

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN EUGENICS SOCIETY, 1921-1940

BY

BARRY ALAN MEHLER

B.A., Yeshiva University, 1970  
M.A., City College of New York, 1973

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History  
in the Graduate College of the  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1988

Urbana, Illinois

Copyright 1988 by Barry Allan Mehler

# ABSTRACT

A History of the American Eugenics Society, 1921-1940

Barry Alan Mehler, Ph.D.

Department of History

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1988

Richard Burkhardt, Jr. Advisor

A history of the American Eugenics Society from its origins as the Eugenics Committee of the United States of America to World War II, this monograph represents the first in-depth study of an American eugenic institution. It is critical of the widely held thesis that American eugenics underwent a major transformation between 1915 and 1930. The author disputes the claim that a "new" eugenics emerged after 1930. The AES is viewed in the context of the international eugenics movement. The notion that Anglo-American eugenics developed independently of other European eugenics movements is disputed, and specific examples of foreign influence on American eugenics are documented. The dissertation includes a detailed prosopographical analysis of the 153 members of the Society's board of directors and advisory council between 1923 and 1935 as well as a 135 page appendix containing the biographies of 170 leading members of the Society between 1921 and 1940. There is a detailed comparison of American and Nazi sterilization programs demonstrating the ideological unity of the two programs in the prewar years. There is an examination of AES efforts to restrict immigration between 1921 and 1940. The author shows that a vigorous campaign to restrict immigration of

non-whites, Mexicans, and others was pursued between 1925 and 1940. This campaign paralleled the earlier campaign against Eastern and Southern Europeans. The study concludes with a detailed analysis of the theory and policy of the Society between 1938 and 1940.

In the memory of my mother

ESTHER MEHLER

1914-1987



## Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of numerous colleagues, friends, and institutions. I am especially indebted to Professor Garland E. Allen of Washington University who first suggested this study in 1976. Between 1976 and 1980, I worked with Professor Allen as his Research Associate. Our work was sponsored by National Science Foundation Grant # SOC 75-21902. His generosity, good humor, integrity, and intellectual clarity are much appreciated. During this period I also met Allen Chase, whose encouragement was unflagging and invaluable.

A grant from the Rockefeller Archive Center in the Summer of 1977 allowed me to travel to Tarrytown, New York to examine the papers of the Population Council of America and the Bureau of Social Hygiene. These papers have been extremely important in forming my perspective on the eugenics movement of the thirties and forties. This material will play an increasingly important role in my work as I begin the exploration of the period 1940 to 1960.

In 1981, Jerry Hirsch invited me to join the Institutional Racism Program at the University of Illinois. As a Trainee in the Institutional Racism Program, I received four years of fellowship support from the National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH grant MH 15173-05]. Dr. Hirsch also

brought me into his behavior genetics laboratory, insisting that a historian of eugenics not only understand the fundamentals of genetics, but have actual laboratory experience in behavior genetic analysis.

Professor Hirsch has been a constant source of materials and information and has given freely of his personal time to discuss the issues of this dissertation and the broader issues of ethics in science. I was also privileged to work with Professor Hirsch's graduate students: Mark Vargo, Mark Halliday, Stephen Zawistowski, and Jeff Ricker. I am particularly indebted to Jeff Ricker, who read many of my manuscripts over the years of our association.

My advisor, Richard W. Burkhardt Jr., was a source of constant good humored support and encouragement. He read through draft after draft of this dissertation and helped to hone the work into its final form. Through the entire process Professor Burkhardt kept me on track. He is, more than any other person, to be thanked for the completion of this manuscript.

Orville Vernon Burton has been my mentor in the area of American social history, historical methodology, and computer analysis. There are very few historians who can match his extraordinary skills in demographic and quantitative analysis. Professor Burton's support has been invaluable.

All the members of my committee, Professors Burkhardt, Burton, Hirsch, and Melhado proved to be extremely supportive of my efforts. Professor Melhado was especially helpful in reorganizing several chapters.

I also wish to acknowledge the help and support of Frederic C. Jaher. Throughout my graduate work, he has been a friend and mentor. In this context, I also wish to mention James Anderson, Professor of History of American Education, in the Educational Policy Studies Program and co-director of the Program for Training in the Study of Institutional Racism.

In the final stages of preparing the manuscript for deposit, Kelly Mickey, owner of the YMCA Used Book Store, read the manuscript and offered very helpful suggestions. Kenneth Wodke, Professor of Psychology, at the University of Wisconsin also read the entire manuscript and offered many helpful suggestions.

The history department at the University of Illinois has been a congenial place to work. I received constant support from the department in the form of steady employment as a graduate assistant from 1982 to the present. I was also awarded the departments Babcock Fellowship in 1986 which gave me a year of uninterrupted time to write the first draft of this manuscript. I would especially like to thank Sandy Colclasure, the departments Administrative

Secretary, for her assistance in winding my way through the University bureaucracy

Everyone who has gone through this process, knows how difficult dissertation writing can be on a spouse. My wife, Jennifer, endured it all with great resilience. Her love and support were the foundation upon which this work was completed. Finally, my son Isaac, helped me put the whole project into perspective when he pointed out that the dissertation was not nearly so important as a Care Bear movie.

## Contents

One: Introduction.....	1
Two: The Origins of the American Eugenics Society.....	34
Three: The American Eugenics Society, 1926-1940.....	81
Four: The American Eugenics Society: a Prosopography..	129
Five: The American Eugenics Society and Immigration Restriction, 1921-1939.....	180
Six: A Comparison of American and Nazi Sterilization..	223
Seven: The Eugenic Hypothesis, 1938-1940.....	269
Eight: Conclusion.....	296
Appendix: AES Advisory Council and Board, 1923-1940..	306
Bibliography.....	450
Vita .....	477

## Chapter One

### Introduction

#### Part I: Historiography

This is the first monographic study of an American eugenic institution. It is unique in several respects. First, this is an in-depth look at eugenics between the years 1921 and 1940, a period during which eugenics in America underwent considerable growth and change. I offer here a new interpretation of that change which challenges the consensus in the literature to date. Second, this study examines American eugenics in the context of the international eugenics movement. I show, for the first time, how American eugenics was influenced by eugenics in France, Norway, and Sweden. I also take a close look at the relationship between American and Nazi eugenics during the thirties. Third, this dissertation contains the first prosopographical study of American eugenic leaders. This is the first systematic analysis of the leadership of American eugenics. All previous studies of eugenics in America deal with the leadership in a haphazard fashion, which has clouded our understanding of the influence of eugenics on American culture.

The historical interest and importance of the eugenics movement is less well appreciated than it should be. The

eugenics movement had a significant impact on American society. Eugenics was an integral part of the Progressive movement, and the study of eugenics is inseparable from the study of genetics, public health, criminal justice, and the welfare state in general. Furthermore, it has had a lasting and profound impact on American social attitudes and legislation.

The eugenics movement played an important role in the passage of the 1924 immigration restriction act which established the "national origins" principle in U.S. immigration policy. This principle was not abandoned until 1965 with the passage of the Celler Act. Thus from 1924 to 1965 American immigration policy was self-consciously based on ethnicity and national origins. The policy was disastrous from the very beginning, pitting ethnic Americans against one another and causing serious foreign relations problems.<sup>1</sup>

Eugenicists also had a significant impact on the American judicial system. They helped convince legislators that crime was the product of bad heredity. This undermined a fundamental principle of American jurisprudence - the idea that everyone should be equal under the law. As Charles Davenport protested, "nothing could be more stupid, cruel, and unjust. The nature of the person should be given no less consideration in determining treatment than the nature

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter Wang, Legislating Normalcy: The Immigration Act of 1924 (Saratoga 1975).

of the deed done."<sup>2</sup> The view that sentencing should be regulated by the nature of the criminal rather than the nature of the crime led to the widespread acceptance of the indeterminate sentence.<sup>3</sup>

The eugenicists in America were also successful in carrying the cause of eugenic sterilization to the Supreme Court and successfully defending the Constitutionality of eugenic sterilization. In 1927, Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, declared that "three generations of imbeciles are enough." It was Holmes opinion that sterilization of biological degenerates was in the best interest of the patient and society.<sup>4</sup> The eugenics movement made deep inroads in educating Americans to accept sterilization as a solution to social problems.

Less clearly understood has been the impact of the eugenics movement on social welfare legislation and the administration of such programs established during the New Deal. From 1937 to 1939 the American Eugenics Society either organized or participated in some twenty-two conferences on such diverse subjects as housing, recreation,

---

<sup>2</sup> Charles B. Davenport to John R. Rockefeller Jr., (1 February 1912) Charles B. Davenport Papers, American Philosophical Society.

<sup>3</sup> Philip Jenkins, "Eugenics, Crime and Ideology: The Case of Progressive Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania History 51 #1 (January 1984) pp. 64-78.

<sup>4</sup> Oliver Wendell Holmes, Buck v. Bell, Supreme Court Reporter 47 (St. Paul 1928) pp. 584-585.



health care, education, medicine, and other public welfare projects.

