from the USA and Richard Goldschmidt, Alfred Grotjahn, Corrado Gini and Julian Huxley from Europe [RPP: Sanger to Pearl; ca. April 1927]. The programme included sections on differential birth-rates, population and food supply, the biology of population growth, the optimum density of population and the work of race biological institutes [RPP; Sanger No.11]. This provided a suitably midway programme. By 1932 the reforming AES had dropped its membership of the orthodox and Rassenhygiene dominated IFEO [CBDP1; IFEO - Finances] and was aligning itself with these population movements. In the post-war world Frederick Osborn of the AES would chair the Population Council.

Following this dividing of the international movement, the IFEO was brought further under orthodox and Rassenhygiene control. In 1930 Ernst Rüdin became President of the IFEO and in 1936 Davenport was elected Honorary President with Rüdin, Mjöen and Ploetz as Honorary Vice-Presidents [CBDP1; IFEO - Hodson; 1936]. In the early 1930s the IFEO was dominated by people like Davenport, Laughlin and Clarence Campbell of the USA, and Rüdin, Ploetz and Lenz of Germany, as well as Mjöen of Norway and Davenport's acolyte Morris Steggarda of Holland. Eugenical News continued as the official organ of the IFEO until the end of the 1930s. At the IFEO conference in 1936 Germany sent fifteen delegates - as many as the USA,
Britain, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway and Sweden put together. German eugenics was not criticised at the conference, but rather was seen as leading the way. By then the IFEO was a German dominated vehicle for the promotion of a Rassenhygiene agenda and a way of attempting to give international credibility to the German branches of eugenics and race sciences. So for America and most of Europe, the IFEO was heading for oblivion along with orthodox and racial eugenics. The international decline of the IFEO is evidenced by the fact that in the mid-1930s IFEO meetings changed from being annual to being every other year and then, when Rüdin's term as president was up in 1936 it was almost impossible to find a replacement. Five people turned the post down and it was eventually taken up reluctantly by the internationally unknown Torsten Sjoegren [CBDP1; IFEO - Hodson].

The two parts of the international movement attempted to come back together once more, in 1935 at the Berlin International Congress for Population Science*. The meeting served to underline two points. First, the willingness of the Nazi regime to manipulate events and second the differences between the parts of the movement. Organised originally by Pearl's International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems the Congress became politicised by the Nazi regime in collusion with IFEO members who were present. In the end the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems element of the conference was sidelined and its speakers sometimes shouted down. It became another event for the promotion of Nazi Rassenhygiene, with nearly half of the papers delivered by German Rassenhygiene scientists. D V Glass reporting for the Eugenics Review called the tone of the congress one of "prejudice... staleness... [and] debatable material" and continued that "the United States section apparently boycotted the Congress" [EugR; Oct 1935; 207]. Raymond Pearl, the congress's original organiser did not attend. Instead the USA was represented by orthodox eugenicist Harry

---

Laughlin and racial eugenicist Clarence Campbell, who gave a lecture in support of Nordic and Aryan supremacy [EugR; Oct 1935; 209].

As the American, British and other movements had moved to less radical and less racial positions under reform eugenics and population control, German eugenics was unique in moving in the opposite direction. By the end of the 1920s Germany's representatives at the IFEO - Ploetz, Rüdin and Fischer (following Otto Krohne's death) - were all from the *Rassenhygiene* wing and each would benefit from the advent of Nazi eugenics in 1933 [CBDP1; IFEO - membership]. The German shift from dominance by *Eugenik* to *Rassenhygiene* meant an increasingly radical and racially oriented programme. The link with *Volksch* ideas, Nordic supremacy and ultimately Nazism meant that *Rassenhygiene* was yet to realise its full potential in Germany. The change in German eugenics coincided with the changes in the opposite direction going on in American, British and Scandinavian eugenics. In 1928, Count Vacher Lapouge wrote of Hans F K Günther and others that "the change of orientation of which they are the protagonists is connected above all with a Nordic movement" [EugN; XIII (Oct 1928); 132-3]. This rise of a *Volksch* nationalist tendency was connected to a generational change. In discussing the potential for anthropometric work Aleš Hrdlicka argued that "the workers in Germany are almost all young and not full fledged, and not quite free of the old "Deutschland über alles"" [KPP; Hrdlicka to Pearson; 20-ix-1928]. The politicisation of the *Rassenhygiene* group was widely recognised. In 1935 Hermann Muckermann characterised the earlier shift from what he called the Berlin group (*Eugenik*) to the Munich group (*Rassenhygiene*) as equivalent to a shift from the Reichstag (parliament) to the Brown House (the Nazi Party) [EugR; Jan 1935; 270].

German *Rassenhygiene* found it easy to dominate its area of the international eugenics movement (including the IFEO), because in the early and mid-thirties this area was in steep decline in most other countries, leaving only a residue of largely irrelevant scientists to collude with Nazism. Along with the American orthodox and racial eugenicists, once respected scientists like Norway's Jon Alfred Mjöen and
Sweden’s Hermann Lundborg were marginalised and found their only role to be with others in the same position. Raymond Pearl described Mjöen as “a good deal of a quack”, and told Jennings that this was the general opinion of him in Norway too [RPP; Pearl to Jennings; 5-vii-1926]. (Despite this reputation the AES kept up its association with Mjöen and organised a US lecture tour for him in 1927 [EugN; XII (Oct 1927); 139]. At the same time Gunnar Dahlberg was coming to prominence in human genetics, and redirecting the Swedish Institute for Race Hygiene. The reasons why German eugenics shifted from a more scientifically rigorous, less racialised basis in Eugenik to overt racism and Nordicism and the less than scrupulous use of science under Rassenhygiene from the late-1920s onwards, as other eugenic movements were changing the other way is a question which could take an entire thesis on its own.
(ii) REFORM EUGENICS

Reform eugenics developed out of the situation which began in the mid-1920s. It was based partly on greater scientific understanding, partly on generational changes and partly a greater acceptance of changes in the world outside of eugenics - the emergence of the birth control movement for example. The AES was central to this process of change. In the late 1930s, in what are generally embarrassingly sycophantic letters Albert Wiggam praised Frederick Osborn for injecting eugenics with his “high intelligence, scientific restraint and wisdom and social vision and financial aid” and contrasted this with “the crude - but commendable - efforts of Davenport, Laughlin and Fisher” [FOP; Wiggam to Frederick Osborn; n.d. ca. 1937]. Orthodox and racial eugenicists had adhered to a tight conception of eugenics and had a widely acknowledged leader in Charles Davenport. They also had a strong institutional and publishing base, led by the ERO and *Eugenical News*, but also including the ERA, the Galton Society and up to 1928 the AES.

It is widely accepted that reform eugenics grew out of reactions to Nazism. Elazar Barkan in *The Retreat of Scientific Racism* writes that the emergence of reform eugenics was the result of “the process of professionalization and the mounting opposition to Nazism, both of which played a major role” [Barkan; 1992; 269]. To attribute this shift in eugenics to a reaction against Nazism, as Barkan does is misleading, because the time-scales make such a position impossible. The roots of reform eugenics are to be found in the 1920s and by 1933 it was fairly well established as a eugenic position separate from orthodox and racial eugenics.

Reform eugenics was a much looser arrangement and from the outset carried a greater diversity. It consisted simply of those who proposed an alternative eugenics to the orthodox version. They never formed a coherent organisation, and would not have wanted to. The AES was the central organisation of reform eugenics, but it could lay no claim to speak for all reformers. Scientists such as Muller, Pearl and Jennings had little to do with the AES, while still supporting some form of
modernised eugenics. Likewise there was no central ideology - reform eugenicists variously promoted environmental and social reform, genetic research and birth control. (Acceptance of birth control methods was one policy area which really marked reform eugenics as different from orthodox and racial eugenics and caused the schism between them). This range of positions explains why the reformers would dismantle their movement and take parts of it in different directions - into population studies and human and medical genetics for example. Reform eugenics only had meaning while there was orthodox and/or racial eugenics for it to be a reaction to. To this extent then reform eugenics never existed in the same way as the older parts of eugenics and is much harder to pin down in time, organisation and thinking. By the later 1930s, even the AES - the only organisation not to drop the word eugenics or close down - could no longer be defined as a eugenic organisation in the old sense. For these reasons care needs to be taken when trying to define reform eugenics.

Reform eugenics rested on the same assumptions that had underpinned orthodox and racial eugenics - degeneration, counter-selectivity, differential fecundity and so on. Reform eugenicists and the population control movements that came after them saw differential fecundity as one of the main issues to be tackled [see e.g. Pearl in EugN; XII (Feb 1927); 22-3]. Men like Pearl and others who moved through orthodox eugenics to reform eugenics and on to population control took with them this part of eugenics. They wished to use birth control and population control methods to skew the birth rate in favour of the eugenically fitter classes. This is one of the ways in which the population control movement of the post-World War Two years can be seen as the inheritor of the eugenics ideology.

The starting point of reform eugenics could be said to be the publication of Raymond Pearl's 1927 article in the American Mercury in which he complains that eugenics had "largely become a mingled mess of ill-grounded and uncritical sociology, economics, anthropology, and politics, full of emotional appeals to class and race prejudices, solemnly put forth as science, and unfortunately accepted as
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such by the general public" [Pearl; 1927; 260]. The article lambasted the orthodox and racial movement and, unlike earlier criticisms, sought a reassessment of the whole programme. Pearl knew the furore the article would cause "the attacks on my paper were, of course, precisely what I expected" [RPP; Pearl to Wiggam; 7-iv-1928]. It was the first public attack on the old-guard and so marked the formal beginning of the movement’s split. It of course did not come out of the blue and reflected the generational changes, developments in science and embracing of birth control that the reform wing came to be associated with. As demonstrated above, these shifts were occurring before Pearl’s article, which cemented them in to a single critique. Before publication he had sent Herbert Spencer Jennings a copy of the article. The covering letter told Jennings that "you are almost the only person from whom I can expect any sympathy in my dreadful heresy" [HSJP2; Pearl to Jennings; 22-x-1927]. Pearl’s attack may well not have been the heresy that he thought, and support came from many quarters and initiated debate. He told Margaret Sanger that since the article "I find a good many people agreeing with it, although of course all the orthodox are on my back" [RPP; Pearl to Sanger; 5-xi-1927]. Sanger, whose opinions on race and religion had long seemed more sympathetic to orthodox or even racial eugenics told him that "I very much enjoyed your article... because without the scientific facts to bolster me up I had come to the same conclusions myself" [RPP; Sanger to Pearl; 2-xi-1927]. (The article did little to temper the racism and bigotry of articles appearing in her journal). Albert Wiggam, the journalist and eugenics propagandist, had previously urged Pearl to give eugenics "the weight of your subtle intelligence either to drive it into the right direction or else to crush it altogether". He told Pearl "your eugenics article... created quite a flurry among the ortho-docks [sic]" [RPP; Wiggam to Pearl; 17-i-1927 & 6-iii-1928]. (Elazar Barkan implies that reform eugenics was a recognisable force much earlier than the publication of Pearl’s article. He writes that “by the end of 1924, Jennings had displayed as much as anyone an alternative to mainline [orthodox] eugenics. His new reform vision...". There had been private criticisms of the orthodox position - by Morgan and Pearl, for example - and incidental debates, but there was no serious overall public critique or engaged debate of the position.
By Barkan’s own admission Jennings’ work at the time accepted all the basic premises of the old movement, he merely came to slightly different conclusions regarding targets [Barkan; 1991; 104-5]).

Reform eugenacists tended to believe in selection on an individual basis and this coupled with their questioning of simplistic racial hierarchies led to the demotion of ethnicity as a determinant of value. Frederick Osborn and Frank Lorimer’s 1934 book *Dynamics of Population* argued that there were no significant differences in intelligence between races [EugR; Jan 1935; 294]. (In the social sphere reform eugenacists still made use of socially constructed groups and ascribed value on that basis). It should not be inferred from this that reform eugenacists abandoned the concept of biological races altogether. Reform eugenacists did reject the orthodox notion that races formed fixed biological hierarchies with all of one biologically determined group (Whites, especially Nordics), being superior to another (Blacks or Slavs). In its place reform eugenacists such as Frederick Osborn and J B S Haldane proposed that races overlapped in their inherited abilities, so that while the average White was superior to the average Black, one could not talk about given individuals with such certainty. While they were relatively free of biological racism, reform eugenacists frequently held culturally racist views.

They also rejected the concept of individual races within what they saw as the three main racial groups - Black, White and Mongolian. They rejected concepts of Nordic supremacy and anti-Semitism not as a reaction to Nazism, but as a reaction to earlier forms of American eugenics and racial thinking (the group and its thinking emerged in the pre-Nazi world). Although relatively free of the blatant racialism of the older styles of eugenics, the idea of racial categories still pervaded reform eugenics. Indeed Samuel Holmes wrote an article explicitly in support of racial prejudice for *Eugenic News* [EugN; XIX (Jan/Feb 1934); 28]. In 1933 the *Literary Digest* published an article by Frederick Osborn purporting to rank states by the average intelligence of their citizens. Contrary to his conclusions in *Dynamics of Population*, he blamed the poor performance of the Deep South on “her numerous
Negroes" [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2]. Barkan suggests that Raymond Pearl's views were deeply racist, but, like Castle, he objected to giving racism a scientific dimension [Barkan; 1992; 212]. Jennings' views of the Irish have already been mentioned. Ellsworth Huntington and Leon Whitney's views as expressed in The Builders of America have been noted on page 231. So it appears that the leaders of the reform movement were not free of the kind of racial prejudices which apparently Nazism alerted people to. Some in the reform movement continued to promote the idea of immigration restriction and quotas along eugenical and ethnic lines [Huntington; 1935; 94-97]. For them the White race was still divided into several components of differing values. In this atmosphere one might have expected such people and their organisations to suffer the same fate as the orthodox and racial wings, if the example of Nazism, rather than other factors, had played such a significant part in the decline of eugenics. Likewise in the German movement Muckermann, who opposed Nazism and Aryanism, wrote to C P Blacker that "every nation... has its special character, which does not only depend on history and environment, but essentially on heredity. If we wish to retain our own character, we ought to retain our indigenous racial composition" [WIHM SA/EUG C238; n.d. ca. autumn 1934].