For example, in 1938 eugenic leaders called a conference on eugenics in relation to housing shortly after the passage of the Wagner-Steagall Act which set aside federal funds for the construction of public housing.<sup>5</sup> It is clear that eugenic leaders believed public housing projects could contribute to the dysgenic trend in births which they believed was prevalent in the United States at the time. During the debate in Congress Senator Byrd and other opponents of the bill attached an amendment which was derisively referred to as the "race suicide amendment" since it limited the size of public housing units to an average of four rooms per unit. It was hoped that this limitation would prevent the Federal Government from subsidizing large families among the dysgenic elements.<sup>6</sup>

It is clear that the leaders of the eugenics movement were able to convey their perspective to legislators and administrators of federal projects. It is still not clear

---

<sup>5</sup> Passed in Congress 3 February 1938. The conference was held 1 April 1938.

<sup>6</sup> See the debate on this point during the Conference on The Eugenic Aspect of Housing of the American Eugenics Society at the Town Hall Club in New York City, Friday 1 April 1938. AES Papers. Specific reference to the "race suicide amendment" can be found in the presentation by Edith Elmer Wood, "The Scope and Methods of Modern Housing," p. 4. See also, the remarks by Warren Thompson, "Housing and Population." I comment further on this in the conclusion to this dissertation.

to what extent eugenics leaders were able to influence either the legislation or the administration of public welfare projects passed during the New Deal. But there is certainly enough evidence now available to warrant a close examination of this issue. Allan Chase has presented clear evidence that eugenic concerns influenced the operation of federally funded family planning programs in the early seventies. As Judge Gerhard Gesell noted in *Waters v. Walker*, "there is uncontroverted evidence in the record" that "poor people have been improperly coerced into accepting a sterilization operation" under federally subsidized programs. Judge Gesell went on to observe, "the dividing line between family planning and eugenics is murky."<sup>7</sup>

Despite the profound impact that eugenics has had on American society, important aspects of its history remain to be explored. In the past decade, several scholars have taken up the subject. Yet, no American history text deals with eugenics in anything more than a cursory fashion. I have surveyed general undergraduate history texts, texts that focus on the twentieth century, and many general monographs specifically dealing with the Progressive era. These texts, as well as monographs on the history of medicine, psychology, social hygiene, and other areas

---

<sup>7</sup> Quoted in Allan Chase, The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism (New York 1980) p. 17.

generally ignore eugenics. That a movement as broadly based and widely influential should have been largely disregarded by historians for so long is certainly worth some thought.

With regard to textbooks the reason may be that textbooks sometimes lag a generation or more behind the leading edge of scholarship,<sup>8</sup> it may take time before discussion of eugenics works its way into general college textbooks. It is certainly to be hoped that the present interest in eugenics will attract the interest of textbook writers.

With regard to the monographic literature the answer is less clear. For the period from 1940 to 1970 there is very little work treating eugenics as an important and serious topic. Certainly, the leaders of the eugenics movement in the United States did not seek attention in this period. The post-war eugenic leadership felt that "the time was not right for aggressive eugenic propaganda or any aggressive campaign for increased membership." Instead, the period called for "thinking out the problems of eugenics with the help of a well-informed audience."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> For examples of problems with text books see James D. Anderson, "Secondary School History Textbooks and the Treatment of Black History," in The State of Afro-American History: Past, Present, and Future (Baton Rouge 1986) pp. 253-274; Diane Paul, "Genetics Textbooks and the Genetics of Intelligence," unpublished manuscript, no date 1984.

<sup>9</sup> Frederick Osborn, "A History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (1974) pp. 121.

Researchers interested in the Holocaust ignored eugenics because there were more pressing historical issues that needed clarification. Holocaust research focused on the extermination process itself and on the magnitude and complexity of the death camp system. More recently, Holocaust historians have taken a serious interest in the role of academic disciplines in the Holocaust. They have also turned their attention to the euthanasia program and eugenics movement as aspects of the Holocaust.<sup>10</sup>

Historians of science did not turn their attention to eugenics until after the publication of Kenneth Ludmerer's history of American eugenics in 1972. Since the history of genetics was still in its infancy in the early seventies, it is not difficult to understand why eugenics was ignored. It is more difficult to understand why social historians have not paid more attention to eugenics.

Recently, however, there has been a virtual explosion of interest in eugenics in the United States and Europe. Researchers have taken up the subject in virtually every country in which eugenics has had an impact. Sessions on eugenics are regularly scheduled at the meetings of scholarly societies throughout the world. The history of

---

<sup>10</sup> For an example of the earlier literature see Raul Hilberg, The Destruction of European Jewry (Chicago 1967). For an example of the more recent literature focusing on euthanasia and eugenics see Robert Jay Lifton, The Nazi Doctor: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide (New York 1986).

eugenics in Germany which was until very recently poorly understood is now being carefully studied.<sup>11</sup>

The question arises: why has eugenics, so neglected for all these years, suddenly become such a popular topic? Obviously, advances in genetics, birth control, genetic screening, amniocentesis, sperm and egg banks, and the highly publicized legal cases involving these issues have spurred our interest in the history of eugenics. At the same time historians of science have become increasingly interested in the social context of science. Genetics in general became a topic of interest in this context since it was so clearly sensitive to the political and social environment. Eugenics has served as an important case study of the interaction of a science with society.

The shock and opprobrium which accompanied the revelations of the Holocaust have subsided which has resulted in a resurgence of support for eugenics among respected academics. Thus, eugenics has re-emerged as a legitimate topic for consideration and debate. Articles published in Intelligence by Daniel R. Vining and more

---

<sup>11</sup> See for example Robert Procter, Medicine Under the Nazis (Cambridge 1988); Robert J. Lifton, The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide (New York 1986); Jeremy Noakes, "Nazism and Eugenics: The Background to the Nazi Sterilization Law of 14 July 1933," in R.J. Bullen, H. Pogge von Strandmann and A.B. Polonsky, Ideas into Politics: Aspects of European History 1880-1950 (New Jersey 1984). Many other recent works on German eugenics are included in the footnotes to Chapter Six.

recently by Marian Van Court and Frank Bean claim to show that there is a dysgenic trend with regard to intelligence in American birth differentials.<sup>12</sup> This has led one highly regarded psychologist to remark that this dysgenic trend "cannot be tolerated for long by a democracy." He asks:

Have we adopted social policies that encourage reproduction among those least able to provide for the intellectual development of their children? Obtaining an answer to this question should have the highest priority.<sup>13</sup>

Thus, eugenics is becoming a more respectable subject in academic circles. We should not be surprised at this trend or underestimate its potential for growth in the years ahead. The chapters that follow show that American eugenics grew out of an international movement of great strength. The leaders of eugenics in America were generally leaders in various fields of endeavor, especially academia, social work, public health, philanthropy, business, and politics. The movement has exhibited extraordinary resiliency. If the

---

<sup>12</sup> Daniel R. Vining, "On the Possibility of the Reemergence of a Dysgenic Trend with Respect to Intelligence in American Fertility Differentials," *Intelligence* 6 (1982) pp. 241-264; Marian Van Court and Frank D. Bean, "Intelligence and Fertility in the United States: 1912-1982," *Intelligence* 9 (1985) pp. 23-32. Van Court and Bean were both at the University of Texas at Austin, Vining was at the Population Studies Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

<sup>13</sup> Lloyd Humphreys, "Intelligence and Public Policy," paper presented at the symposium on "Intelligence, Measurement, Theory and Public Policy," held at the University of Illinois, 30 April - 2 May 1985. The conference was held in professor Humphreys' honor and his was the final presentation. The conference papers are scheduled to be published by the University of Illinois Press.

history of the movement is any guide we can expect the resurgence of eugenics advocacy to spread as the social and political environment becomes more hospitable.

#### Definition and Historiography

Eugenics was defined in the late 19th century as the movement to improve the inborn qualities of the human species both physically and mentally by manipulating the mechanisms of social control in such a way as to encourage the breeding of genetically superior individuals and discourage the breeding of genetically inferior individuals.<sup>14</sup> More recently, eugenics has been defined as a social movement encompassing "all efforts whose goal is the modification of natural selection (the guiding force of evolution) to bring about change in a particular direction within human populations or the human species as a whole."<sup>15</sup>

The movement is now just over one hundred years old.<sup>16</sup> During the course of its evolution it has been redefined

---

<sup>14</sup> Francis Galton, Inquiries into Human Faculty and its development (London 1907; originally published in 1883) p. 17. Daniel Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity (New York 1985) pp. 3-20.

<sup>15</sup> Carl J. Bajema (Ed.), Eugenics Then and Now (Stroudsburg 1976) p.2. Bajema goes on to define the purpose of eugenics as a science and as a social movement. As a science, the purpose of eugenics is to ascertain the direction of genetic change in a population. As a social movement, the purpose of eugenics is to modify in a eugenic direction the way in which natural selection is operating (p. 3).

<sup>16</sup> Eugenic organizations in the United States today include the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics in New York and the Mankind Quarterly, an international quarterly specializing in

numerous times by its advocates. Generally, there has been agreement that there are two main directions of eugenic policy. Efforts to raise the general level of genetic fitness of the human species fall within the category of "positive eugenics." Efforts to eliminate specific negative aspects of human character and physique fall within the category of "negative eugenics."