While orthodox and racial eugenicists had had a clear programme of immigration control, anti-miscegenation and sterilisation for the sphere of negative eugenics (preventing defective stocks) they had also expressed a belief in positive eugenics. Charles Davenport described eugenics as "the science of the improvement of the human race by better breeding" i.e. increasing the number of superior people [Davenport quoted in ERO Bulletin 10; 1914; 100]. Alexander Graham Bell went further, arguing that "an increase in the superior element seems to be a more important factor in producing improvement than a decrease in the inferior element" [Bell; 1908; 121-2]. While supporting the abstract concept of increasing superior

---

* The Literary Digest was founded and owned by J H Kellogg of the Race Betterment Foundation. In 1933 Raymond Pearl considered suing Kellogg over an article headed "Professor Pearl Proves the Futility of Birth Control" [RPP; Pearl to Sanger; 10-i-1933].
elements, orthodox and racial eugenicists found it hard to promote policies to encourage this. They could agree on concepts like tax incentives, but it was controversial and potentially explosive to try to define what constituted superior - beyond a general agreement that most superiority was to be found in the middle-classes. It was far easier to name the degenerate than the superior. This danger was voiced by a number of writers [e.g. Rice; 1929; 10 & Grant; 1922; 52]. It was this positive eugenics element that had created the problems in Johnson and Sumner's resolution at the Sixth International Birth Control Conference. Margaret Sanger's editorial condemning the resolution strongly rejected ideas of positive eugenics, while supporting negative eugenics (but not under that name). “Children who are brought into this world must give promise of being a value to the community, and that if there is any doubt or indication to the contrary, in the traits or heredity, such possible parents must refrain from exercising the function of parenthood” [draft editorial at RPP; Sanger to Pearl; 13-v-1925]. Many reform eugenicists moved away from ideas of actively encouraging large families amongst the better classes and concentrated instead on negative eugenics, preventing the birth of defectives and social and welfare reform. Raymond Pearl attacked this whole concept, in a crude but effective analysis of the parents and children of great philosophers, arguing that superior people do not necessarily come from superior people [Pearl 1927; 263-265]. Given their much greater belief in education, environment and their objections to compulsion, this gave birth control and reform eugenics huge areas of common ground in population control and even in the later programmes of the AES. It facilitated the placing of birth control at the centre of reform eugenics and the inclusion of a reform eugenics dimension by the birth control movement.

The American sterilisation lobby had long claimed that a comprehensive programme would rapidly reduce the number of defectives (see pages 108-9). The specifics of the claim varied, but the decline would be impressive. Thurman Rice claimed that it would be possible “to reduce the number of defectives to one-half or less in a single generation”, suggesting that “in the beginning but a fraction of one per cent of the
population should be sterilised. Even this small number would do much to correct the situation” [Rice; 1929; 7 & 322]. Through more rigorous scientific enquiries and new research methods geneticists could rein in this claim through more sober and realistic calculations. The objections to sterilisation that genetics supplied and which were taken up by some but not all reform eugenicists were three-fold. Firstly, there was the fact that it was very hard to make accurate predictions about genetic inheritance (due to the interaction of environment and heredity and the lack of unit character inheritance). Secondly, there was the scepticism about just what characteristics were of genetic origin. And, thirdly there was the fact that even if a characteristic could be identified it would be a much slower process to breed it out than had been previously thought. Yet despite these doubts about sterilisation, it was still promoted as a tool of reform eugenics, but more guardedly. Over time it was demoted by reform eugenicists, although it increased in use over time as it was put on a non-eugenic basis.

J B S Haldane, who had become increasingly distanced from eugenics since around 1930, saw sterilisation as a blunt weapon that would prevent the birth of many “normal children” [Haldane; 1938; 95]. (He also complained that proposed legislation like Laughlin’s Model Eugenical Sterilization Law was so broad as to include Jesus as “socially inadequate”. He would have been sterilised on the grounds that he was homeless, a tramp and a pauper [Chase; 1980; 633]). Scientists like Haldane, Jennings, Muller and others, based on the work originally done by Reginald Punnett in 1917, claimed that the process of removing a trait from the population would take decades to have any noticeable effect on numbers of defectives (see page 136). This was well known by 1932 [TICE; 1934; Muller; 138]. Furthermore some argued that for sterilisation on eugenic grounds to have any value, it would necessarily involve sterilising huge numbers of phenotypically ‘normal’ people, who carried recessive genes for traits like feeble-mindedness or alcoholism. Such policies would particularly effect the “parents and collaterals of the defectives” [JofH; 24 (1933); 121]. This was never suggested by orthodox or racial eugenicists but was used in opposition to sterilisation policies because it would be a logical progression from
sterilising those who displayed traits to sterilising those who carried the genes for them.

By the early 1930s the mainstream American press was supporting a restrained view. A New York Times editorial in 1932 stated that "even if we discovered the carriers of hidden defective genes by applying the methods of the cattle-breeder to humanity, the process [of reduction] would take about a thousand years" [quoted in Kevles; 1995; 165]. (Hitler also took a measured line compared to America's racial and orthodox eugenicists. He referred to the fact that "prevention of the faculty and opportunity to procreate on the part of the physically degenerate and mentally sick, over a period of only six hundred years, would... free humanity from an immeasurable fortune" [Hitler; 1992; 368]. In regard to the time-scale needed for sterilisation Hitler was closer to America's reform eugenicists and to reality). In 1934 the Journal of Heredity, following its reorganisation in 1933, suggested that the orthodox eugenicists idea of sterilising ten million or more of the population made no sense [JofH; 25 (1934); 415-8]. This radical change of belief regarding sterilisation and other policies such as segregation was not confined to Anglo-American eugenics. In the Scandinavian eugenics movements a calmer tone was also found. In 1941 Race, Reason and Rubbish by Gunnar Dahlberg, head of the Swedish Institute of Race Hygiene, poured doubt on sterilisation as a useful tool. Dahlberg claimed that "we cannot expect to produce any socially significant reduction of the frequency of defects by measures for sterilisation." [Dahlberg; 1942; 161]. But the reform eugenicists and geneticists did not just question sterilisation on the grounds of how many generations were needed for a significant reduction in the number of defectives. They were exploding the favourite and most widely used claims of orthodox eugenics. Doubts continued to grow about the nature of mental disability and other traits, about categories such as feeble-minded. They attacked the idea that all traits were inherited in a simple Mendelian fashion and with no impact from environmental factors. This in turn helped to undermine some of the traditional class biases of eugenics. As the period went on doubts arose about the eugenic value of sterilisation. By 1935 the governor of Alabama justified his rejection of sterilisation
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legislation, partly on scientific doubts. Governor Graves declared that the hoped for good results are not sure enough or great enough to compensate for the hazard to personal rights" [quoted in Larson; 1995; 168]. New rationales were developed to replace the eugenic one, however, including ideas of reducing welfare expenditure on economically dependent families, but this put sterilisation outside of the concerns of many reform eugenicists.

It is hard to say exactly when reform eugenics emerged in the USA because of its eclectic and disorganised nature. Looking at the individuals involved there are two groups. There are older people like Jennings, Pearl and Huntington who had doubts about orthodox eugenics in the mid-1920s, and there are a second group of younger people like Frederick Osborn, Perkins and Julian Huxley who represented a new generation of thought on eugenics. The rise to positions of influence for both groups seems to have been the end of the 1920s when attacks from scientists and others were becoming widespread, there was a crisis of funding and a need for institutional and organisational change.

By the end of the 1930s the loose groupings of reform eugenicists were heading further in different directions. The feature that had originally defined them as a group - their acceptance of eugenic principles with a strong critique of orthodox eugenics - no longer mattered in a country with no orthodox eugenics movement to critique. The AES, the birth control movement and individuals like Raymond Pearl helped to develop population studies. People like Paul Popenoe and Roswell Johnson promoted family planning. Hermann Muller, Sewall Wright, C C Little and others within the universities created genetics, very consciously moving towards medicine and away from the idea of socially defined groups. Family planning and newer work in genetics tended to emphasise the individual rather than the community. Garland Allen has called population studies "old wine in new bottles" [Allen; 1980; 28]. All three of these areas - population studies, human genetics and family planning - which grew in part from eugenics, had new priorities and a re-oriented set of goals.
They each owed a debt to eugenics, however, and each contained elements of 1930s eugenic thinking.

- The AES

The transformation of the AES is symbolic of features across the American eugenics movement. By the end of the 1920s Paul Popenoe like many others believed that the AES was "bankrupt, both financially and morally, and it is probably going to have to be reorganised altogether and started off on a new basis" [WIHM SA/EUG C276 I; 01-vii-1930]. At this early stage orthodox eugenicists like Popenoe, Huntington and others recognised that their position had serious problems. In 1928 Frederick Osborn (nephew of Henry Fairfield Osborn) became a director of the AES. He was the man who would make the necessary changes. (It is possible to overstate the importance of Frederick Osborn in the emergence of reform eugenics generally, as Mark Haller does, although Frederick Osborn's importance to the AES is undeniable [Haller; 1963; 174-6]. Part of the problem arises from Frederick Osborn's own, rather self-oriented portrayal of events [e.g. AESP; History]). Until 1930 the AES limped along with recurrent and growing crises - of organisation, finances, membership etc. It had stuck to orthodox policies and ideologies and allowed Davenport, Laughlin and other more traditional eugenicists a large influence. The names that made up the AES's Immigration Committee in 1928 demonstrates how much it was dominated by the old-guard. The committee contained four racial eugenicists (Grant, Charles Gould, John Trevor and DeCourcy Ward), one orthodox eugenicist (Laughlin) and one racial eugenicist who was in the process of becoming a reform eugenicist (Roswell Johnson). (Irving Fisher had asked Herbert Spencer Jennings to serve on the committee. When he declined Madison Grant wrote that it "relieves that embarrassment" [HSJP2; Fisher to Jennings; 22-xi-1924 & CBDP1; Grant to Davenport; 8-xii-1924]). Likewise, of the ten directors of the AES itself at least seven were either racial or orthodox eugenicists [EROP; Series X]. The change in the leadership by 1933 was almost total, although the hundred member advisory board would take longer to change. The board maintained an orthodox and racial dimension, as the 1935 board demonstrates. It no longer contained scientists like
Pearl, Jennings, Castle or Muller, but it did still contain, Davenport, East, Arthur Estabrook, Albert Johnson, John Kellogg, Henry Fairfield Osborn, Stoddard, Terman, Whitney and Yerkes. There were a good number of people who were reform eugenicists, or who had significantly moderated their view, including Brigham, Goddard Holmes, Hooton, Hrdlicka, Roswell Johnson and Sewall Wright [Huntington; 1935].

The founding of the journal *Eugenics* by the AES was the catalyst of profound changes in the eugenics movement and the splitting of the AES from the orthodox wing. It was based on practical, financial and ideological issues. After the journal was established the bitterness on both sides increased and relations between the ERO and AES never recovered. *Eugenical News* had been the official organ of the AES, as stated on the journal's cover, but as soon as *Eugenics* began publication, this statement was dropped and was never reinstated [EugN; XIII (Oct 1928)]. (Exactly a year later *Eugenical News* became the official journal of the orthodox and *Rassenhygiene IFEO*). The AES made *Eugenics* their official journal, but Davenport never had any formal involvement with the new journal. As a direct result of the arguments Davenport wrote to Whitney "please do not use my name as editor, or on the editorial committee of "Eugenics". In fact, I think... I should not be connected with the Board of Directors of the [American Eugenics] Society. Indeed, I think I should withdraw from the Society" [CBDP1; Davenport to Whitney; 6-x-1928]. (He actually continued his work at the AES at a low level). It is often suggested that Davenport's "association with the American Eugenics Society was lifelong" [Selden; 1988; 65]. This is technically true, but the reality is that relations never recovered from the various arguments over journals and his poor relationship with Whitney. From 1930 onwards Davenport had little involvement with, or impact on, the AES. In November 1928 the AES formally withdrew all support for *Eugenical News* [CBDP1; Davenport to Grant; 20-xi-1928]. As soon as the AES stopped sponsoring *Eugenical News*, it in turn downplayed affairs relating to the AES. It provided lengthy coverage to ERA and Galton Society meetings, often running to several pages. Its coverage of the AES was as brief as possible. For example, tucked away at the back of a 1933
issue was the bland statement “the American Eugenics Society held its eighth annual meeting at the Town Hall Club in New York City on May 12th 1933” - this is the article repeated in full [EugN; XVIII (May/June 1933); 64]. When Eugenics closed in 1931 the AES did not renew its relationship with Eugenical News [AESP; Frederick Osborn - History of the AES; 9].