Eugenics advocates have variously stressed the positive or negative side of eugenics, depending upon the context of the eugenics movement of the moment. Thus, Francis Galton, in the last quarter of the 19th century stressed positive eugenics. In the first quarter of the 20th century, Charles Davenport, Galton's American disciple, emphasized negative eugenics. For a decade after the Holocaust, eugenics advocates, in the face of world-wide opprobrium, avoided mention of negative eugenics programs.<sup>17</sup> More subtle changes in focus, not only with regard to positive and negative eugenics but more broadly with regard to the scope of eugenics have occurred over the century of the movement's history. Furthermore, in any period of the movement's history, the various promoters of eugenics have held a range of views regarding the aims and methods of the movement, so

---

eugenics. The Pioneer Fund, created in 1937 by Frederick Osborn and Harry Laughlin is still actively supporting eugenic studies. Professor William Shockley runs the Foundation for Research and Education on Eugenics and Dysgenics (FREED).

<sup>17</sup> During this period eugenics was also narrowly defined as medical genetics and genetic counselling.



that a "center of gravity" for the movement is not always easy to identify.

Mark Haller published in 1963 the first monograph on the history of the eugenics movement in America. He divided the history of eugenics into three stages: from about 1870 to 1905, during the first period, eugenic ideas flourished among the directors of institutions for the insane, feeble-minded, paupers, and criminals. In this initial period eugenics advocates were essentially part of the liberal movement in America. During the second phase, between 1905 and about 1930, the eugenics movement reached its height of influence, when, according to Haller, a conservative bias and a racist tone marked its polemics. The period after 1930 was marked by rapid decline in the movement. According to Haller, advances in genetics, anthropology, psychology, and psychiatry undermined the scientific foundation of the movement. "At the same time, Hitler in Germany demonstrated the uses that might be made of some of the eugenics doctrines." These developments stripped eugenics of its scientific trappings and exposed it as a movement motivated by nativism and based on a reactionary social philosophy. Nevertheless, the movement did not die out. Over the next three decades, according to Haller, a group of "thoughtful students of human heredity"

gradually worked out a "cautious, sober, and scientific eugenics."<sup>18</sup>

In 1972 Kenneth Ludmerer published the second major monograph on American eugenics. He accepted the division of eugenics outlined by Haller and began his study with the period 1905 to 1930. For Ludmerer, too, eugenics was both a science as well as a "sanctuary for bigots and racists."<sup>19</sup> Ludmerer claimed that eugenicists' "misuse" of the science of genetics "became so blatant" in the period 1920 to 1930 that "many prominent geneticists" felt obliged to denounce the movement publicly. Furthermore, the misuse of genetics by leading eugenicists inhibited research in the area of human genetics. As eugenics fell into disrepute, so too did the field of human genetics.<sup>20</sup>

Ludmerer believed that it was important to determine whether particular individuals were "racists". It was therefore essential to define "scientific racism." A "scientific racist," according to Ludmerer, was a person who believed scientific evidence supported the myth of "Aryan" or "Nordic" superiority. The scientific racist was blinded by a strong emotional stake in the outcome of studies of

---

<sup>18</sup> Mark Haller, Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought (New Jersey 1963) pp. 3-7.

<sup>19</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 2.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. p.3.

racial differences.<sup>21</sup> Ludmerer concluded that many of the early eugenicists were racists, but he pointed out that they lived in a period when determinist hereditarian interpretations of human nature were ubiquitous. He concluded that they should not be judged by today's standards.

Ludmerer's definition of scientific racism was abitrarily narrow. Scientific racism can be more broadly defined as the belief that the human species can be divided into superior and inferior genetic groups and that these groups can be satisfactorily identified so that social policies can be advanced to encourage the breeding of the superior groups and discourage the breeding of the inferior groups.

The question of whether the early eugenicists were racist and how to judge them was pursued by Carl J. Bajema in Eugenics: Then and Now (1976). Bajema denied that eugenics included racist policies such as those of the Nazis. The attribution of racism to eugenics was the result of "confusion" which "still exists" over the precise meaning of eugenics. Citing Francis Galton, Bajema stated that any eugenic policy had to fulfill two criteria. It had to be humane and lead to the genetic improvement of the human species. By this standard, Bajema concluded, the Nazi sterilization and breeding programs were not eugenic since

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. p. 5.

they were not humane and did not, in fact, do anything to improve human genetic development.<sup>22</sup>

By Bajema's criteria there was no eugenics movement at all before 1935 since all eugenics prior to that date - including Galton's eugenics - failed Galton's criteria. Certainly, the American movement to sterilize degenerates and inhibit the flow of European immigrants does not meet Bajema's interpretation of Galton. Furthermore, Bajema's reading of Galton is difficult to accept. Galton very clearly believed that non-white races were inferior to the white race and that the goal of eugenics was to give the "more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had." Galton went on to claim that there existed a "sentiment, for the most part quite unreasonable, against the gradual extinction of an inferior race." Galton also stated the belief that the Jews were "specialized for a parasitical existence." Thus, whether Galton should be excused from those implicated in the Nazi atrocities seems at least worth considering.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Carl Jay Bajema, (ed.) Eugenics Then and Now (Stroudsburg 1976) pp. 5-6.

<sup>23</sup> Galton, Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development (London: Dent. (original work published 1883) p. 17; Jerry Hirsch, "Behavior-genetic analysis and its biosocial consequences." In N.J. Block & G. Dworkin (Eds.), The IQ Controversy (New York 1976). Originally published in Seminars in Psychiatry, 1970, 2, 89-105.

While a general belief in inferior and superior genetic strains was an essential ingredient in the early eugenics movement, there was a clear difference between those who accepted theories of Aryan superiority and those who did not. Sheila Faith Weiss, in an article on German eugenics, identifies "nonracist eugenicists within the German movement." She notes, however, that "it goes without saying that all eugenicists, insofar as they accepted the racial and cultural superiority of Caucasians as a matter of course, were 'racist' by today's standards."<sup>24</sup> Barbara Ross, editor of the Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences agrees with Weiss. She claims it is historically incorrect to use "today's enlightened view" to label an earlier generation of eugenic leaders racists.<sup>25</sup>

The opposite view is taken by historian Gisela Bock, who believes that eugenics was an "essential core of National Socialist racism." She also contends that

---

<sup>24</sup> Sheila Faith Weiss, "Wilhelm Schallmayer and the Logic of German Eugenics," ISIS 77 (1986) p. 34.

<sup>25</sup> Barbara Ross, "Scholars, Status, and Social Context," Contemporary Psychology 30 (1985) p. 857. See the response, "Eugenics has a long racist history," by Jerry Hirsch and Barry Mehler in volume 31 #8 (August 1986) p. 633. Neither should we judge those who burned the witches at Salem by "today's enlightened view," but it is appropriate to apply feminist theory and analysis to the history. The question is not how to judge the eugenicists, but how shall we understand them? As we look back on the eugenics of the thirties we can hardly fail to notice the racism inherent in their ideology. Our task is to understand the dynamics of this racism and its consequences, not to excuse it with platitudes about the ubiquity of "hereditarian notions."

"eugenics was a form of racism." This, in fact, is one of the main themes in her book, Zwangssterilisation im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik (1986), and she explores this theme both historically and theoretically. Bock contends that the very theory of inferiority is essentially a form of scientific racism. In this regard British, Scandinavian, American, and English eugenicists were essentially the same. Conditions in the Nazi state simply allowed the Nazis to "do a better job" than their American and European counterparts.<sup>26</sup>

In 1985 Daniel Kevles published In the Name of Eugenics. Kevles' book is a comparative study of British and American eugenics from Francis Galton to the present. Kevles does not believe that Anglo-American eugenics was much influenced by the European eugenics movement. While he acknowledges there was some interaction, he claims there are no real signs of any European eugenics movement influencing Anglo-American eugenics. He also supports Ludmerer's claim that the success of American eugenics in the field of

---

<sup>26</sup> The quotes are taken from personal correspondence between Gisela Bock and the author. For a thorough exploration of Bock's views see Zwangssterilisation im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik (Opladen 1986). See also her article, "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany: Motherhood, Compulsory Sterilization, and the State," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 8 (1983) #31, pp. 400-421; slightly revised and republished in When Biology Became Destiny: Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany edited by Renate Bridenthal, et. al. (New York 1984) pp. 271-296.

legislation and its subsequent opprobrium inhibited the development of human genetics in America.<sup>27</sup>

The present study touches on many of these issues. This study focuses on the historical development of eugenics in the United States between 1921 and 1940. It examines the collective views of the leadership of the AES and compares these views with those of European eugenicists. It examines the question of interaction between American and European eugenicists and explores the issue of scientific racism and the interrelations of American and Nazi eugenics.

Particularly for the years between 1920 and 1940, historians have placed too much emphasis on change in the eugenics movement and not enough on continuity. There are many reasons for this historical orientation. From the mid-thirties to the early forties the American eugenicists themselves continuously wrote and spoke of a new American eugenics. Bitter conflicts emerged particularly between Charles Davenport, the acknowledged leader of American eugenics, and some other eugenic leaders. Ultimately, Davenport retired from leadership of the movement in the mid-thirties.