Aided by the Depression Frederick Osborn could secure leadership of the AES by bringing to it a large amount of money to replace the funding lost over recent years. He could also work for the AES full time. In effect money bought the AES for the reformers under Frederick Osborn. It had begun to extricate itself from involvement with Davenport and the ERO with the debacle over journals, when it began its contacts with the birth control movement, and in the proposals over various mergers. The gradual change in AES leadership towards a more birth control sympathetic position further alienated the old-guard, as did the demotion of immigration and race issues and the promotion of more scientific methodologies. In the years before the advent of Nazism, the AES had largely severed links with orthodox and racial eugenics - in personal, financial, institutional and propaganda terms. Frederick Osborn tried to do the same with the ERA, where he donated $10,000 and became its treasurer, but it proved impossible to breathe new life into the ERA [CBDP1; Davenport to Frederick Osborn; 4-i-1929]. In the 1930s the ERA “simply faded away” [Haller; 1963; 179].

Leon Whitney was not a man renowned for his intellectual powers or scientific knowledge, although he was a good organiser and administrator. Part of the antagonism between Whitney and Davenport was due to the fact that Davenport believed that Whitney overstepped the mark by trying to present himself as a scientist rather than an administrator. [see e.g. HSJP2; Fisher to Jennings; 22-ix-1924]. Roswell Johnson commented that “Whitney is doing eugenics some harm among scientific men... they ridicule him with his pretensions of genetics... he does not seem to mature” [CBDP1; Roswell Johnson to Davenport; 1-xi-1926]. Although Whitney espoused some reform views he was mostly an orthodox eugenicist. His
bitterness towards Frederick Osborn is evident from his autobiography. He accused Frederick Osborn of trying to break up the ERA and of driving out every member of the AES (including himself). "Almost every one of our activities displeased him" [LWA; 219]. Frederick Osborn stripped out the old organisation and reconstructed it, virtually ceasing operations while the change took place. The new organisation utilised genetic knowledge, advocated environmental and social improvements and integrated the idea of universally available birth control into its programme. The organisation had little need for Whitney who for so long had been the backbone of the organisation and had raised most of the money. He left in the early 1930s to pursue a career in dog-breeding and producing pet foods. Leon Whitney accuses Frederick Osborn of despising birth control [LWA; 219]. He was wrong. Frederick Osborn believed fully in birth control, but believed that eugenics had purposes aside from it. Richard Soloway writes that Frederick Osborn "warmly embraced birth control and the new statistical science of demography" [Soloway; 1995; 640]. One only has to look at the people Frederick Osborn surrounded himself with - Henry Perkins, Roswell Johnson, Guy Burch - to see that he was in favour of birth control. (As President of the AES from 1931-34 it was Perkins who established close contacts with the Birth Control League [AESP; History of the AES; 11], Johnson had proposed the controversial eugenics clause at the 1925 birth control conference and Burch left the AES in 1935 to join the National Committee on Federal Legalisation of Birth Control). By the mid-1930s birth control was the centre of the AES's eugenic programme. By 1938 the programme of Frederick Osborn's AES consisted essentially of voluntarily birth control, improvements in social conditions and eugenic education [EugR; Oct 1938; 187].

The redesigned and repackaged AES was up and running very shortly after the Nazis came to power in Germany and started work on promoting its new programme in the early 1930s. Most important in the new programme were the documents Notes For a Eugenic Program (1934) and A Eugenics Program for the United States (1935), which were worked on by a committee representing birth control interests almost as strongly as eugenics [the two documents and other information at AESP;
Frederick Osborn Papers 1 No.5]. The committee included Frederick Osborn, Huntington, Guy Burch, Wiggam, Irving Fisher, Perkins, Henry Pratt Fairchild and C C Little. The new programme put birth control right at the centre of eugenic policy.

The 1934 document *Notes For a Eugenic Program* promoted an archetypal reform programme which embraced environmental reform as well as eugenics. Neither document contained racially motivated ideas and simply ignored immigration - the issue which had been so central to the concerns of orthodox eugenics. The document promoted four points. Firstly, the segregation and sterilisation of those who would make bad parents or who might pass on hereditary defects. Secondly, birth control should be available to all married people regardless of class or income. Thirdly, the disabled and dependent should be encouraged to have small families. Finally, the economic hardships of having a large family should be removed. (To promote the last two points, the AES supported slum clearance, an end to ostentatious life-styles, assistance to young families etc.). (In this programme financial and environmental aspects of the programme seem to have been given far greater weight than aspects of heredity. At the end of the documents are quotations from various interested parties which show how much the AES had moved away from the old eugenic positions. There are favourable responses from John Merriam of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, who at the same time was organising the committee which would close down the ERO, and also from A E Hooton who was on that committee. Merriam is quoted as saying "I find it interesting and looking in the direction in which I thought eugenics must ultimately develop". Quotations in praise of the programme are to be found from the American Birth Control League and from Margaret Sanger of the National Committee on Federal Legislation of Birth Control. Perhaps most interesting of all is a quotation from Raymond Pearl who wrote that "it seems to me within the limits of the attitudes upon which it is founded to be saner and wiser than any other such program that I have seen". Although this is hardly gushing praise, it was an achievement to get even this much from Raymond Pearl, who both before and after this statement was reticent about having public involvement with eugenics. It suggests that eugenics was now moving towards the population control movement that Pearl was so involved in. By 1934 the new style of
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eugenic programme of the AES was firmly in place. This followed what Frederick Osborn described in 1933 as a period when “the Society has been quite inactive”, while it reconstructed itself [AES; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2; 24-v-1933 2].

When the AES published its 1934 Notes For A Eugenic Program it stated that “a sound program must satisfy the requirements of both the hereditarians and the environmentalists”. It promoted an eleven point plan including the non-controversial aims of ending rural and urban slums as well as those with a wider base than pure eugenics, such as encouraging knowledge of birth control and offering financial assistance to young families. The only traditional eugenic demand was for a programme of segregation and sterilisation. Many points had disappeared since the publication of the 1927 programme. These abandoned demands included IQ testing of immigrants and selection on that basis, more deportations, tightening and extension of the quota system, divorce available on eugenic grounds and marriage only with the approval of a state eugenicist. [WIHM SA/EUG E1; 25-vi-1927 & 07-xi-1934 & CBDP1; Roswell Johnson No.4].

By 1940 the AES’ programme was a watered down and mildly eugenic version of earlier eugenics, it embraced population control, social and welfare programmes, birth control and family planning. The programme included calls for relatively non-controversial policies like maternity leave, cheaper medical care, free school dinners, more playgrounds, marriage guidance and, of course, equal access to birth control. In the area of encouraging the more desirable classes to have larger families were ideas such as better accommodation for large families and tax breaks for young families. It was argued that if birth control were truly available to all then the most wealthy classes - which still equated with eugenic fitness - would have the largest families. This was exactly the argument used by Margaret Sanger’s National Committee on Federal Legalisation of Birth Control. Although eugenics was still very much in evidence, its centrality to the AES’ programme was gone. [FOP; AES]. This was reflected also in the conferences that the AES ran. In the later 1930s its conferences were on topics such as housing, medicine, education and nursing
rather than on the issues of the old movement like immigration or feeble-mindedness [FOP; AES].

The membership of the AES would be a reasonable measure of how far eugenics had permeated the general public, or at least the more aware and more active in social and political causes. It also gives a suggestion as to what did or did not cause the decline of the AES. Unlike other national eugenic organisations, such as the ERA, the ERO and even John Kellogg’s Race Betterment Foundation, the AES was envisaged by its founders as a broad based mass movement. (The ERA for example was intended to consist of researchers of eugenics and was a forum for discussion, debate and planning. It would promote eugenics amongst a more academically inclined audience through Eugenical News. Consequently the ERA only had around 400 members by May 1933 [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2; 24-v-1933 3]). Although the AES was intended to have a strong representation from the scientific world, its *raison d’être* was promotion and propagandising to a wide audience and was intended as a mass organisation. For this reason AES membership was open to all, with a membership fee of $2 /year. The broad-based AES only had 1,260 members at its high point of 1930 [AESP; Frederick Osborn - History of the AES; 7]. (At the same time in Germany, with half the population, the narrow based Society for Race Hygiene could also boast 1,100 members [ARGB; 26 (1932); 94-104]). In his 1933 report for Rockefeller Frederick Osborn estimated that membership “has probably fallen to a couple of hundred” [ASEP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2 24-5-1933 2]. By 1940, despite the reorganisation, membership was between 200 and 300 [AESP; Frederick Osborn - History of the AES; 17]. So AES membership remained roughly level from 1933 to 1940. The main period of decline in membership was 1929-1933, when it dropped from 1,260 to 200 and thus could not be as a result of Nazism. When Nazism became unpopular in the USA in the later 1930s, there was no corresponding decline in AES membership.

• The End of Reform Eugenics
In the mid-1930s with the orthodox and racial eugenics movements gone, the disparate reform eugenicists began the process of transforming themselves into a number of new fields. The loose nature and lack of a unifying philosophy meant that without the old eugenics, that the reform movement was a reaction to, there was little need or desire for a single reform position. After all no ideological connection remained between birth control, genetics, sterilisation and social concerns when the belief in the universality of simple inheritance of all human traits had gone. Developments in the 1920s and 1930s meant that priorities had changed, some underlying assumptions - like differential fecundity - remained unaltered through the process of transition and well into the post-war world. As reform eugenicists moved their various parts of eugenics, based on their rejection of orthodox eugenics, into new arenas, the nature of their movements changed. It is possible to trace the development of eugenic ideas through orthodox eugenics to reform eugenics and into areas like population control and human genetics. Shifts in agendas obscured and watered-down eugenic dimensions. It is not possible to pin-point the exact moment when organisations and their personnel changed from being eugenics organisations to eugenically oriented ones and then to non-eugenic ones. It was a gradual process and the drawing of lines is arbitrary. The process certainly began before 1933 and was inevitable from the emergence of reform eugenics in the late 1920s.

Reform eugenics was a necessary step in transitional process, and was never destined to be a permanent movement. It was never a coherent group of people or organisations. While the orthodox and racial eugenicists had their distinctive programme of sterilisation, immigration restriction and anti-miscegenation laws, the reform group proposed a variety of solutions to eugenic concerns from human genetics to birth control to social change, depending on the ideology of the person involved. People headed in different directions with some people working in human and medical genetics, others working in population studies and others working on family planning etc. Frederick Osborn suggested that some areas of negative eugenics (presumably sterilisation) came to be the concerns of public health officials.
and physicians [FOP; Frederick Osborn to Johnson; n.d. ca. 1960s]. While none of the new groups could be called eugenic they still took some of their thinking from their eugenic past. By the late 1930s Albert Wiggam was referring to the AES as involved in “eugenics and population studies” [FOP; Wiggam to Frederick Osborn; n.d. ca. 1937]. At bottom they were all concerned with improving humanity through breeding and/or heredity. By the outbreak of war the AES was the only ‘eugenics’ organisation left, but it was unrecognisable from the movement of fifteen years before. Its existence was an anachronism. Frederick Osborn had showed himself to be the new Davenport - unable to move with the times scientifically, and unable to relinquish his complete control of his organisations. Leon Whitney reveals in his unpublished autobiography that it was Frederick Osborn who killed off any idea of a full merger of the AES and the birth control movement [LWA; 219].

For many in the reform camp birth control could ultimately replace most aspects of eugenics as it too could be used to keep the counter-selectivity of the modern world in check. In 1940 a Statement of Population Authorities was published and signed by many who were once orthodox eugenics sympathisers - Pearl, Hooton, Henry Pratt Fairchild, E A Ross, Norman Himes and Ellsworth Huntington.

In the past, the size of populations has been controlled by death, through inhuman means of famine, pestilence and war. Now science has found the means for rational regulation of population through human foresight and intelligence. Through control of birth, humanity may move toward greater individual happiness and a civilization of higher quality and culture.

[RPP; Birth Control Federation of America; ca. early 1940]

Replace the words “control of birth” with “eugenics” and the statement reads like earlier rationales for eugenics. While avoiding eugenic methodologies, the statement still contains its aims. Part of the reason that birth control became so central to reform eugenics programmes was that later eugenicists believed that “to be effective without birth control, eugenics would have to be compulsory, and compulsory eugenics is beyond our present imaginative powers” [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.8]. Although some earlier eugenicists had supported the
introduction of compulsion to eugenic programmes, the reform group had, since before 1933, opposed this.

Population control organisations emerged like the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems and its World Population Congress. These kinds of organisations had begun in the late 1920s and attracted large numbers of reform and ex-orthodox eugenicists. In part the organisers hoped to avoid the mistakes of the eugenics movement. They wished to utilise parts of the old programme, but locate it much more firmly within a standard scientific framework. Before the 1927 World Population Congress Raymond Pearl warned Margaret Sanger that Henry Goddard was “not scientifically up to the general level of the men who are to take part in the Conference”, he went on “I think it undesirable to invite him or other eugenist propaganda people to our conference” [RPP; Pearl to Sanger; 22-iii-1927] (These comments came despite the inclusion of eugenicists such as himself, Little, East, Huxley, Fisher, Grotjahn, Goldschmidt and Gini [RPP; Sanger No.11]). When Pearl and Edward East set up their International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems in 1928 they were self-conscious about the eugenic connection in the history and ideology of population control movements. They actively sought biologists and other scientists, rather than orthodox eugenicists for the organisation (Pearl, Hrdlicka and the ground-breaking Polish / British anthropologist Malinowski) and introduced tight control of activities [EugN; XIII (Oct 1928); 131-2 & Allen; 1980; 26].