Furthermore, the eugenics movement peaked in the period from 1915 to 1930. This was a period of extraordinary activity and growth. With the onset of the depression and

---

<sup>27</sup> Daniel Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity (New York 1985).

troubles in Europe, attention naturally turned away from eugenics. The period between 1930 and 1940 was one of struggle for the eugenics movement. During this period many eugenic institutions declined in membership or disappeared completely. Writers on the history of eugenics in this period have tended to attribute this decline to internal factors. The old eugenics was dying because it was out of touch with changing social conditions. Some older eugenicists were dying and retiring, but they were being replaced by younger recruits in a natural process of change and development. Nevertheless, the turnover in leadership, at least for the period 1930 to 1940, was not dramatic.

Historians have also generally approached the history of eugenics from a Whiggish perspective which sees science moving away from prejudice and naiveté.<sup>28</sup> The history of eugenics has generally been portrayed as moving from a period of great ignorance about human genetics to a period of enlightenment regarding the complexity of human genetics, particularly with regard to intelligence and character traits.<sup>29</sup> There also developed in the thirties a greater

---

<sup>28</sup> The Whig perspective sees history as the continuing and inevitable victory of progress over reaction. See Herbert Butterfield, The Whig Interpretation of History (New York 1951).

<sup>29</sup> There are numerous examples of this trend. It is most apparent in Kenneth Ludmerer's Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) and Bentley Glass, "Geneticists Embattled: Their Stand Against Rampant Eugenics and Racism in America During the 1920s and 1930s," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 130 #1 (1986) pp. 130-154. See also "Eugenics: Must It be a



self-consciousness regarding the prejudices of the earlier period. According to most accounts, American eugenics by 1930 had abandoned much of its early ideology.<sup>30</sup>

Influenced by this Whiggish orientation, many commentators appear to believe that eugenics is fundamentally a legitimate endeavor, and to express the view that the movement as a whole ought not to be condemned because of the excesses of some its early advocates. These commentators have taken pains to distinguish the honest scientists and the legitimate concerns of eugenics from the extremists and their unacceptable ideas. The desire to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate eugenics has led to a focus on old and new eugenics.<sup>31</sup>

---

Dirty Word?" by James F. Crow in Contemporary Psychology, 33 #1 (1988) pp. 10-12. Crow criticizes Kevles, Haller, and Ludmerer for emphasizing the negative side of eugenics. He writes that "we should not lose sight of its (eugenics) more lofty aims." Quoting Curt Stern, he writes that eugenics has a "sound core." Crow is professor emeritus in the Genetics Department at the University of Wisconsin and a member of the National Academy of Sciences.

<sup>30</sup> This is not to deny that significant advances in genetics occurred during this period. I believe these advances had less effect on the social and political goals of the movement than has been generally portrayed by historians.

<sup>31</sup> Haller, for example, writes, "Eugenists grasped an important fact that a person's heredity is a major factor in his success and development.... Unfortunately, the early eugenists oversimplified the problems of human genetics... and the excesses of the early movement brought eugenics into disrepute.... Today... a cautious, sober, and scientific eugenics is once more struggling for attention." Haller, Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought (New Jersey 1963) p. 3-6.

The eugenics movement did undergo changes in the 1930s. The eugenics movement was developed in American society along with other social movements. Eugenic leaders defined eugenics in relation to birth control, population control, the public health movement, as well as emerging academic disciplines such as demography, medical genetics, social biology, and social psychology. Eugenic leaders interacted with social reformers of all stripes and worked very hard to define a place for eugenics within their various areas.

This study stresses the fundamental continuity and coherence in the history of eugenics as a corrective to an oversimplified division of the movement into "old" and "new".<sup>32</sup> This is not to deny historical development. Significant evolution did take place in the American eugenics movement, but that evolution was not from a "bad" eugenics to a "good" eugenics nor was the eugenics of the 1930s a repudiation of the older eugenics. The evolution was continuous and while one old timer such as Davenport might lose favor, others such as Harry Laughlin and Henry P. Fairchild remained leaders throughout the thirties. Still others, such as Paul Popenoe remained in leadership positions well into the post-war period. Thus, in some

---

<sup>32</sup> In my own work I have used the term "new eugenics" to refer to the resurgence of eugenics advocacy in the past three decades, i.e. since 1960. Even in this case my work has stressed the historical consistency of the movement. See, Mehler, "The New Eugenics: Academic Racism in America Today," Science for the People 15 #3 (May/June 1983) pp. 18-23.

important respects the outline of the history of American eugenics has yet to be clarified.

## Part II: The Organization of the Dissertation.

Chapter Two of this dissertation begins with the organization of the American Eugenics Society as an ad interim committee of the Second International Congress of Eugenics held in New York in 1921. The committee's original purpose was to help organize central eugenic organizations among the member nations of the International Congress.

The first half of Chapter Two is devoted to the Second International Congress of Eugenics. The international aspect of eugenics has generally been overlooked in studies of American eugenics. If eugenics had been confined to England and the United States it would hardly have been able to generate the enthusiasm it did. We have yet to show clearly the ways in which eugenic ideas travelled from one country to another. We need to know more about the development of national eugenic movements. Eugenics was an international movement and we know very little of the international dimensions of the movement.

Virtually all writers to date have rejected the notion that the Anglo-American eugenics movement was influenced by other national eugenic movements. I present two carefully documented cases in which AES policy clearly derived from Norway and Sweden. Much more work needs to be done to

clarify the origins of particular eugenic ideas and trace their movement from one country to another.

The fact that eugenics was an international movement by 1921 was clearly a source of great pride among the leadership. It helped to confirm their belief that eugenics was destined to spread throughout the world and rival Christianity as a secular religion. There was a lively exchange of ideas at the international gatherings as well as a constant exchange of news. Leaders from various countries traveled internationally to survey the progress being made in different parts of the world.

American eugenics cannot be fully understood in isolation. The American Eugenics Society was created by a motion from the Norwegian Eugenics Commission and was strongly influenced by its leader Jon Alfred Mjoen. In later years what became known as the "eugenic hypothesis" which was the core of the so-called "new" or "reform" eugenics was developed by Frederick Osborn from ideas derived from Swedish eugenics programs.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Osborn, Preface to Eugenics (New York 1940) p. 200. Osborn cites Alva Myrdal, "A Program for Family Security in Sweden," International Labour Review 39 #6 (June 1939) 723-763. The relationship is quite direct. In the Eugenical News 24 #1 (March 1939) Osborn published a synopsis of the "eugenic hypothesis" entitled, "The American Concept of Eugenics." Facing Osborn's new definition of eugenics was an article by Alva Myrdal, "The Swedish Approach to Population Policies: Balancing Quantitative and Qualitative Population Philosophies in a Democracy," pp. 3-7. Myrdal's article was followed by "Birth Limitation in Switzerland," a report on the Swiss sterilization law by Marie Kopp, pp. 7-8. Osborn himself

The second half of Chapter Two focuses on the Eugenics Committee (later to become the AES) and its relationship to other eugenic organizations both in the U.S. and abroad. Eugenics was well organized in the United States by 1921. The Eugenics Record Office (ERO), established in 1910, was the largest and best funded of the American eugenic organizations. It functioned as a training and research center as well as a clearing house for information which was published in the Eugenical News. In 1906 John Harvey Kellogg established the Race Betterment Foundation which ran conferences on eugenics and acted as Michigan's largest eugenics organization. The Eugenics Research Association (ERA), founded in 1913, was established to promote the exchange of information among eugenic researchers and field workers. It was meant to be a professional organization of scientific workers in the field of eugenics. The Galton Society was established by Madison Grant, Charles Davenport, and Henry Fairfield Osborn in 1918 ostensibly to be an anthropological society to counter the influence of Franz Boas. It actually became an elite fellowship society whose members were carefully chosen from among the inner core of the East Coast eugenic establishment. There were numerous other smaller eugenics organizations throughout the United States. Thus, the establishment of the committee was actually the culmination of numerous organizing efforts on behalf of eugenics.

---

referred to the Swiss program as the source of his belief in the validity of the "eugenic hypothesis".

From the start the committee acted as a central eugenic agency to coordinate activity in the United States. The idea of the committee was to work in close association with all related organizations including related professional and scientific associations. The committee leaders believed eugenics encompassed virtually all societal concerns including religious orientation, political philosophy, administration of justice, health care and insurance, education, foreign policy, immigration, labor, and scientific endeavors directly related to eugenics. The committee endeavored, through the selection of the advisory council, to secure a broad representative sample of leaders in all these areas.

The committee worked most closely with the Eugenics Record Office, Eugenics Research Association, and the Galton Society. These three organizations, closely tied to the American Museum of Natural History in New York, shared interlocking boards, the publication the Eugenical News, and regular meetings. Thus, coordination among these organizations was extremely close. Slightly more peripheral, but still closely affiliated, were such organizations as the American Genetics Association, the Life Extension Institute, and the Race Betterment Foundation.

From the beginning the committee was well connected to national and international scientific and professional organizations, government agencies, foundations, and

educational institutions. While the AES was not actually incorporated until January 1926, the goals and orientation of the society were all established during the committee years.

Quite clearly these goals represented a sweeping vision for the complete transformation of American society along eugenic lines. These goals were carried forward from the Second International Congress and closely resemble in spirit and form the policies articulated at the Congress meetings. Eugenics was seen as a new religion or secular ethic which, it was hoped, would pervade all aspects of American society. Teachers, clergymen, politicians, lawyers, and scientists would all pursue their endeavors with the goal of promoting a "eugenic society."

Chapter Three carries this story forward from the incorporation of the AES in January 1926 through 1940. The focus in this chapter remains the organizational structure and general ideological development of the society. It details the phenomenal growth of the society and examines the range of activities of the numerous committees established during this period. The society was sponsoring sermon contests and exhibits at state fairs, publishing eugenic pamphlets, and lobbying for eugenic legislation.

Chapter Three also discusses ideological changes which were occurring within the society. This section focuses on three men, Henry P. Fairchild (1880-1956), Henry F. Perkins

(1877-??), and Frederick Osborn (1889-1981),<sup>34</sup> all of whom played important roles in the development of the society. Fairchild was elected president of the society in 1929.<sup>35</sup> Perkins was elected president to serve from 1931 to 1934. While Frederick Osborn was not elected president of the society until 1946, he rose to a leadership position in the society between 1934 and 1940. This section looks closely at changes in theory and policy during the period between 1926 and 1940 and concludes that, while changes in theory did take place, policy remained remarkably consistent.

Most historians who have written about Frederick Osborn have accepted the notion that he paved the way for the transformation of American eugenics into "social biology." Osborn has been depicted in the literature as the man who came into the eugenics movement in the early thirties and slowly retired the extremists from the American Eugenics Society and articulated a "new eugenic" ideology.<sup>36</sup> I have given extensive space to examining this claim and Osborn's views both in the early thirties and later, when they developed into his "eugenic hypothesis," discussed in Chapter Seven.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ellsworth Huntington was also a key figure in these years and his contribution is discussed in Chapter Six.

<sup>35</sup> Fairchild served as president from 1929 to 1930.

<sup>36</sup> Most fully developed in his 1940 monograph, Preface to Eugenics (New York 1940).



The fourth chapter of the dissertation is unique in eugenics literature. Virtually all studies of American eugenics discuss the same group of perhaps two dozen eugenic leaders. One typically finds chapters or large sections on Francis Galton, Karl Pearson, Charles Davenport, Henry Fairfield Osborn, and Harry Laughlin. A coterie of other names generally appears but one finds throughout the literature virtually the same individuals being discussed. For example, in all of the literature one does not find a single reference to August Vollmer, the criminologist who introduced IQ testing for recruitment of police. Vollmer was an active member of the Eugenics Society and helped organize police departments the world over. His contribution to eugenics has gone completely unrecognized. In their critiques of Kevles in Isis, Robert Olby and Richard Lewontin called for us to go beyond the "handful" of individual biographies "to search for common features predisposing individuals to eugenic commitments." Chapter Four is still just a beginning, but I am convinced that nothing less than a full scale database of the several hundred leading eugenic activists in the the United States will convey the true dimensions of the eugenics movement. To date, far too much attention has been paid to the biologist and far too little to the clergymen, sociologists, and lay persons.

Standard biographies made little mention of individuals' activities within the eugenics movement. Quite

often even extended monographs and articles which should have touched on the eugenics aspects of a person's career made no mention of those aspects or consciously minimized them. For example, in an article on the noted anthropologist Clark Wissler, in which Ruth and Stanley Freed specifically seek an explanation of the "strained relations" between Wissler and Franz Boas, the authors completely ignore Wissler's advocacy of eugenics.<sup>37</sup> Similarly, William Provine minimizes the role of Sewall Wright in the American Eugenics Society by claiming that Wright was a member in name only and profoundly disagreed with the conclusions of the society leadership. No doubt Sewall Wright was less active in the society than many others but he allowed his name to be used for over a decade in publication after publication.<sup>38</sup>

Bentley Glass, in a recent article, "Geneticists Embattled," comments on the "sorry history" of eugenics and the curious interest historians of genetics have shown in the "peripheral development of eugenic policies and programs during the first four decades" of the century. His article makes it appear that the tendency has been to over-emphasize

---

<sup>37</sup> George Stocking's biography of Wissler likewise minimizes the place of eugenics ideology in Wissler's career. See Dictionary of American Biography pp. 906-909.

<sup>38</sup> Stanley and Ruth Freed, "Clark Wissler and the Development of Anthropology in the United States," American Anthropologist 85 (1983) pp. 800-825; William Provine, Sewall Wright and Evolutionary Biology (Chicago 1986).

the enthusiasm geneticists showed for eugenics. Glass believes there were many reasons why geneticists didn't speak out against eugenics but that generally they disapproved of the movement. However, this study shows that the number of biologists and geneticists who belonged to the advisory council increased from 1923 to 1935.<sup>39</sup>

In no area has the tendency to minimize the role of eugenics been more pronounced than in the history of psychology. The standard histories of psychology such as E.G. Boring's A History of Experimental Psychology and Robert Thomson's The Pelican History of Psychology have little to say about the race theories and eugenics advocacy of the leading psychologists. Most recently Mark Snyderman and Richard Herrnstein have gone the farthest toward blatant apologetics. Fortunately, the well-balanced work of Franz Samelson stands as a counter to this tendency.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Bentley Glass, "Geneticists Embattled: Their Stand Against Rampant Eugenics and Racism in America During the 1920s and 1930s," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 130 #1 (1986) pp. 130-154. We still need to understand in greater detail why some biologists and geneticists supported eugenics while others opposed it. Obviously, there were competent professionals on both sides of the issue.

<sup>40</sup> E.G. Boring, A History of Experimental Psychology (New York 1950); Robert Thomson's The Pelican History of Psychology (Harmondsworth 1968); Mark Snyderman and Richard J. Herrnstein, "Intelligence Tests and the Immigration Act of 1924," American Psychologist 38 (September 1983) pp. 986-994. Franz Samelson, "Putting Psychology on the Map: Ideology and Intelligence Testing," in Psychology in Social Context edited by Allan Buss (New York 1979) pp. 103-159.

If my analysis of the society's leadership shows anything clearly, it is that the leadership was a social and political elite. To my knowledge there were no workers' organizations advocating eugenics, and poor people in general are not to be found in the membership of the eugenics societies. Many of the elite of the American Eugenics Society came from old American stock. Some were socialist while others were conservatives. The eugenics movement was not monolithic. It was held together by a fear of degeneracy and a dream of a better world. All eugenicists considered themselves "progressive" in the sense that eugenics was a great social-scientific movement to improve the human species.

Clearly, the eugenics movement contained many individuals who did not share common political, social, religious, or scientific orientations. A common belief in eugenics was able to bring anti-Semites together with learned rabbis; socialists, communists, and liberals together with reactionaries and fascists. Regardless of the political philosophy of the exponents, however, eugenics was always the tool of an elite.

Chapter Five examines the issue of immigration restriction. There is an abundance of literature on this issue, but virtually all examinations of eugenics in relation to American immigration policy focus on the Immigration Act of 1924. I have closely examined the role

of the AES in the passage of the 1924 law, but I have also carried forward the study to examine the position of the society between 1924 and 1939.

The passage of the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act in 1924 was a great victory for the society, one which was not to be repeated in the ensuing years. Nevertheless, the society continued to campaign vigorously for the extension of immigration restriction to the Americas. The society was particularly interested in restricting the immigration of Mexicans, Latins, and blacks across the U.S.'s southern borders. The campaign against Mexican immigration parallels in every way the campaign against eastern and southern Europeans.

Chapter Six on sterilization shows that the American eugenics society saw the dysgenic elements of our population as less than full human beings. They were seen as a disease to be eliminated from society. The American programs espoused by Frederick Osborn and other "new eugenicists" differed very little from earlier eugenics programs. The social and political milieu changed drastically as the Nazis began their rise to power but, Osborn and the other leaders of the AES praised the Nazi programs throughout the thirties. The combination of Nazi fascism and eugenics was particularly deadly. The situation in America was clearly not as bad as Nazi Germany, but this should not obscure the

fact that there was a good deal of ideological affinity between the two movements.

Chapter Seven examines the final pre-war years of the society, looking closely at the development of the "eugenic hypothesis" and summing up the theme of the study: while changes were occurring within American eugenics between 1920 and 1940, much of the older ideology survived these transitional years. What emerged between 1938 and 1940 was a more sophisticated version of the earlier ideology with most of the essentials intact. The society was still focusing on the need for the creation of a eugenic society; warning of the dangers of the dysgenic trend in births; and calling for sterilization, immigration restriction, and social controls over the feeble-minded.

This dissertation stresses the continuity of eugenics over time and the international scope of the movement. Changes did occur in America eugenics in the thirties. There were national and even regional differences in eugenics. We have yet to explore the differences between the eugenics movement in the Northern industrial centers as opposed to the movement in the South and West. But, much work has already been done on the differences between eugenics in the various countries of Europe. Nevertheless, there was a core of values which held the eugenics movement together both geographically and temporally. The elements of that continuity has thus far been overlooked.

## Chapter Two

### The Origins of the American Eugenics Society

#### Part I: The Second International Congress of Eugenics

The American Eugenics Society was initially organized as the Eugenics Committee of the United States by the Executive Committee of the Second International Congress of Eugenics. The energy, momentum, and emotional tone of the Congress were instrumental in the creation of the Society, and the Society's original orientation and program reflected the concerns expressed by leaders of the conference. This chapter will examine the Congress and the Committee that emerged from it.