For those geneticists like Muller, Sewall Wright, C C Little, Curt Stern (living in the US since 1933) and the Britons Haldane, Lionel Penrose and Ronald Fisher who moved into population, human and medical genetics these new fields offered the chance to improve the gene-pool and end society's degeneration through eliminating certain types of defective. At the end of the 1920s the connections between human genetics and eugenics were total. As noted above eugenics was human genetics. These scientists began the process of extracting a scientifically rigorous human genetics from eugenic programmes and taking their work back into
the science laboratory. Muller had long seen a eugenic edge to human genetics, telling Davenport that he was interested in genetics because of the opportunity it gave to humanity as a “means of self-betterment” [CBDP1; Muller to Davenport; 26-viii-1918]. Eugenicists had been promoting human and medical genetics for a number of years. One delegate at the Third International Congress of Eugenics argued that the teaching of medical and human genetics was indispensable if a eugenics programme was to be enacted [TICE; 1934; Macklin; 157-8]. Since the later 1920s men like Haldane and Castle had become increasingly distanced from eugenics and others like C C Little had been putting his time into his new Jackson Laboratory in Maine.

The number of American eugenicists who developed human and population genetics was relatively small compared to the number of Britons. Although statistically inaccurate J B S Haldane said that there were only six people in the world who knew anything of human genetics and that five of them were British [quoted in Kevles 1995; 205] (the other was the Swede - Gunnar Dahlberg - mentioned above). The USA, however, contributed geneticists like James Neel, L C Dunn and Theodosius Dobzhansky who were un tarred by the eugenics brush and who would help make the USA the future centre for work in genetics. (In the case of population genetics the British bias - in the form of Haldane and Fisher - is understandable because of the continuing strength of biometry in Britain through the period).

While the old methods like sterilisation were blunt, inefficient and slow, genetics offered highly targeted methods. The tainted history of eugenical aspects of human genetics has never totally gone away. Echoing criticisms of the inter-war eugenics movement, Kevles and Hood quote one anonymous geneticist who argues that “the only thing you can do with human genetics is develop prejudices” [Kevles & Hood; 1992; 11]. Geneticists at the end of the century are not all this negative, but are still well aware of the history of their science. Professor Steve Jones is currently Galton Professor of Genetics at University College London, a position which developed
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from the pre-war Galton Professorship of National Eugenics. He argues that post-war genetics has been to a large degree a repackaged version of eugenics, so needs very careful handling [Steve Jones to this author; 12-xii-1999]. James Neel had expressed this view but without the hesitancy, when he wrote in 1954 that "what we are really discussing is a new eugenics" [Neel quoted in Paul; 1995; 124].

Connections between the emergent human genetics and the old eugenics movement through the intermediary of the reform movement were not just limited to personnel. In institutional and financial aspects the connections are clear. Diane Paul points out that the Dight Institute for Human Genetics (at Minnesota University) was funded by legacies from two eugenacists - Charles Dight and Charles Goethe. She goes on to argue that "virtually all the sponsors of human genetics had eugenic motives" [Paul; 1995;123]. When the ERO closed in 1939 the Carnegie Institution of Washington's Cold Spring Harbor site became an exclusively human genetics operation (and would later be central to the Human Genome Project). When the Carnegie Institution of Washington made its recommendations after its 1935 review of the ERO, it seems that it was being groomed to become a more serious and academic centre. It had long been the Carnegie Institution of Washington's Department of Genetics. The committee was looking specifically at how the ERO records could be used in genetic research. Its final report, as well as ending its current work, demanded that the ERO stop "all forms of propaganda and the urging or sponsoring of programs for social reform or race betterment" [quoted in Allen; 1986; 252].

The AES, by the later 1930s was more of a population control movement than a conventional eugenic organisation. In the early 1950s the AES came much more firmly within the population control movement, as it accepted office space and money from John D Rockefeller III's new Population Council, which Frederick Osborn headed from 1952 [Bird & Allen; 1981; 341 & Mehler & Allen; 1977; 9]. Frederick Osborn had maintained good relations with John D Rockefeller III throughout the 1930s and 1940s, as demonstrated by extensive correspondence
between them. Frederick Osborn had foreseen this change in orientation as early as 1937, when he referred to population studies, especially by Raymond Pearl as "a new science... unheralded, but yet destined to be equally significant [as genetics] for eugenics" [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.8; 1-vi-1937].
(iii) OTHER REASONS

• Support of Nazism by Others

There is no denying that orthodox and especially racial eugenicists in the USA made statements and behaved in ways which demonstrated their support for Nazism, or at least with aspects of it. Clarence Campbell, Lothrop Stoddard and Harry Laughlin were the most notable supporters of and propagandists for Nazism, but many others were sympathetic at least to aspects of Nazism. Racial and orthodox eugenicists were not the only people in the USA, however, to praise parts of Nazism. There were many people and movements who to varying degrees applauded some parts of Nazism and ‘turned a blind eye’ to others. These movements were not on the edges of American society and included some - like the birth control movement and many reform eugenicists - who were, or had been, extremely close to the orthodox and racial eugenicists. Raymond Pearl, campaigner for birth control and population control, for example, defended aspects of Nazism for longer than some orthodox eugenicists. The main difference was that orthodox and racial eugenics underwent closure at around this time while the others survived. Orthodox and racial eugenics would have undergone closure anyway and Nazism did nothing to speed this process up or slow it down. It was in the late 1930s that the reputation of Nazi Germany went into nose-dive with the American public, but even then it was because of the racial and anti-Semitic character and the aggression of the regime rather than because of its social policy. By this time the American eugenics movement was reduced to its reform part.

The central organisation of the reform movement was the AES, but although it had purged itself of large parts of its racial thinking, it still supported aspects of Nazi policy. The AES’s 1937 conference on eugenics and nursing contained a paper from Marie Kopp - a well known eugenicist and supporter of Nazism. In her paper on sterilisation in Germany she praised the German eugenics programme and argued that “Germany’s rapidity of change with respect to eugenics was possible only under a dictator”. Kopp praised the marriage loans system (which was not open to non-
Aryans or those who did not meet basic criteria of eugenic value [decree at: Noakes & Pridham; 1991b; 455-6] as well as the compulsory sterilisation programme. The minutes of the conference (written by Frederick Osborn) suggest that the meeting supported, with some reservations, the 1935 Nuremberg Laws. Frederick Osborn himself wrote in the same minutes that “taken altogether, recent developments in Germany constitute perhaps the most important social experiment which has ever been tried” [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.8; 24-ii-1937]. At the 1937 annual dinner of the AES Ellsworth Huntington’s presidential address included a specific discussion of the German eugenics programme. Huntington said that “we must watch carefully the so called eugenic policy of Germany... we are sitting on the sidelines of a marvellously interesting show” [AESP; Annual meeting 1937 No.1]. At the same time that the AES was offering this tacit support of Nazi policy, the popularity of Nazism amongst Americans was declining fast, yet membership remained the same across the period from 1934 to 1940.

Outside of this tight-knit community there were many others who continued a relationship with Nazi and German eugenics. A letter amongst the Harry Laughlin papers refers to the distribution of the German propaganda film "Eugenics in Germany" which Laughlin was promoting. Even by this date - December 1938 - German eugenics propaganda was being used without widespread condemnation in 28 schools and by organisations like the Society for the Prevention of Blindness [letter from Laughlin to Colonel Draper 9-xii-1938 at ISAR Archives; 1998; 1].

It was not just in the early years of the Nazi regime that these groups supported aspects of Nazism. Margaret Sanger and the various organisations and journals clustered around her and her birth control movement offered significant support for Nazism and Rassenhygiene policies. In 1933 the Birth Control Review gave space to Ernst Rüdin, in much the same way as Eugenical News gave space to Ploetz, Günther and others [BCR; iv-1933; 102-4]. With the Second World War already underway, a Birth Control Review editorial which failed to condemn Nazism stated that like Germany “we, too, recognize the problem of race building, but our
concern is with the quality of our people, not with their quantity alone" [BCR; i-1940; 38]. (The journal's consulting editors at this time included the pro-euthanasia Foster Kennedy, Ellsworth Huntington, C C Little and E A Ross). Lothrop Stoddard, a well known anti-Semite and propagandist for Nazi Germany, who met with Hitler in 1940, continued to publish work in the Birth Control Review and sat on the board of the American Birth Control League into the Second World War. The Journal of Heredity continued to give positive coverage to Nazi policy. As late as 1942 T U H Ellinger reported on a trip to Germany and in a laudatory article explained that “the deliberate eradication of the Jewish element in Germany has nothing whatever to do with religious persecution. It is entirely a large-scale breeding project, with the purpose of eliminating from that nation the hereditary attributes of the Semitic race” [JofH; 33 (1942); 142]. So the emerging policy of genocide was actually in everybody's genetic interest. (The article went on to condemn race crossing using the tired old analogy of dog breeding).

• The Appeal of Eugenics
In the late 1920s Leon Whitney put a huge amount of effort into establishing an AES committee in each state. After a couple of years effort he informed Davenport that seventeen states were still without committees - mostly in the south and mid-west (but also including New York, Delaware and Rhode Island) [CBDP1; Whitney No.3; 26-ii-1929]. A number of people had turned down his request to help establish committees, amongst them Jennings, Brigham, Vernon Kellogg and others who were beginning to reject eugenics. The number of state committees in existence rather overstates eugenics' influence. In a leaflet probably from the late 1920s the AES lists its 29 state committees (whose members were recruited independently of the federal AES). Of these only seven committees had more than ten members. Of the remaining twenty-two, ten have only one or two members [HSJP2; Eugenics Society of America ; n.d.]. It would seem that most of the AES committees were far from effective functioning bodies, but were rather created to bloat the image of the AES. As a mass movement of concerned Americans, the AES was a failure from the outset.
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Writing of Henry Perkins' Eugenics Survey of Vermont Kevin Dann states that it "never captivated the attention and support of the Vermont public. The Eugenics Survey was not unique in this dilemma, which plagued all the national and state eugenics organizations" [Dann; 1991; 18]. Eugenics in the USA was never a mass movement, but was rather a movement of various social workers, academics and scientists, with a smattering of intellectuals, concerned individuals, philanthropists and others. These people are much more likely to have been influenced by advances in genetics, other changes in science, economic considerations and so on, than they would have been by the rise of Nazism. For politicians and some others, opposition from religious organisations may have tempered their public behaviour, if not their actual opinions. This is borne out by Frederick Osborn's assertion that "by 1931... the Society had lost much of the luster of its association with prominent people" [AESP; Frederick Osborn - History of the AES; 10]. The American public may or may not have been repulsed by Nazism, but if they were never eugenics enthusiasts in the first place, it is not of any particular interest in the decline of American eugenics. By the Third International Congress of Eugenics one speaker estimated that the total combined membership of all eugenic organisations in the USA was "not one tenth of one per cent of the enrollment [sic] necessary to make really effective progress even a remote possibility" [TICE; 1934; Cook; 441]. Priorities had changed with the growth of birth control, recognition of the role of the environment and so on. Funding had slipped away to new organisations and movements. The residue of individuals from the orthodox and racial eugenics groups - especially Laughlin and Campbell, but also many others - had to turn to Nazi Germany in an attempt to recapture their influence and prestige which had been in decline since the mid-1920s. The AES began the popular journal Eugenics in 1928. The success of the journal can best be described as brief. When Eugenics began in October 1928 it had 700 subscribers and by January 1929 this had grown to 1,100 [CBDP1; Whitney No.3; 14-v-1929]. By 1931 the journal had gone into such decline that it folded.
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None of this means that the public did not sympathise with aspects of eugenic policy or hold views akin to people active within the eugenics movement. As Philip Reilly has pointed out, as late as 1937 a survey found that 63% of Americans believed that habitual criminals should be compulsorily sterilised, specifically to prevent their genes being passed on [Reilly; 1991; 123]. Nazi sterilisation policies then were unlikely to have outraged the majority of American citizens.

• British Eugenics

The inter-connections between British and American eugenics were many and the two movements in many ways ran in parallel. Authors on the history of eugenics, including Daniel Kevles and Elazar Barkan; emphasise (with limitations) this similarity of development [Kevles; 1995 & Barkan; 1992]. One important difference, however, was that British eugenicists condemned Nazism from the outset and wished to have nothing to do with it. Unlike their American counterparts they largely refused to distinguish between the various parts of Nazi eugenics. Yet, despite this the same process of split, decline and voluntary dissolution occurred in British eugenics. The old styles of British eugenics went in to decline. This applied to both the Mendelians represented by Leonard Darwin and the Eugenics Society and the biometricians represented by Karl Pearson and University College London's Galton Laboratory for National Eugenics. Under C P Blacker the Eugenics Society (the old Eugenics Education Society) moved in similar directions to the AES. The National Eugenics Laboratory under Ronald Fisher (along with people like J B S Haldane and Lionel Penrose) began moves to a reform position, more rigorous science and ultimately to human and population genetics. The Galton Laboratory for National Eugenics was beginning the process of voluntarily vacating the eugenics field to become one of the world's leading centre's for human genetics as the Galton Laboratory for Genetics. British eugenics declined in the same way that American eugenics declined. If Nazism was so crucial in eugenics' downfall then it is hard to see why British eugenics should have undergone an almost identical transition as American eugenics when from the outset the British movement had been publicly opposed Nazism. By the admission of American eugenicists, readers who wanted a
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serious eugenics journal in English read the British *Eugenics Review*, which had also rejected Aryanism and Nazism.