Most work in the field of eugenics has concentrated on the Anglo-American movement. There is no major study of eugenics from an international perspective. It has even been claimed that eugenics was "peculiar to England and the United States."<sup>1</sup> Over the past decade a number of articles have been printed on eugenics in France, Norway, Japan, Russian, Italy, Latin America, and Canada.<sup>2</sup> Work on the

<sup>1</sup> Horace F. Judson, "Gene Genie" in The New Republic (August 1985) p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> On Russian eugenics see, Phillip Boys, "Detente, Genetics and Social Theory," Radical Science Journal no. 8 (1978) pp. 61-89; Loren Graham, "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s," American Historical Review 82 (1977) pp. 1133-1164; see also by Graham, "The Return of Genetics: A New Revolution in Soviet Science," The Washington Post (7 October 1985)

German eugenics movement is moving forward very rapidly and a volume of essays on eugenics in various countries is being prepared. Still the question remains as to whether the inspiration for eugenics was uniquely Anglo-American or whether significant interactions took place. While this question cannot be answered in full until more work has been done on the international aspect of eugenics, the AES was clearly influenced by the international movement out of which it literally grew.

That American leaders were keenly interested in the world-wide growth of the eugenics movement is clear from an examination of the Eugenical News which is filled with coverage from around the world. Interest is not the same as influence, however, and the case has not yet been made for the interaction and interdependence of American eugenics with the international movement. This chapter details the initial organization and early ideological development of the Eugenics Committee (later to become the AES) in relation

---

pp. 23-24. On French eugenics see William Schneider, "Toward the Improvement of the Human Race: The History of Eugenics in France," Journal of Modern History 54 (June 1982) pp. 268-291. On Italian eugenics see Claudio Pogliano, "Scienza e stirpe: Eugenia in Italia (1912-1939) Passato e Presente 5 (1984) pp. 61-79. On Canadian eugenics see Angus McLaren, "The Creation of a Haven for 'Human Thoroughbreds': The Sterilization of the Feeble-Minded and the Mentally Ill in British Columbia," Canadian Historical Review 67 #2 (1986) pp. 127-150. McLaren is writing a book on Canadian eugenics. On Norway see Nils Roll-Hansen, "Eugenics Before World War II: The Case of Norway," History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 2 (1981) pp. 269-81. On Japanese eugenics see Zenji Suzuki, "Genetics and the Eugenics Movement in Japan," Japanese Studies in the History of Science No. 14 (1975) pp. 157-164.



to the international eugenics movement. It focuses on two men, Georges Vacher de Lapouge (1854-1936) and Jon Alfred Mjoen (1860-1939). Mjoen actually introduced the resolution which called for the formation of the Eugenics Committee and Lapouge, more than any other speaker at the conference, articulated the emotional tone of the Society's founders.

In the fall of 1921, the American Museum of Natural History hosted the Second International Congress of Eugenics. It was an impressive affair attended by over 300 delegates from around the world. Notables at the conference included future President Herbert Hoover; internationally renowned scientist Alexander Graham Bell (honorary President of the Congress); nationally known conservationist and future Governor of Pennsylvania, Gifford Pinchot; and Leonard Darwin, son of Charles Darwin.<sup>3</sup> Henry Fairfield

---

<sup>3</sup> For a full report on the Congress see, Eugenical News 6 #11-12 pp. 65-67. The Minutes of the Executive Session of the Second International Congress of Eugenics are Part of the AES Papers, American Philosophical Society Library, Philadelphia PA. See also Allan Chase, The Legacy Of Malthus (New York 1980) p. 277.

The First International Congress of Eugenics had been held in London from 24-30 July 1912. It was organized by the Eugenics Education Society of Great Britain (precursor of the English Eugenics Society) and directed by Leonard Darwin. The meetings were held at the University of London. Vice presidents of the Congress included Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty; Charles Davenport, director of the Eugenics Record Office and secretary of the American Breeders' Association; Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president-emeritus of Harvard University; Dr. David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University; and Gifford Pinchot.

The American Consultative Committee appointed at the First International Conference took responsibility for

Osborn, Director of the Museum and noted paleontologist was President of the Congress. Madison Grant, New York lawyer, trustee at the Museum and author of the best selling The Passing of the Great Race (New York 1916) was Treasurer.<sup>4</sup> Harry Laughlin, Superintendent of the Eugenics Record Office, was in charge of exhibits, and Lothrop Stoddard, popular writer and author of the Rising Tide of Color Against White Supremacy (New York 1920), was in charge of publicity.

A truly international affair, the Congress included representatives from France, England, Italy, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Japan, Mexico, Cuba, Venezuela, India, Australia, New Zealand, San Salvador, Siam, and Uruguay. The Germans and the Russians were not invited. They were ostracized from many

---

organizing the Second Conference. The Committee consisted of Davenport, A.G. Bell, W. Castle, C.R. Henderson, A. Meyer, F.A. Woods, A. Hrdlicka and V.L. Kellogg. Davenport was the guiding spirit. He helped persuade Bell, whose world-wide fame would help lend prestige to the conference, to be the honorary president and H.F. Osborn to be the president. The Congress was originally scheduled for 1915 but was postponed because of the War. Mark Haller, Eugenics (New Jersey 1963) p. 74.

See Frederick Osborn, "History of American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (1974) pp. 115-126; Chase, Legacy of Malthus (New York 1980) p. 19. See also Problems in Eugenics. Papers Communicated at the First International Eugenics Congress (London 1912).

<sup>4</sup> The Passing of the Great Race passed through four separate editions between 1916 and 1921. It went through numerous printings and was translated into German, French, and Norwegian. See Laughlin Papers "Notes on Madison Grant" in Laughlin/Grant file. Laughlin Papers, Northeast Missouri State University, Kirksville, MO.

international conferences after the war and this ostracism extended to eugenics despite fairly cordial relations between the American, German, and Russian eugenicists.<sup>5</sup> The existence of large and active eugenics organizations in so many countries belies the claim so often made that eugenics was essentially a movement of America and Protestant Europe.<sup>6</sup>

Between 22 and 28 September one hundred eight papers were presented on topics ranging from plant and animal genetics to anthropology, political science, and "scientific" polemics against race mixing. The scientific papers were presented by the world's leading authorities. H.S. Jennings spoke on "Inheritance in Unicellular

---

<sup>5</sup> Loren Graham, "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s," American Historical Review 82 (1977) p. 1148.

<sup>6</sup> See for example, Horace F. Judson, "Gene Genie" in The New Republic (August 1985) pp. 28-34. Judson writes, "eugenics... has been a movement in large part peculiar to England and the United States" (p. 30). There is no major work on the eugenics movement from an international perspective and over 90% of the scholarly work on eugenics has been done on America and England. There is no monograph on the German eugenics movement. This situation is changing. In the past few years a number of scholars have turned their attention to the German eugenics movement. See, for example, Paul Weindling, "Die Preussische Medizinalverwaltung und die 'Rassenhygiene'," Zeitschrift für Sozialreform 30 (1984) pp. 675-687; and also by Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics: The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics in Social Context," Annals of Science 42 (1985) pp. 303-318. I would also highly recommend, Benno Müller-Hill, Tödliche Wissenschaft: Die Aussonderung von Juden, Zigeunern und Geisteskranken 1933-1945, (Hamburg 1985). This spring Harvard University Press is scheduled to release Robert Proctor's study, Racial Hygiene: Medicine under the Nazi.

Organisms," Calvin Bridges on "Aberrations in Chromosomal Materials," and H.J. Muller on "Mutation." Other papers on genetics were read by Sewall Wright, Raymond Pearl, and C.C. Little - all recognized authorities in the burgeoning field of genetics. Abraham Meyerson and Aaron J. Rosanoff spoke on the inheritance of mental disorders while Karl E. Seashore and Hazel Stanton presented papers on the inheritance of musical ability.<sup>7</sup>

Reports were heard on the eugenics movement in France, England, Cuba, and Czechoslovakia as well as "Eugenics and Islam." Gopalji Ahuwallia, General Secretary of the Eugenics Society of India, presented a paper on "The Hindu Ideal of Marriage." Redcliffe Salaman spoke about the "Jewish Problem" while Dr. Frederick Hoffman lectured on "The Problem of Negro-White Intermixture and Inter-marriage." Other papers discussed eugenic problems in Italy, Norway, Hawaii, and the United States.<sup>8</sup>

The eugenicist had good reason to feel satisfied with the international growth of the movement. The International Federation of Eugenics Organizations could boast members on

---

<sup>7</sup> The papers were published in two volumes, Eugenics, Genetics and the Family and Eugenics in Race and State (Baltimore 1923).

<sup>8</sup> Eugenics in Race and State (Baltimore 1923). See also, Eugenical News 6 #11-12 (November-December 1921) pp. 65-67.

every continent except Africa.<sup>9</sup> The American eugenics movement was already the world's largest and best funded with support from the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the Rockefeller Foundation in New York, and Kellogg's Race Betterment Foundation in Battle Creek, Michigan. There were numerous independent eugenic organizations in cities throughout the country including New York, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Madison, and San Francisco. What the eugenics movement both in the U.S. and abroad lacked was coordination. Eugenics organizations duplicated efforts and sometimes even worked at odds with each other. Organization, communication, and coordination of activity were the major goals of the conference.<sup>10</sup>

The English Eugenics Education Society had over 1000 members by 1914 with branches in Birmingham, Liverpool, Southampton, Manchester, Haslemore, and Belfast.<sup>11</sup> The French Eugenics Society never had more than 100 members but according to William Schneider, historian of the French

---

<sup>9</sup> Eugenical News 6 #11-12 (November-December 1921) p. 67. Members of the International Eugenics Commission in 1921 included Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Columbia, Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela, the United States, Australia and New Zealand. South Africa had a eugenics movement but references to it do not appear in the Eugenical News until 1929-1930. I am not aware of any study of South African eugenics.

<sup>10</sup> Mark Haller, Eugenics (1963) p. 73.

<sup>11</sup> Donald Mackenzie, "Eugenics in Britain," Social Studies of Science 6 (1976) pp. 499-532; Haller, Eugenics, p. 20; Daniel Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics (Knopf 1985).

eugenics movement, "the prestige of the officers and active members" compensated for the lack of numbers. The small French Eugenics Society was able to influence government policy, publish eugenics tracts and periodicals, and gain international recognition. It also sent the largest foreign delegations to both the first and second international eugenics congresses.<sup>12</sup> In Sweden, a proposal to set up a "Nobel Institute of race biology" at the Karolinska Institute failed by one vote. The decision was close enough to be laid before the 'Riksdag' and was reported to be receiving 'zealous support' in the Swedish press. Brazil boasted two eugenics organizations, the Eugenics Society of Sao Paulo with 140 members and the smaller Eugenics Society of Amazonia. Together they were intensely active holding conferences and publishing eugenics tracts.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> William Schneider, "Toward the Improvement of the Human Race: The History of Eugenics in France," Journal of Modern History 54 (June 1982) pp. 268-291. For example, Pinard, president of the Eugenics Society, was one of the most respected obstetricians in France during the first decades of the twentieth century. See Dictionary of Scientific Biography 10 pp. 522-23. In addition to being a member of the Académie of Sciences, Pinard was a deputy to the French National Assembly from 1918 to 1928. Lucien March, treasurer of the FES and member of the Executive Committee of the Second International Congress, was the chief statistician of the French government. See Schneider, pp. 277-278.

<sup>13</sup> The Eugenical News contains many news items on developments in the international eugenics movement. See Eugenical News 6 #2 (February 1921) p. 13 and 6 #3 (March 1921) p. 18 for reports on the Swedish and Brazilian movements.

In Belgium, The Société Belge d'Eugénique was established in 1920 and was publishing a quarterly Revue d'Eugénique within a year.<sup>14</sup> In Russia two branches of the Russian Eugenics Society were established in Petrograd and Moscow in 1919. The Russian Eugenics Society was led by N.I. Vavilov.<sup>15</sup> A Eugenics Bureau was established under the auspices of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1922.<sup>16</sup> The Russian eugenicists published two journals, The Russian Eugenics Journal and the Bulletin of the Bureau of Eugenics. The Indian Eugenics Society was organized in Lahore in 1921. It had 120 members with a branch in Simla.<sup>17</sup> Although Japan's eugenics movement was not institutionalized until 1924 with the establishment of the Japanese Eugenics Society, the movement dated back to 1881 with the introduction of Galton's ideas into Japan by Yukichi Fukuzawa.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Eugenical News 6 #6 (June 1921) p. 43.

<sup>15</sup> Loren Graham, "Science and Values," p. 1146. Graham claims both organizations were created in 1921. But the Eugenical News carries a memorandum from N.I. Vavilov who was visiting the ERO. Vavilov claims the RES was established in 1919. Eugenical News 6 #11-12 (November-December 1921) pp. 72-73.

<sup>16</sup> Eugenical News 7 #2 (February 1922) p. 13.

<sup>17</sup> Eugenical News 7 #1 (January 1922) p. 2.

<sup>18</sup> H. Tukuba, and Z. Suzuki, "The Reaction of Yukichi Fukuzawa to Eugenics," Igakushi Kenkyu (Historical Study of Medicine) #24 (1967) pp. 1225-9. See also Zenji Suzuki, "Genetics and the Eugenics Movement in Japan," Japanese Studies in the History of Science #14 (1975) pp. 157-164; Eugenical News 9 #7 (July 1924) p. 64.

Speakers at the conference came from the world's most prestigious institutions of learning, medicine, and state. They represented the University of Nancy in France; the University of London and the Rothemsted Experimental Station in England; the University of Christiania and the Winderen Laboratorium in Norway; the University of Naples, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Princeton, Cornell, MIT, NYU, and Harvard University, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Wistar Institute, the Peabody Museum, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, the U.S. Veterans Administration, and the Registrar General of England.

The expansive growth of eugenics societies world wide led many eugenic advocates at the Congress to believe they were the patron saints of a new ethic. Like the prophets of a new religion their polemics were filled with Jeremiads against the prevailing social systems. Although eugenics might save the world from impending deterioration, the situation was critical and civilization was on the brink of disaster.

Harry Laughlin was in charge of the large selection of exhibits which filled three great halls of the museum. The exhibits included charts of intermarriage and miscegenation in New York and Hawaii and a statuette of "the average American male" as determined by the United States War Department by averaging the proportions of 100,000 white



soldiers at demobilization. There were also a series of composite portraits showing a typical 'horse-car conductor', a typical member of the Harvard faculty of 1887, etc. These composite pictures, by Henry Bowditch, a physician and one of America's most prominent genealogists, were made by putting together components of dozens of samples of various 'types.' Such exhibits reflected the widely held belief that physical form and mental character were correlated. This belief was held especially with respect to criminals. Many eugenists believed one could identify inferior individuals simply by their appearance. Thus, eugenics field workers attached to the Institute of Criminology in New York identified criminals with such phrases as "inferior looking Irishman," "ignorant looking negress" [sic], or "inferior looking Jewish boy."<sup>19</sup>

Another collection of pictures showed the brains of fifty criminals presented by the Massachusetts Department of Mental Diseases. There were also charts, pictures, and plaster busts showing the differences between Negro and

---

<sup>19</sup> B. Mehler, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers," The Mendel Newsletter: Archival Sources in the History of Genetics, (November 1978) p. 8. This theory has been resurrected by James Q. Wilson and Richard J. Herrnstein in Crime and Human Nature (New York 1985). They claim there is a criminal "type" - male, young, mesomorphic body type, and low intelligence. They even quote a 1939 study by Thornton which presents evidence for "facial correlates of crime." Thornton presented pictures of 20 criminals to 175 University of Nebraska students and asked them to identify the crime each had committed. They were able to "discriminate accurately at a level significantly better than chance."

white fetuses; a large map displaying the state laws regarding eugenical sterilization in the United States; pedigrees of musical ability, hairlip, epilepsy, alcoholism, syphilis, feeble-mindedness, insanity, sexual perversion, and nomadism; inheritance of iso-agglutinins in human blood; and the family pedigrees of the Tribe of Ishmael, the Jukes, and the Nams as well as a chart showing the "Approaching Extinction of the 'Mayflower' Descendants." At the end of the Congress some of these exhibits were moved to Washington, D.C., and remounted in the U.S. Capital Building where they stood for three months while lawmakers pondered the pros and cons of immigration restriction and social welfare legislation.<sup>20</sup>

A congress of this size and scope at the American Museum of Natural History naturally attracted the attention of the press and the academic community at large. The New York Times carried reports of the conference every day from 21 September to 29 September (except 22 September). Other newspapers including the Times of London and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried stories on the Congress. Henry Fairfield Osborn's opening speech was reprinted in Science. The Sunday New York Times (9/25) carried an extensive report

---

<sup>20</sup> For a complete description of the exhibits see Eugenical News 6 #11-12 (November-December 1921) p. 66. Chase claims the exhibit stood in Washington for three years. Mark Haller claims it was three months and cites "Report of H. H. Laughlin for the Year Ending August 31, 1922" in the Davenport-Laughlin correspondence of the Davenport Papers, APS, Philadelphia. Chase, Legacy of Malthus, p. 279; Haller, Eugenics, p. 151 and note 35 on page 235.

of his speech. The Scientific Monthly and other major newspapers also reported on the Congress.<sup>21</sup>

Osborn set the tone for the Conference in his opening address. He declared that "education and environment do not fundamentally alter racial values."<sup>22</sup> America, he argued, was "engaged in a serious struggle" to maintain her republican institutions which were threatened by immigrants who were "unfit to share the duties and responsibilities" of democracy. It was imperative for the state to "safeguard the character and integrity of the race or races on which its future depends." Just as science "has enlightened government in the prevention and spread of disease, it must also enlighten government in the prevention of the spread and multiplication of worthless members of society, the

---

<sup>21</sup> Science 53 (7 January 1921) pp. 16-17; Science 54 (7 October 1921), pp. 311-313; See also in the same issue the lengthy article by Leonard Darwin, "The Methods of Eugenics." Scientific Monthly 13 (21 August 1921) pp. 186-7; School and Society 13 (14 January 1921) pp. 75-6. NYT, 9/21, 8:2; 9/23, 8:2; 9/24, 10:8; 9/25, 16:1; 9/25 II, 1:8; Editorial, "Eugenics as Romance," 9/25 II, 2:5; 9/26, 32:3; 9/27, 20:2; 9/28, 11:1; Editorial, "Not Yet Ready for Despair," 9/29, 16:5. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 9/23/21, p. 4.; Times (London) 9/24/21 p. 7c.