British eugenicists were critical of Nordic and anti-Semitic aspects of Nazi eugenics as well as Nazism in general. The *Eugenics Review* as the central mouthpiece of British eugenics was unequivocal in its condemnation. Blacker wrote to Julian Huxley expressing his concern that the introduction of Germany’s sterilisation law (long the centre-piece of any social eugenics programme) would do the British movement “much harm” [WIHM SA/EUG C185 03-v-1935]. Huxley replied to Blacker in May 1933 urging him to run a piece in the *Eugenics Review* on “the so-called eugenics policy which has been introduced in Germany under Eugen Fischer… It is mere pseudo-science and it would be a great pity if we were tarred with that brush!” [WIHM SA/EUG C185; 29-v-1933]. British eugenicists moved quickly. In July 1933 a long article on Nazism appeared in the *Eugenics Review*. It supported the idea of sterilisation, but condemned the new German law. It unequivocally condemned Nazism and its anti-Semitism and attempted to draw a sharp line between eugenics and Nazism with the statement that “it is significant that such familiar names as Baur, Fischer, Lenz, Goldschmidt, Kretschmer and others whom we in this country have learned to respect, are nowhere included among the government’s eugenic consultants”. (Most of these names would become inextricably linked to Nazi *Rassenhygiene*). The same article called the Nazis’ anti-Jewish policies “ridiculous” and urged Hitler to “drop the race warfare against the Jews - for it is… without a shadow of scientific backing” [EugR; July 1933; 77]. (Not being totally free of prejudice, the same issue of *Eugenics Review* did attempt to spur the regime to a greater assault on the Catholic Church). The following issue’s editorial again attacked Nazism, citing the “profound uneasiness that is felt by eugenists both here and abroad at the political and racial discrimination that is being pursued by the present rulers of Germany in the name of biology and eugenics” [EugR; Oct 1933; 145]. By 1935 the *Eugenics Review* was referring to Nazism’s “race arrogance and political intolerance which has made the Nazi régime stink in the nostrils of decent folk” [EugR; Oct 1935; 236]. (It is worth contrasting this and the other comments with

246
the difficulty of getting any kind of public condemnation in the USA). From the Galton Laboratory, J B S Haldane used The Listener to condemn Nazism's politicisation of eugenics, arguing that it was "a prostitution of science, far more serious than the manufacture of high explosives, bombing aeroplanes, or poisonous gases" [Haldane quoted in EugR; Oct 1933; 145].

The "two most significant" books opposing Nazi race propaganda were by Britons - We Europeans by Julian Huxley and A C Haddon (1935) and Heredity and Politics by J B S Haldane (1938) [Provine; 1973; 794]. The strength of opposition to Nazism, aryanism and so on is reflected in the fact that the British Eugenics Society was actually taken over by an emergency committee from 1934 [Barkan; 1992; 271]. At around the same time the council of the Eugenics Society passed a resolution stating "this Society deprecates the use of the term Eugenics to justify racial animosities". The resolution was subsequently published in the Eugenics Review [EugR; Oct 1933; 158]. Even this could not halt the downfall of old-style eugenics and the drift of reform eugenics into new fields.

These were not public positions taken on pragmatic grounds, but represented the true feelings of those concerned. Private correspondence of the Eugenics Society bears this out. For example, Blacker wrote to Julian Huxley that "the construction given to the word 'eugenics' by Germans is not in accordance with ours and is regarded by many people, including myself, as ridiculous (I refer to the stress on the Nordic cult and the anti-Semitism)" [WIHM SA/EUG C185; 03-V-1935]. Many were sceptical of Nazism's ability to resist using the sterilisation legislation as a political weapon. C P Blacker wrote in August 1933 that "in view of the fact that many of the occupants of German prisons have been sentenced for political reasons, this possibility gives obvious grounds for disquiet". He went on to question the ambiguity of the law in respect of prisoners, wondering if the law was "carelessly phrased, or whether it is very carefully and subtly phrased to admit extensions of the principle of sterilisation" [WIHM SA/EUG D216; 30-viii-1933].
This resolute rejection of Nazism in Britain can be accounted for in a number of ways. The British movement had always included a large number of socialists - Karl Pearson, George Bernard Shaw, the Webbs, Lancelot Hogben, Havelock Ellis and Haldane. British eugenics had a more inclusive tradition. The movement was partly based at University College London which prided itself on its non-conformist, open tradition. In the 1930s C P Blacker - the most influential person in the Eugenics Society - was typically upper-class British, but far from Nordic. His father was Peruvian and the 'C' stood for Carlos.

- Criticisms of Eugenics
In the wake of Nazism there were articles opposing eugenics in magazines, newspapers and journals and there were public denouncements of eugenics, some drawing parallels with Nazism. This does not mean that Nazism ended eugenics. There had long been opponents of eugenics and public criticism.

There were those who criticised eugenics in private like Morgan. More significant were the many who criticised it in public, including the Boas group, Walter Lippmann, Catholic organisations, articles in the American Mercury and the New York Times and so on. The Survey consistently opposed eugenic interpretations of immigration and racial issues and published Jennings criticisms of Laughlin's evidence in the debate over the 1924 Immigration Act [Jennings; 1923]. The owner of popular newspapers and magazines (including Harper's and Cosmopolitan), William Randolph Hearst, had opposed eugenic sterilisation since as early as 1925 [CBDP1; Davenport to Goethe; 3-ix-1925]. Steven Selden's article "Resistance in School and Society: Public and Pedagogical Debates About Eugenics" examines four opponents of eugenics - biologist Herbert Spencer Jennings, educator John Dewey, educator William Chandler Bagley and journalist Walter Lippmann [Selden; 1988]. (His choice of Jennings is perhaps mistaken in light of later reinterpretations of Jennings work [e.g. Barkan; 1991]). In the mid-1920s the Encyclopaedia Britannica included an entry for eugenics written by W E Castle and highlighting five serious scientific problems with eugenics [EugN; XIII (May 1928); 61-2].
The word eugenics itself was somewhat in disrepute by the late 1920s. In 1928 Davenport implied that eugenics was a word bringing with it only good connotations when he said that Margaret Sanger “feels that birth control does not taste in the mouth as well as eugenics” [LWP; Davenport to Whitney; 05-iv-1928]. The reality was, however, that the word and the concept had always been discredited with a significant number of people - at least partly because of Davenport’s work. Davenport himself acknowledged that the concept was widely ridiculed up to the 1921 congress [CBDP1; Davenport to Campbell; 3-ii-1927]. When Pearl launched his attack in 1927 he argued that “eugenics has fallen in some degree into disrepute in recent years because of the ill-advised zeal” with which orthodox and racial eugenicists made scientifically unjustified claims [Pearl; 1927; 260]. From the orthodox camp Thurman Rice felt “the word ‘eugenics’ might be dropped. It is a good term but has been so much maligned and misrepresented that there is a tremendous prejudice against it. The word is often received by otherwise reasonable persons with disgust, or with an indulgent smile and a shrug of the shoulders” [Rice; 1929; 359]. This shows how serious the problems of American eugenics were in the later 1920s (in theoretical and conceptual rather than in financial terms). Things still had not improved by the 1932 international congress. Robert Cook spoke of the “view encountered rather often” in discussions of eugenics suggesting that it “is, or borders on being, “half-baked”” [TICE; 1934; Cook; 441].
CONCLUSIONS

• Racial, Orthodox and Reform Eugenics

The high point of eugenics' success in the USA came in the mid-1920s with the triumph of racially motivated eugenics in the Immigration Act and socially motivated eugenics in the Supreme Court's upholding of sterilisation in Buck versus Bell. It is apparent that eugenics was never the sole motivation for any policy in the USA or Germany. Immigration restriction relied on groups like the IRL and others. Sterilisation policies had a number of rationales. The eugenic one was dominant only briefly after 1927. Anti-miscegenation laws were eugenically compatible, but in reality rested much more strongly on existing racial, social and economic prejudices. This in part explains the fact that while eugenics declined in popularity, these three favourite policies of racial and orthodox eugenicists remained in force until the 1960s. This aspect of eugenics is mirrored in Germany where eugenics gave a scientific and rational coating to Nazi policy. In neither country then does it follow that if eugenics had not existed as a distinct movement, that eugenically compatible policies would not have been introduced. The USA would have kept European immigrants out and Black people separated. The Nazi regime would have perpetrated genocide against Jews, Slavs, Gypsies and various social groups.

Orthodox and racial eugenics hit serious problems in the later 1920s and was in terminal decline by 1930. These problems were a combination of scientific advances (especially in genetics, but also in intelligence testing, psychology and sociology), the growth of scientific opposition in the mould of the Boas group, growing opposition from the Churches, strengthened by the clarity of Casti Connubii. The economic troubles encountered by the movement before the 1929 crash were supplemented by the wider economic problems of the Depression. Part of the problem was that many of the old-guard refused to acknowledge the problems that eugenics faced and consequently carried on regardless. Despite all the evidence about the state of eugenics, Davenport declared in 1932 that "the past two decades
have seen the new eugenics rise from a mire of ridicule to the solid foundation of a recognized important social factor. It is probable that in the next two decades it will rise still further in public esteem and become regarded as the most important influence in human advancement" [italics in the original; TICE; 1934; Davenport; 22].

A further problem for orthodox and racial eugenics was that the three central planks of the old programme had slipped away from them, without their realising it. Concern about immigration declined sharply because of restrictive laws and a large drop in numbers. Miscegenation (and racial hierarchies) were shown to be connected to social, political and cultural issues, rather than to any biological or eugenic considerations. Sterilisation was simultaneously shown to be incredibly slow and indiscriminate, and to be targeted against groups that people were increasingly convinced could not be biologically defined. Racial and social issues such as these still existed, but people found new rationales for policies which no longer rested on scientific-biological-eugenic considerations. The orthodox and racial branches were squeezed out because they had always rejected anything other than a scientific-biological-eugenic understanding of racial and social issues. After a quiet period orthodox and racial eugenics was effectively dead by 1933, although individuals and some institutions lingered on.

The 1932 Third International Congress of Eugenics can be seen as a ‘farewell’ event for the faithful few. One speaker painted the picture of “world eugenics so inadequately supported and financed that it cannot, at present, be considered to be a significant element in human affairs” [TICE; 1934; Cook; 442]. In April 1933 the Journal of Heredity, which had long helped to sustain orthodox eugenics, carried an article entitled “Is Eugenics Dead?”. It was written by A W Forbes, a long time amateur enthusiast for eugenics. A half page editorial before the main article suggested that this was “a view that is probably general enough to deserve discussion” [JofH; 24 (1933); 143]. The article was followed by responses, some of the titles of which are revealing. Responses came from Clarence Campbell, Henry F Perkins (“Make Haste Slowly”), C C Little (“Not Dead But Sleeping”), Leon Whitney
and Harrison Hunt. Forbes' article suggested that "the feeling is spreading today that eugenics is a fad that has come and passed, that it should be consigned to the realm of visionary utopias, unworthy of consideration by practical men" [JofH; 24 (1933); 144]. The responses of the eugenicists failed to produce a convincing counter argument. They ranged from C C Little's agreeing to Leon Whitney's suggestion that interest would resume as soon as the Depression was over to Harrison Hunt's total avoidance of the issue [JofH; 24 (1933); 144-51]. Both the editorial and Forbes had suggested that the *Journal of Heredity* be used to discuss the future of eugenics, who the new eugenicists were and what policies should be pursued. This proposed debate elicited no response and the journal continued to publish articles on German eugenics, sterilisation and Nordicism as its contribution to eugenics.

The effects of Nazism were negligible because the course had already been taken by American eugenics. It seems then that the standard chronology of the decline of orthodox and racial eugenics is incorrect. The decline started before most historians suggest that it did, and the orthodox and racial movements were gone by 1933. Garland Allen's assertion that "the fifteen-year period from 1925 to 1940 saw the decline of old-style eugenics" is too long a period, although accurate in a technical sense [Allen; 1986; 250]. The fact that the ERO, ERA and *Eugenical News* continued is misleading. In early 1933, at exactly the time that the Nazis came to power in Germany, Frederick Osborn wrote a confidential report for John D Rockefeller Junior on the eugenics movement stating that the USA's eugenic organisations were "all at present at a low ebb" [AESP; Frederick Osborn Papers I No.2; 3]. They were simply redundant organisations awaiting formal closure or total overhauls. From before 1933 they contributed nothing and spoke neither for anybody, nor to anybody. It is interesting to speculate on events, had Nazism arisen in Germany when eugenics was at its height in the USA.

• Reform Eugenics
Although naming dates is to a large degree arbitrary, the crucial period in the history of eugenics and its transformations run from 1927 with the publishing of Pearl's article in the American Mercury, to 1934 when the redesigned AES published its Notes For a Eugenic Program. This period is too early for Nazism to have impacted on eugenics. Reform eugenics was too eclectic to ever stay together, or really even to be considered one group, except in the area of wanting to move on from orthodox positions. The groups that replaced eugenics - population control, family planning, human and population genetics - retained the old eugenic aim of improving humanity through controlling reproduction and through that, controlling social development. To some extent it should be seen more as an undercurrent of the inheritors of parts of the traditional eugenics ideology, than as an identifiable grouping. It is much harder to characterise the success or failure of the reform eugenicists programme, because there were no overriding policy proposals like immigration restriction, sterilisation or prevention of race crossing. The unifying feature of most reform eugenicists was their demand for more research before any action was taken. The success of reform eugenics was in the area of dismantling the old eugenics programme.

That reform eugenics developed in response to Nazism is a fallacy, because reform positions emerged in the 1920s. A younger generation of geneticists were working on what would become human and population genetics, others were beginning to understand the importance of environmental factors to human welfare. Most important of all is the embracing of birth control methods by many reform eugenicists. This is so important because it marked a real and tangible break with orthodox eugenics. Following the rise to power of Nazism, American reform eugenicists mostly carried on as before. Each worked in his or her own area within a re-worked eugenic paradigm. Little, Dunn, Muller and others worked in human genetics. Sewall Wright and Britons like Haldane worked on population genetics. Sanger and Roswell Johnson promoted birth control. Raymond Pearl continued working in population studies. Frederick Osborn continued his work in the AES. Individuals pursued their own interests, with a eugenic slant, such as Charles
Goethe’s campaign for more children’s play areas. These areas utilised some of the old eugenic philosophies and tried to salvage what they wanted from the old movement. When the old movement was gone they drifted further into their own new fields. Ultimately population genetics, human genetics, population control and family planning each became established and independent and quietly dropped the language, though not always the thinking, of the eugenics movement. It was well into the post-war period when these groups finally stopped promoting some form of ultra-cleansed and sanitised version of reformed eugenics.

Nazism then could not have been a factor in either the emergence or disappearance of reform eugenics. Reform positions began in the 1920s and it is easy to see that they could not continue as a single movement whether or not Nazism existed. There was no unifying ideology, structure or personality, so reform eugenicists voluntarily vacated the eugenics field.

- Nazism & American Eugenics

Nazism may on a very limited scale have been part of the detail of events in the decline of American eugenics- such as concern over the potential political misuse of the sterilisation law. It may have informed certain individuals’ opinions - like L C Dunn. It was, however, entirely absent as part of the broad sweep of factors causing the downfall. It was neither a necessary nor sufficient condition, and was irrelevant to the changes in knowledge and priorities which did lead to shifts away from eugenics. Those who cited Nazism in their condemnation of American eugenics were from groups who traditionally opposed eugenics anyway. Edward Larson gives examples of Catholic opponents of Alabama’s sterilisation law comparing it to Nazism [Larson; 1995; 146]. Nazism provided a convenient example of a regime criticised by the mainstream at that time, more for its trampling of human rights and dismantling of democracy, than for its use or abuse of eugenics. Nazism then provided confirmation for those who already rejected eugenics and Nordic supremacy, but rarely made new converts in the pre-war years. Nazism needs to be
removed from the list of major factors contributing to decline and placed somewhere near the bottom of the list of minor influences.

There were connections between Nazism and American eugenics, but these serve to underline the weaknesses of the American movement. During the Nazi years the traffic was almost exclusively one way. There were the honorary degrees awarded to Harry Laughlin and Foster Kennedy, the signed books requested by Hitler from Madison Grant and Leon Whitney and the praise from Nazi officials for the influence of Laughlin and Popenoe’s work. There were no accolades in the other direction because American eugenicists simply could not get universities to give honorary degrees, encourage politicians to read eugenics literature or influence the introduction of eugenically inspired legislation. The volume of praise given to Nazism by the orthodox and racial eugenicists was because the home movement had already reached closure and these people were socially and scientifically superfluous. The agenda of the reform movement had moved on from crude policies of immigration control, anti-miscegenation laws and mass sterilisation. The connections between it and Nazism were to be found in their historic roots, but there were not the individuals or organisations willing to be bound in to the Nazi worldview.

American eugenics did not depend on Nazism, or German eugenics generally, in any significant way. The reverse relationship had two significant dimensions. Firstly, Nazi eugenics attempted to legitimise itself by pointing to the past eugenics policies of the USA - on race crossing, on sterilisation and on immigration - as well as looking to the theoretical aspects of American eugenics. Secondly, the existence of eugenics in the USA as a respectable movement in the 1920s perhaps helped Americans - politicians, academics and the general public - to accept Nazism for longer than they otherwise might have. (It is outside the scope of this dissertation to examine these issues in any detail).
On the ultimate eugenic policy of wholesale destruction of populations - the area that would keep eugenics out of mainstream scientific discourse in the post-war world - there were clear distinctions between American eugenicists and their German counterparts. The vast majority of American eugenicists had specifically opposed state sponsored killing long before Nazism turned it from an abstract concept to a reality.

- International Dimensions

The international dimensions of eugenics were seen as important to all eugenics movements. Stefan Kühl is correct to highlight the personal contacts between eugenicists in the two countries and even the institutional contacts. Schisms caused by World War One took years to heal, but then were replaced by the rise of Nazism. When it came to formal international forums like the IFEO or the international congresses on-going dislocations in eugenics meant that there was little or no contact over the period. Germany was not invited to the Second International Congress of Eugenics and could not afford to send delegates to the Third International Congress of Eugenics (both held in New York). The Fourth International Congress, which should have been held in Austria in 1939, was cancelled due to the situation in Europe. Factional changes in Germany through the period added to international differences. The IFEO, failed to include both the USA and Germany on an equal footing for more than a couple of years, despite the attempts of Davenport and others. The major international forums then tended to be meeting places for American and British and a few other eugenicists. Organisations like the IFEO were an attempt to create a truly international eugenics movement, which, like Alfred Ploetz's International Race Hygiene Society before it largely failed. The IFEO to some extent, became instead an attempt to present an internationalist veneer to a fragmented movement. There were, of course countries with high levels of co-operation, such as Britain and the USA. Co-operation between German and American eugenicists was nowhere near this level. The international area where cooperation is evident is in the birth control oriented *Eugenik / reform World Population Congress.*
The cross-fertilisation of German and American eugenics has been much overstated. American eugenics drew very little from German eugenics, despite attempts to paint a picture of eugenic movements progressing together and cooperating on a large scale. American eugenics dominated too much in the period up to around 1930 for much influence to have been drawn from what by comparison was a eugenic backwater like Germany. Indeed, when in 1925 *Eugenical News* listed the eight most important centres of eugenics, Germany was not even on the list [EugN; X (May 1925); 49]. By the end of the 1920s Germany had conducted research, but passed no legislation to compare with that of the USA. Eyes were still on the USA as the world’s eugenic leader. In the post-1930 world generational changes in American eugenics, the radicalisation of German eugenics under Nazism and the dismantling of reform eugenics in America, meant that little was absorbed from German eugenic experiences. (In this context it is worth remembering that in the period 1928 to 1932 eugenics in both countries shifted. In Germany from moderate to radical and in the USA from radical to moderate).

German eugenicists were keen to present the image of a eugenics programme in Nazi Germany, which built on eugenics in the USA. The reality is that German eugenics depended very little on what had preceded it in the USA. The Nazi regime was eager to present its policies as part of a legitimised and widespread trend. By associating Nazi policy with American eugenics policy - the world’s leader - Nazism could gain a veneer of respectability at little cost. The American eugenicists who Nazism and *Rassenhygiene* celebrated as the ancestors of German policy - Laughlin, Popenoe, Campbell - would gratefully accept such dubious honour, because their brand of eugenics was in such disarray at home. In 1939 the *ARGB* claimed that the USA had “achieved something great” since passing its first sterilisation laws [ARGB; 33 (1939); 224].

* Post-World War Two
The older orthodox and racial parts of eugenics finished before 1933. The reform movement emerged as a more scientifically rooted form of eugenics, but was far from free of racial and social prejudice. Many people within the reform wing and others who were associated with it continued for many years to support at least certain aspects of Nazism, yet their part of the movement survived. Reform eugenicists voluntarily vacated the field of overt eugenics. The integration of birth control at the centre of the reform eugenics programme and the emergence of a 'cleansed' genetics, particularly population and human genetics, necessarily led to a reconceptualisation of the whole movement and the emergence of population studies of various sorts. This new field took with it the bulk of the funding and personnel. Post-war organisations like Planned Parenthood and the Population Council were the inheritors of a more subtle eugenics programme.

The complex relationship between birth control and eugenics has often been ignored. Examining birth control and population control movements of the early post-war years reveals a fairly clear line of historical descent, which many people chose to obscure. Richard Soloway suggests that the connection was “expunged as a painful embarrassment from the historical memory of the triumphant birth control movement” as part of a general drive to remove all traces of overt eugenics in the aftermath of Nazi genocide and other eugenic policies [Soloway; 1995; 637].

The importance of Nazism to the story of American eugenics (and part of the reason for the confusion over its role) is its post-war effect. Since 1945 Nazism has undoubtedly served as the strongest deterrent to the re-emergence of overt eugenics movements in any country, and has served to keep eugenics as a ‘dirty word’ to mainstream society and scientists. Frederick Osborn recognised this fact in his 1960s account of the demise of American eugenics, when he wrote that “in the minds of many americans [sic] the word eugenics still connotes racism and supermen” [FOP; Frederick Osborn to Johnson; n.d. ca. 1960s].
Modern day eugenicists also see Nazism as the major cause of their movement's unpopularity (rather than the generally discredited science, or its socially divisive nature) In the *Eugenics Bulletin* Stephen Saetz argues that “the link with atrocities committed during the Third Reich is the greatest cross which contemporary eugenics has to bear” [Saetz; 5-v-1999; 1]. While many contemporary eugenicists such as Saetz seek distance eugenics from Nazism and genocide, others like Carl Bajema have argued that “eugenics includes such policies as those of Nazi Germany if eugenics is defined as the social control of human genetic evolution” [quoted in Saetz; 5-v-1999; 1].
GLOSSARY

Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie = Archive for Race and Society

Biology
differential fecundity = the idea that the lower classes breed more rapidly than the higher classes
dysgenic (and cacogenic) = eugenically unfit / bad

Eugenik = Eugenics

Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene = Society for Race Hygiene

Lamarckism = the idea that physical and psychological characteristics acquired in a lifetime through environmental conditions can be inherited by offspring

miscegenation = race crossing, especially between Black and White in the USA

Rassenhygiene = race hygiene

AES = American Eugenics Society

ARGB = Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie

ERA = Eugenics Research Association

ERO = Eugenics Record Office

IFEO = International Federation of Eugenic Organisations

IRL = Immigration Restriction League

KWG = Kaiser Wilhelm Community, including various institutes

KWI = Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics, part of the KWG

n.d. = No date
BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

These biographic notes are not meant to be extensive or complete. They are meant simply to give some information about each person to help put them into context for this study. Publications lists are not complete, but are indicative.

Baur, Erwin (1875-1933) German plant geneticist and eugenicist. Published *Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene* in 1921 with Fritz Lenz and Eugen Fischer. It was one of the cornerstones of German genetics and eugenics until 1945. In 1931 it was published in England as *Human Heredity*. Became involved in the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems.

Blacker, Carlos Paton (1895-1975) British reform eugenicist and long time secretary of the Eugenics Society. Trained as a physician. Often cited as the British equivalent to Frederick Osborn. Blacker published extensively, with a total of over fifty books and articles.

Boas, Franz (1858-1943) German-Jewish born American cultural anthropologist. Headed the anthropology department at Columbia University from 1899 to 1937. From here he organised the main scientific opposition to eugenics, racism and Nazism. He was committed to ideas of the power of the environment and opposed the idea of race as a scientific category. He published extensively on questions of race and science including work on immigrants - "Eugenics" (1916), "The Great Melting Pot and Its Problem" (1921) and "This Nordic Nonsense" (1925).

Brigham, Carl Campbell (1890-1943) Brigham had been one of Yerkes' original army testers, and by 1923 was Professor of Psychology at Princeton. In the later 1920s he publicly rejected his own work on the army tests and its racial bias. Published *A Study of American Intelligence* (1923) and "Intelligence Tests of Immigrant Groups" (1930).

towards reform positions in the later 1920s. From 1908-1936 he was Professor of Genetics at Harvard’s Bussey Institute. He was renowned for getting into fierce academic arguments, and he was an early critic of Davenport. His *Genetics and Eugenics* (1916) was a cornerstone of American genetics in the period. “Biological and Social Consequences of Race-Crossing” (1924) and “Race Mixture and Physical Disharmonies” (1930) attacked the scientific basis for opposition to race crossing.


**Davenport, Charles Benedict** (1866-1944) The leading American orthodox eugenicist of the period. Founded the Station for the Experimental Study of Evolution and its subsidiary the ERO (1910), which was the central organisation of orthodox eugenics. He was the first chair of the Galton Society (founded 1918) and president of the ERA 1913-4. His many publications include *Heredity In Relation to Eugenics* (1911), “The Effect of Race Intermingling” (1917) and *Race Crossing in Jamaica* (1929) with Morris Steggard. He was president of the Third International Congress of Eugenics (1932) and of the IFEO. He retired in 1934, but remained a force behind the scenes.

**Fischer, Eugen** (1874-1967) German Rassenhygiene wing eugenicist. Director of the KWI for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics from 1927 to 1942. He was Germany’s leading expert on race crossing. Published *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardisierungsproblem beim Menschen* (1913) and *Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene* (1921) with Fritz Lenz and Erwin Baur. The latter was one of the cornerstones of German genetics and eugenics until 1945. It was published in English as *Human Heredity* (1931). Was on the committee which recommended sterilising the Rheinlandbastarde. He joined the Nazi party in 1940.

**Fisher, Irving** (1867-19??) Economist at Yale University. A driving force behind the founding of the AES, its president from 1922-27 and a significant contributor of funds. President of the ERA 1920-21. He remained involved in eugenics and
population control through the 1930s although some of reputation was lost after the 1929 crash.

**Goddard, Henry Herbert** (1866-1957) American psychometrician, campaigner against feeble-mindedness and orthodox eugenicist who introduced the Binet IQ test to the USA. Director of the Training School for Feeble-minded Girls and Boys at Vineland, New Jersey. He helped Yerkes design the army tests. Publications include *The Kallikak Family* (1912). “Mental Tests and the Immigrant” (1917) proved the inferiority of various immigrant groups. “Feeble-mindedness: A Question of Definition” (1928) attacked some of his own previous work.


**Günther, Hans F K** (1891-1968) German Volkisch thinker and Rassenhygiene eugenicist. In 1930 he became professor of anthropology at Jena and then at Freiburg. He was a regular correspondent with Madison Grant, who got some of his work published in *Eugenical News*. Publications include *Rassenkunde des Deutschen Volkes* (1922). He joined the Nazi party in 1932. Was on the committee which recommended sterilising the Rheinlandbastarde.

**Haldane, John Burden Sanderson** (1892-1964) British population geneticist and reform eugenicist, who became highly sceptical of all eugenic schemes (although not aims) after 1930. A committed communist. Publications include *Possible Worlds and Other Papers* (1928) and *Heredity and Politics* (1938).

**Holmes, Samuel Jackson** (1868-1964) Largely a reform eugenicist, with some orthodox opinions (especially on race). Geneticist / biologist at University of California at Berkeley. President of the AES 1938-40. Publications include *A Bibliography of Eugenics* (1924) and *The Eugenic Predicament* (1933).

**Hooton, Ernest Albert** (1887-1954) American physical anthropologist, based at Harvard from 1913 to 1953. In the 1920s he moved away from crude racial theories
towards a more sophisticated position. At Boas' request he tried to organise a formal rejection of Nazism and racism. Publications include *Up From the Ape* (1931) and "A Plain Statement About Race" (1936).

**Hrdlicka, Aleš** (1869-1943) Czech born American anthropologist and curator of the Smithsonian Institution. Idiosyncratic orthodox eugenicist. Founded and ran the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. Publications include *Old Americans* (1925). Although he was involved with many orthodox and racial eugenicists, he refused to become involved in debates on immigration.

**Huntington, Ellsworth** (1876-1943) American eugenicist, birth control campaigner and Professor of Geography at Yale University. Started out as an orthodox eugenicist, but became a reformer around 1930. Treasurer of the AES 1933-34 and president 1934-38. Authored *The Builders of America* (1928) with Leon Whitney, and *Tomorrow's Children* (1935) to replace Whitney's *A Eugenics Catechism*.

**Huxley, Julian Sorell** (1887-1975) British reform eugenicist, grandson of Thomas Huxley and brother of Aldous Huxley. He spent much time in the USA and rejected Nazism decisively from the outset. Although he rejected much of racial eugenics he remained a firm believer in sterilisation as a method of controlling the feebleminded. Publications include *We Europeans* (1935) with A C Haddon.

**Jennings, Herbert Spencer** (1868-1947) American reform eugenicist with some orthodox views, such as on the biological consequences of race crossing. Studied under Davenport at Harvard 1894-6, with W E Castle. Long time protozoologist at John Hopkins University. He became a correspondent and confidant of Raymond Pearl, his one time student. Published *Prometheus or Biology and the Advancement of Man* (1925), *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (1930) and edited *Scientific Aspects of the Race Problem* (1941). His opposition to Laughlin's evidence on immigration was published as "Undesirable Aliens" (1923).

**Johnson, Roswell Hill** (1877-post1950) From 1912 Professor of Eugenics at Pittsburgh University. Trained as a geneticist and co-authored the highly influential *Applied Eugenics* (1918) with Paul Popeneoe. Started out as a racial eugenicist but moved to a reform position around 1930 with the Institute of Family Affairs. Even in
the early years he mixed racial eugenics with support for birth control, causing controversy with the eugenic resolution at the 1925 Sixth International Birth Control Conference in New York. Treasurer of the AES 1928 and secretary 1928-31.

**Laughlin, Harry Hamilton** (1880-1943) Orthodox eugenicist (with a racial eugenics tinge). Superintendent of the ERO, under Davenport and through the entire period Davenport’s heir apparent as leading orthodox eugenicist. One of America’s two leading propagandists for sterilisation. Gave evidence to the Congressional committee working on the 1924 Immigration Act and at the Buck versus Bell Supreme Court case. He was a close friend of Davenport and Grant. President of the AES 1927-28. His many publications include *The Legal, Legislative and Administrative Aspects of Sterilization* (1914) and *Eugenic Sterilization in the United States* (1922).

**Lenz, Fritz** (1887-1976) German *Rassenhygiene* eugenicist. In 1923 he became Germany’s first associate-professor of race hygiene (at Munich). Published *Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene* in 1921 with Erwin Baur and Eugen Fischer and “Die Stellung des Nationalsozialismus zur Rassenhygiene” (1931). The former was one of the cornerstones of German genetics and eugenics until 1945. In 1931 it was published in England as *Human Heredity*. Was on the committee which recommended sterilising the *Rheinlandbastarde*.

**Mjöen, Jon Alfred** (1860-1939) Norwegian race hygienist, and founder / director of Norway’s *Winderen Laboratorium*. Having been largely rejected by Norway’s scientific community by the mid-1920s he focused on the international eugenics movement.

**Morgan, Thomas Hunt** (1866-1945) leading American geneticist of the 1920s and 1930s. Early supporter of eugenics but by 1918 he opposed it in private. In 1933 he became the first geneticist to win the Nobel prize for physiology or medicine.

**Muckermann, Hermann** (1877-1962) German Catholic eugenicist and leading member of the *Eugenik* wing. In 1927 he became director of the eugenics section of the Berlin *KWl*. As a Jesuit priest Muckermann tried to reconcile Catholicism and eugenics. Forced into retirement immediately after 1933 for his anti-Nazi stance.
Published *Attitude of Catholics Towards Darwinism and Evolution*. In 1947 he became the first director of the Max Planck Institute for Applied Anthropology (formed from the KWG).

**Muller, Hermann Joseph** (1890-1967) American socialist reform eugenicist and geneticist. He worked in Morgan's *Drosophila* laboratory at Columbia. His admiration for the Soviet Union led him to live there from 1933-7, which in turn inspired his book *Out of the Night*. Like Haldane he was committed to a form of socialist eugenics and was highly critical of orthodox and racial positions, launching an attack at the Third International Congress of Eugenics in 1932. In 1946 he won the Nobel prize for physiology or medicine.

**Osborn, Frederick** (1889-1981) American reform eugenicist and nephew of Henry Fairfield Osborn. Osborn is largely credited with transforming the AES and moving it closer to the birth control movement. He joined its board of directors in 1927. He was secretary from 1936-39 and treasurer 1936-45. Despite his centrality to reform eugenics Frederick Osborn remained on good terms with old-style eugenicists like Davenport and Laughlin. Publications include *Preface to Eugenics* (1940)

**Osborn Henry Fairfield** (1857-1935) Founder of the Galton Society (1918). President of the American Museum of Natural History (1908-33). President of the Second International Congress of Eugenics (1921) and honorary vice-president of the third. He was one of a group of men -Davenport, Laughlin, Popenoe, Grant - in the 1920s who in various combinations made up most eugenic organisations.

**Pearl, Raymond** (1879-1940) American reform eugenicist and birth control advocate. Started out as an orthodox eugenicist, publishing work like "Breeding Better Men" (1908). He changed to a reform position in the 1920s and went public with his criticisms in 1927 with "The Biology of Superiority" (he retained a crude form of cultural racism and Social Darwinism). He was a colleague of Jennings at John Hopkins, where a close friendship developed. He was involved in the birth control movement and became president of the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems. Among over 300 publications are "The Racial Effect of Alcohol" (1924) and "The Biology of Superiority" (1927).
Perkins, Henry Farnham (1877-1956) Professor of Zoology at University of Vermont. He held a mixture of orthodox and reform eugenic opinions simultaneously. Founded the Eugenics Survey of Vermont in 1925 (closed 1936) and drafted Vermont’s sterilisation law in 1927. Active in the AES and its president from 1931-34. He helped move the AES towards the birth control movement in this period.

Ploetz, Alfred Julius (1860-1940) German founder of the Rassenhygiene wing of German eugenics, and the godfather of Nazi eugenics. Was committed to Aryanism from the beginning of his career. Founded the ARGB and the Society for Race Hygiene. Publications include Die Tüchtigkeit unserer Rasse und der Schutz der Schwachen (1895).


Rüdin, Ernst (1875-1952) Swiss born German Rassenhygiene eugenicist and psychiatrist. Co-founded the Society for Race Hygiene. In 1931 he became head of the KWI for Psychiatry. Was on the committee which recommended sterilising the Rheinlandbastarde. He joined the Nazi party in 1937.

Sanger, Margaret Louise (1883-1966) The USA’s leading birth control campaigner and driving force behind the movement. Although she eventually teamed up with reform eugenicists, she retained many orthodox views (a grouping who more often than not rejected her birth control movement).

Schallmayer, Wilhelm Friedrich (1857-1919) German founder of Eugenik. He rejected Aryanism and the racialising of eugenics. He did not organise any institutional base to rival Ploetz’s ARGB and Society for Race Hygiene. After his death, his position was taken over by Hermann Muckermann, Arthur Ostermann and
Alfred Grotjahn. Publications include *Vererbung und Auslese im Lebenslauf der Völker* (Selection and Heredity in the Life History of Peoples) (1903).

**Stoddard, (Theodore) Lothrop** (1883-1950) American racial eugenicist, promoter of birth control and anti-Semite. A propagandist rather than any kind of scientist, he authored the popular books *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy* (1920), *The Revolt Against Civilisation* (1922) and *Into the Darkness* (1940) (about his trip to wartime Nazi Germany).

**Terman, Lewis Madison** (1877-1956) American orthodox eugenicist and psychometrician. A psychologist at Stanford university, who changed Binet’s IQ tests to make them suitable for the USA (the Binet-Simon tests Stanford revision). He helped Yerkes design the army tests.

**Whitney, Leon Fradley** (1894-ca.1970) Mixed orthodox and reform eugenics. Long time secretary of the AES and a key fund-raiser, left after falling out with Frederick Osborn. Was felt by many to be a liability, because of his pronouncements on scientific matters, when he had no scientific training. Inadvertently began the separation of the AES from orthodox eugenics, with a proposed merger with parts of the birth control movement and the founding of the journal *Eugenics*. Authored *A Eugenics Catechism* (1923) *The Builders of America* (1928) with Ellsworth Huntington and *The Case for Sterilization* (1935), before moving out of eugenics and into animal breeding.

**Yerkes, Robert Mearns** (1876-1956) Orthodox eugenicist and psychometrician. He introduced and conducted the army intelligence tests of the First World War. After World War One became Professor of Psychology at Harvard (where he had previously been a graduate student of Davenport’s). Published *Psychological Testing in the United States Army* (1921) and *Army Mental Tests* (1920) with Clarence Yoakum.
• Archival Sources

AESP  American Eugenics Society Papers
      575.06 AM3 American Philosophical Society
      Philadelphia

CBDP1  Charles Benedict Davenport Papers
       B/D27 No.1 American Philosophical Society
       Philadelphia

CBDP2  Charles Benedict Davenport Papers No.2
       B/D27 No.2 American Philosophical Society
       Philadelphia

EROP   Eugenics Record Office Papers
       Ms Coll No.77 American Philosophical Society
       Philadelphia

FOP     Frederick Osborn Papers
       Ms Coll No.24 American Philosophical Society
       Philadelphia

HSJP1  Herbert Spencer Jennings Papers
       B J44 American Philosophical Society
       Philadelphia

HSJP2  Herbert Spencer Jennings Papers
GLOSSARY, BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION, BIBLIOGRAPHY

B J44a American Philosophical Society
Philadelphia

KPP Karl Pearson Papers
University College, London
(Bloomsbury Science Library)
London

LWA Leon Whitney Unpublished Autobiography
B W613b American Philosophical Society
Philadelphia

LWP Leon F Whitney Papers
575.06 Am3w American Philosophical Society
Philadelphia

RPP Raymond Pearl Papers
B:P312 American Philosophical Society
Philadelphia

WIHM Eugenics Society of GB Papers
The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine
(Contemporary Medical Archives)
London
• Books

SICE = The Second International Congress of Eugenics; (Two Volumes)
Baltimore (USA) 1934
TICE = A Decade of Progress in Eugenics: Scientific Papers of the Third
International Congress of Eugenics; Baltimore (USA) 1934

Adams, Mark B; The Wellborn Science; Oxford (GB) 1990
Arad Yitzhak, Gutman Yisrael, Margaliot Abraham; Documents on the Holocaust;
Jerusalem 1981
Balfour, Michael; The Kaiser and His Times; London 1964
Barkan, Elazar; The Retreat of Scientific Racism; Cambridge (GB) 1992
Bartov, Omar; Murder In Our Midst; Oxford (GB) 1996
Baur, Erwin, Fischer, Eugen, Lenz, Fritz; Human Heredity; London 1931
Brigham, Carl; A Study of American Intelligence; Princeton (USA) 1923
Burleigh, Michael; Death and Deliverance; Cambridge (GB) 1994
Burleigh Michael, Wippermann Wolfgang; The Racial State; Germany 1933-1945;
Cambridge (GB) 1992
Campbell, A E; America Comes of Age; London 1971
Castle, W E; Genetics and Eugenics; Cambridge (USA) 1921
Chase, Allan; The Legacy of Malthus; Chicago; 1980
Cohn, Norman; Warrant For Genocide; London 1996
Dahlberg, Gunnar; Race Reason and Rubbish; Woking (GB) 1942
Darwin, Charles; The Origin of Species By Means of Natural Selection; Twickenham
(GB) 1998
Davenport, Charles; Heredity in Relation to Eugenics; London; 1912
Dawidowicz, Lucy; The War Against The Jews; New York 1976
East, Edward M; Mankind at the Crossroads; New York 1923
Fischer, E; *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardisierungsproblem beim Menschen*; Jena (Germany) 1913

Feyerabend, Paul; *Science In A Free Society*; London 1978

Friedländer, Saul; *Nazi Germany and the Jews*; London 1997

Friedlander, Henry; *The Origins of Nazi Genocide*; Chapel Hill (USA) 1995

Galton, Francis; *Inquiries Into Human Faculty*; London 1883

Gilbert, Martin; *The First World War*; London 1994 (a)

----------; *Atlas of the First World War*, London 1994 (b)

----------; *Britain and Germany Between the Wars*; London 1980

Goddard, Henry H; *The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness*; New York 1912

Goethe, C M; *War Profits and Better Babies*; Sacramento (USA) 1946

Gould, Stephen J; *The Mismeasure of Man*; London 1997

Grant, Madison; *The Passing of the Great Race*; London 1922

Grant, Madison and Davison, Charles; *The Alien in Our Midst*; New York 1930

Haldane, J B S; *Heredity and Politics*; New York 1938

Hall, Charles; *Negroes in the USA 1920-1932*; New York 1934

Haller, Mark; *Eugenics: Hereditary Attitudes in American Thought*; New Brunswick (USA) 1963

Harrowitz, Nancy; Anti-Semitism, Misogyny and the Logic of Cultural Difference; Lincoln (USA) 1994

Hasain, Marouf A; *The Rhetoric of Eugenics in Anglo-American Thought*; Athens (USA) 1996

Herf, Jeffrey; *Reactionary Modernism*; Cambridge (GB) 1988

Hitler, Adolf; *Mein Kampf*; London 1992

Hobsbawm, Eric; *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*; Cambridge (GB) 1990

Hoche, A and Binding R; *Die Freigabe Der Vernichtung Lebensunwerten Lebens*; Leipzig (Germany) 1920

Hoffman, G von; *Rassenhygiene in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika*; Munich (Germany) 1913

Hrdlicka, Aleš; *Old Americans*; Baltimore (USA); 1925
Human Betterment Foundation; *Collected Papers on Eugenic Sterilization in California*; Pasadena (USA) 1930

Huntington, Ellsworth; *Tomorrow's Children*; New York; 1935

Huntington, Ellsworth, Whitney, Leon; *The Builders of America*; London 1928

Jennings, Herbert Spencer; *Prometheus or Biology and the Advancement of Man*; New York 1925

Jones, Steve; *The Language of the Genes*; London 1993

Kenrick, Donald, Puxon, Gratton; *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*; London 1972

Kevles, Daniel J; *In The Name Of Eugenics*; Cambridge (USA) 1995

Kevles Daniel, Hood Leroy; *The Code of Codes*; Cambridge (USA) 1992

Klee, Ernst; *Euthanasie im NS-Staat: Die Vernichtung Lebensunwerten Lebens*; Frankfurt 1983

Klineberg, Otto; *Race Differences*; New York 1935

Kühl, Stefan; *The Nazi Connection*; New York 1994

Kuper, Leo; *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*; London 1981

Larson, Edward J; *Sex, Race and Science: Eugenics in the Deep South*; Baltimore (USA); 1995

Laughlin, Harry; *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States*; Chicago 1922

Ludmerer, Kenneth; *Genetics and American Society*; Baltimore (USA) 1972

Mitscherlich, A & Mielke, F; *Doctors of Infamy*; New York 1949

Mosse, George; *The Crisis of German Ideology*; New York 1981

Noakes, J, Pridham, G; *Nazism 1919-1945: A Documentary Reader Vol. I*; Exeter (GB) 1991a

---------------; *Nazism 1919-1945: A Documentary Reader Vol. II*; Exeter (GB) 1991b

---------------; *Nazism 1919-1945: A Documentary Reader Vol. III*; Exeter (GB) 1991c

Müller-Hill, Benno; *Murderous Science*; Oxford (GB) 1988

Nyiszli, Miklos; *Auschwitz*; London 1979

Palmer, Alan; *Dictionary of Modern History*; London 1983

Paul, Diane B; *Controlling Human Heredity: 1865 to the Present*; Atlantic Highlands (USA) 1995

Pickens, Donald; *Eugenics and the Progressives*; Nashville (USA) 1968
Pommerin, Reiner; Sterilisierung der Rheinlandbastarde 1918-1937; Düsseldorf (Germany) 1979

Popenoe, Paul and Gosney, Eugene; Sterilization for Human Betterment; New York 1929

Proctor, Robert; Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis; Cambridge (USA) 1995

Reilly, Philip; The Surgical Solution: A History of Involuntary Sterilization in the United States; Baltimore (USA) 1991

Rice, Thurman B; Racial Hygiene; New York 1929

Rose, Steven, Lewontin, Richard, Kamin Leon; Not In Our Genes; London 1990

Ripley, William Z; The Races of Europe; London 1900

Roll-Hansen N, Broberg G; Eugenics and the Welfare State; East Lansing (USA) 1996

Starr Jordan, David; The Human Harvest; New York, 1907

Stepan, Nancy L; The Hour of Eugenics; New York 1991

Stoddard, Lothrop; The Revolt Against Civilisation; New York 1922

---------; Into the Darkness; New York 1940

Terman, Lewis; The Measurement of Intelligence; London 1919

Weindling, Paul; Health, Race and German Politics Between National Unification and Nazism 1870-1945; Cambridge (GB) 1993

Weiss, Sheila F; Race Hygiene and the Rational Management of National Efficiency: Wilhelm Schallmayer and the Origins of German Eugenics 1890-1920; Baltimore (USA) 1983

Whitney, Leon F; The Case for Sterilization; London 1935

Wolf, Julius; Der Geburtenrückgang; Jena (Germany) 1912

Yerkes, Robert; Psychological Testing in the United States Army; New York 1921

Yoakum, Clarence and Yerkes, Robert; Army Mental Tests; New York 1920

• Articles from Books and Journals

 ARGB = Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbioologie (Germany)

276
GLOSSARY, BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION, BIBLIOGRAPHY

BCR = Birth Control Review (USA)
EugR = Eugenics Review (GB)
EugN = Eugenical News (USA)
JAMA = Journal of the American Medical Association (USA)
JofH = Journal of Heredity (USA)

Allen, Garland E; "Genetics, Eugenics and Class Struggle"; Genetics 79 1975 29-45
-----------; "Genetics, Eugenics and Society: Internalists and Externalists in Contemporary History of Science"; Social Studies of Science 6 1976 105-122
-----------; "The Work of Raymond Pearl from Eugenics to Population Control"; Science for the People July / August 1980 22-28
-----------; "The Misuse of Biological Hierarchies"; History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 5 (1) 1983 105-128

Barkan, Elazar; "Mobilizing Scientists Against Nazi Racism 1933-1939"; in Bones, Bodies, Behaviour ed. G. Stocking; Madison (USA) 1988 180-205

Barker, David; "The Biology of Stupidity: Genetics, Eugenics and Mental Deficiency in the Inter-War Years; British Journal for the History of Science 22 1989 347-375

Beardsley, Edward; "The American Scientist as Social Activist - Franz Boas, Burt G Wilder and the Cause of Racial Justice, 1900-1915"; Isis 64 1973 50-66

Bell, Alexander Graham; "A Few Thoughts Concerning Eugenics"; National Geographic Magazine February 1908 119-123

Bloch, Harry; "The Berlin Correspondence in the JAMA During the Hitler Regime"; Bulletin of the History of Medicine 47 1973 297-305

Boas, Franz; "Eugenics"; Scientific Monthly 3 1916 471-478

Bock, Gisela; "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany"; Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 8 (3) 1983 400-421

Brigham, Carl C; "Intelligence Tests of Immigrant Groups"; The Psychological Review 37 1930 158-165

Burleigh, Michael; "Euthanasia and the Third Reich"; History Today 40 1990 11-16

Castle, W E; "Race Mixture and Physical Disharmonies"; Science 71 1930 604-660

Critchelow, Donald; "Keeping the Life Stream Pure"; Reviews in American History 20 1992 343-349

Crook, Paul; "War As Genetic Disaster?"; War and Society 8 (1) May 1990 47-71

Dann, Kevin; "From Degeneration to Regeneration: The Eugenics Survey of Vermont", 1925-1936; Vermont History 59 (1) 1991 5-29

Dietrich, Donald; "A Catholics Adaptation to German Eugenics from World War One to 1933: Hermann Muckermann"; Hispania Sacra 42 1991 71-82

Dikötter, Frank; "Race Culture: Recent Perspectives on the History of Eugenics"; American Historical Review April 1998 467-478


Glass, Bentley; "A Hidden Chapter of German Eugenics Between the Two World Wars"; Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 125 5 1981 357-367

Goddard, Henry; "Mental Tests and the Immigrant"; Journal of Delinquency 2 1917 243-277

------------; "Feeble-mindedness: A Question of Definition"; Journal of Psycho-Asthenics 33 1928 219-227

278
Graham, Loren; "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s"; *American Historical Review* 82 1977 1133-1164

Harvey, R D; "Pioneers of Genetics: A Comparison of the Attitudes of William Bateson and Erwin Baur to Eugenics"; *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 49 (1) 1995 105-117

Harwood, Jonathan; "National Styles in Science: Genetics in Germany and the United States Between the World Wars"; *Isis* 78 1987 390-414

Jennings, Herbert Spencer; "Undesirable Aliens"; *The Survey* 15 December 51 1923 309-312 & 364


----------; "Into Hostile Political Camps: The Reorganisation of International Science in World War I"; *Isis* 62 1971 47-60

Kopp, Marie E; "Legal and Medical Aspects of Eugenic Sterilization in Germany"; *American Sociological Review* 1 1936 761-770


MacKenzie, Donald; "Eugenics in Britain"; *Social Studies of Science* 6 1976 499-532

Mallet, Bernard; "Vital Statistics As Affected By The War"; *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* LXXXI January 1918 1-36

Mehler, Barry; "Sources in the Study of Eugenics No.2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers"; *Mendel Newsletter* 16 1978 6-11

Mehler, Barry & Allen, Garland; "Sources in the Study of Eugenics No.1: Inventory of the American Eugenics Society Papers"; *Mendel Newsletter* 14 1977 9-16

Noakes, Jeremy; "Social Outcasts in Nazi Germany"; *History Today* Dec 1985 35 15-19

279
Nye, Robert A; "The Rise and Fall of the Eugenics Empire"; The Historical Journal; 36 (3) 1993 687-700
Paul, Diane; "Eugenics and the Left"; Journal of the History of Ideas 45 1984 567-590
Pearl, Raymond; "Breeding Better Men"; The World's Work January 1908 9818-9824
------------; "The Biology of Superiority"; American Mercury 12 Nov. 1927 257-266
------------; "Karl Pearson"; Journal of the American Statistical Association 31 Dec 1936 664
Pearson, Karl; "Wie Steht's Mit Der Deutschen Kultur?"; The New Statesman London 10 October 1914 9-12
Pommerin, Reiner; "The Fate of Mixed Race Children in Germany"; German Studies Review 5 (3) 1982 315-323
Rafter, Nicole Hahn; "White Trash: Eugenics as Social Ideology"; Society 26 (1) 1988 43-49
Reinders, Robert; "Racialism on the Left: E D Morel and the "Black Horror on the Rhine""; International Review of Social History 13 1968 1-28
Selden, Steven; "Resistance in School and Society: Public and Pedagogical Debates About Eugenics"; Teachers College Record 90 (1) Fall 1988 61-83
Soloway, Richard; "The 'Perfect Contraceptive': Eugenics and Birth Control Research in Britain and America in the Interwar Years"; Journal of Contemporary History 30 1995 637-664
Weindling, Paul; "The 'Sondenweg' of German Eugenics: Nationalism and Scientific Internationalism"; British Journal for the History of Science; 22 1989 321-333
GLOSSARY, BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION, BIBLIOGRAPHY

Weingart, Peter; “German Eugenics Between Science and Politics”; Osiris 5 1989 2nd Series 260-282
---------; “Eugenics - Medical or Social Science?”; Science In Context 8 (1) 1995 197- 207
Weiss, Sheila F; “Wilhelm Schallmayer and the Logic of German Eugenics”; Isis 77 1986 33-46
---------; “The Race Hygiene Movement in Germany”; Osiris 3 1987 2nd Series

• Internet
Allen, Garland “Science Misapplied: The Eugenics Age Revisited”; 07-viii-1998;
ISAR Archives; “Harry Laughlin Papers”; 08-vi-1998;
   www.ferris.edu/isar/Laughlin/nazifilm.htm
   www.all.org/resource/contents.txt
PBS; “A Science Odyssey”; 01-ii-1999;
   www.pbs.org/wgbh/aso/databank/entries/dh23eu.html
Saetz, Stephen; “Eugenics and the Third Reich”; 5-v-1999;
   www.eugenics.net/papers/3rdreich.html

• Other
PhD Thesis - Sheila Faith Weiss; Race Hygiene and the Rational Management of National Efficiency; John Hopkins University, Baltimore (USA) 1983
PhD Thesis –Barry A Mehler; A History of the American Eugenics Society, 1921-1941; University of Illinois, Urbana- Champaign (USA) 1988