<sup>22</sup> These views were repeated practically verbatim on the floor of the House during the debate over immigration restriction in 1924. Grant Hudson, Representative from Michigan said, "We are slowly awakening to the consciousness that education and environment do not fundamentally alter racial values." See Congressional Record (4/5/24) p. 5641. Quoted from Kenneth Ludmerer, "Genetics, Eugenics, and the Immigration Act of 1924," Bulletin of the History of Medicine 46 (1972) p.73.

spread of feeble-mindedness, of idiocy, and of all moral and intellectual as well as physical diseases."<sup>23</sup>

The New York Times carried two long articles on the Eugenics Conference in the Sunday edition of 25 September. It also carried an editorial praising the work of the conference. Prominently displayed on page one of the editorial section of the Times was a full column story on the Congress entitled:

#### EUGENISTS DREAD TAINTED ALIENS

-----  
Believe Immigration Restriction  
Essential to Prevent Deteri-  
oration of Race Here.

-----  
Melting Pot False Theory

-----  
Racial Mixture Liable to Lower  
the Quality of the Stock --  
Prof. Osborn's Views.

#### ----- THE LESSONS OF EVOLUTION

"Severe restriction of immigration is essential to prevent the deterioration of American Civilization, according to students of race and biology now taking part in the Second International Eugenics Congress," the Times reported. It continued: "The 'melting pot' theory is a complete fallacy, according to eugenists, because it suggests that impurities and baser qualities are eliminated by the intermingling of races." Experts explained, the

---

<sup>23</sup> H.F.Osborn, "Address of Welcome," Eugenics, Genetics and the Family: Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, (Baltimore 1923) pp. 1-5. This racist diatribe was reprinted as the lead article in Science and extensively covered in the New York Times.

Times continued, that the mixing of inferior races with superior races does as much harm to the superior race as it does good to the inferior race.

"The theory held by some eminent anthropologists that all races have an equal capacity for development and that all race questions, even the negro question, is to be solved in the long run by race mixture, was vigorously combated." One of the most outspoken addresses on this subject, the Times reported, was by Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn, President of the Congress, author of Men of the Old Stone Age (1915) and an authority on evolution.

"In the United States," he told the Congress, "we are slowly awakening to the consciousness that education and environment do not fundamentally alter racial values. We are engaged in a serious struggle to maintain our historic republican institutions through barring the entrance of those who are unfit to share the duties and responsibilities of our well-founded government."<sup>24</sup>

The New York Times editorialized:

---

<sup>24</sup> New York Times (25 September 1921) Section II, p. 1 col. 8.

"Modern philanthropy working hand in hand with modern medical science, is preserving many strains which in all preceding ages would have been inexorably eliminated. As early as 1859, Charles Darwin pointed out that the noblest impulses and finest achievements of modern life were ceaselessly lowering the average of human fitness. Since then a new phenomenon has asserted itself. While life has become easier in the lower ranges, it has become more difficult for the well born and the educated, who pay for modern philanthropy in an ever lessening ability to afford children of their own. There is a very serious question whether the twentieth century will be able to maintain and pass onward the infinitely intricate and specialized structure of civilization created by the nineteenth century." <sup>25</sup>

The attention given the Congress by the Times can be compared with the attention given by newspapers across the country at this time to the Ku Klux Klan. The Klans views on race were similiar, though less scientific, than the eugenicists. By the late summer of 1921, the Ku Klux Klan had an estimated 100,000 members and an annual income in the millions of dollars. In September 1921, beginning with a series of exposé articles in the New York World, newspapers across the country were carrying stories almost daily about the Klan. By early October the U.S. Congress had ordered an inquiry into Klan activities and Attorney General Dougherty was recommending action against the Klan to President Harding.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> N.Y. Times Section II, p. 2. The date of 1859 should probably be 1871 when the Descent of Man was published.

<sup>26</sup> There are number of good histories of the Klan. See, "The Ku Klux Klan: A History of Racism and Violence," published by the Southern Poverty Law Center (Montgomery,

Although the Klan's position on racial issues did not differ significantly from that of the eugenicists, the newspaper treatment of the Klan is in marked contrast to the treatment of eugenics. The Klan schemes were a "menace" and "moral idiocy" in which "the sinister and the ludicrous are so mixed up that one wonders how it can entice even fools into its meshes." The liberal newspapers were one in the opinion that "the whole force of public opinion should be directed to its abolition."<sup>27</sup> Statements on race made by the leaders of the Eugenics Congress, on the other hand, were seen as "scientific" and therefore not racist. In fact, during the planning of the Congress, Charles Davenport warned Osborn of the necessity of keeping "crackpots" out of the Congress. Only scientific men such as Grant and Stoddard should be allowed to speak on race.<sup>28</sup>

One reason the Eugenics Congress received such attention was surely the presence of so many well-known figures from Europe. Of all the visiting dignitaries, two were singled out by Osborn and the press. They reflected, in a unique way, the outlook of the American leadership. The first of these eminent foreigners was Georges Vacher de Lapouge. Lapouge ranks with Gobineau and Chamberlain as one

---

1981) for an excellent bibliography. David Chalmers, Hooded Americanism (New York 1981) is a standard work.

<sup>27</sup> "KKK - Farce and Menace" St. Louis Post-Dispatch 9/18/21.

<sup>28</sup> Haller, Eugenics, p. 156. The Times carried similar stories throughout September. The Times generally kept Klan stories out of the headlines.

of the fathers of European Aryan ideology. He was introduced by Henry Fairfield Osborn as "the leading authority on racial anthropology" in France and an "earnest exponent of practical eugenics measures by the government."<sup>29</sup> Actually, Lapouge was not highly regarded in France. His theories of Aryan supremacy alienated most French eugenicists who believed the French were basically "Latin." His advocacy of artificial insemination, sterilization of the unfit, and polygamy were also considered too extreme by the conservative leaders of the French Eugenics Society. Nevertheless, he was extremely well thought of by Osborn, Grant, and Stoddard as well as Margaret Sanger and others in the birth control movement. His talk was extensively reported in the New York Times. In many ways his message encapsulated the beliefs of the Congress's leading organizers.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> H. F. Osborn, "Address of Welcome," Eugenics, Genetics and the Family, (Baltimore 1923) p. 1.

<sup>30</sup> William Schneider, "Towards the Improvement of the Human Race," Journal of Modern History 54 (June 1982) pp. 268-91. Schneider contends that "the fear of degeneration was made more acute in France because of neo-Lamarckism." The French eugenicists feared the poor environment of the lower classes combined with their high birth rate would result in the rapid decline of the population. Fears of degeneration were also intimately connected with fears of military defeat which were exacerbated in France due to the defeat in the war. (Schneider, p. 273). For Lapouge see Gunter Nagel, George Vacher de Lapouge (1854-1936): Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Sozialdarwinismus in Frankreich (Freiberg, 1975). Information on Lapouge is also included in an early manuscript version of William Schneider's article on the French eugenics movement cited above. Lapouge was not well respected by the official delegates of the French Eugenics Society. In fact, he was not a member of the FES. Nevertheless in the United



According to Lapouge the human race "was facing a swift descent in the scale of civilization, because the better human strains were losing ground." The Times reported him as saying that the world was suffering from a shortage of "minds big enough to deal with its problems and that there was little hope for a coming generation.... The poorer races were threatening the more advanced, and the backward elements of society everywhere were threatening the progressive."<sup>31</sup>

Lapouge believed that the war in Europe "gave a blow to superior elements that may be mortal." The war not only destroyed three ancient empires - Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia - but it wiped out many of the aristocratic families, leaving the survivors crippled and impoverished. The lower classes everywhere have destroyed the superior elements of European society. "In Russia, eugenical inheritance has been destroyed." When the top layer of society is destroyed "it cannot be replaced by the lower strata... annihilation of the elite of a race means the permanent degradation of that race." The future of the world, he concluded, may depend on America. It was

---

States he was treated with great deference and usually referred to as a leader of eugenics in France.

<sup>31</sup> For this and the following page see G. V. de Lapouge, "La race chez les populations mélangées," in Eugenics in Race and State II (Baltimore 1923) p. 1. A summary with extensive quotes can be found in the New York Times 9/28/21 p. 11.

therefore imperative that America not be inundated by the lower races of Europe.

"The least enriched classes," the New York Times quoted him as saying, "the remainder of uncivilized people on the entire earth, reproach the chosen ones with having created a civilization which multiplies their desires far beyond the possibility of satisfying them. A great movement has begun among the inferior races and classes, and this movement which has the air of being turned against the whites and against the rich, is turned against the superior intellectual elements - and against civilization itself."

Perhaps the most effective foreign eugenics leader was Jon Alfred Mjoen. Like Lapouge, Mjoen was much more highly regarded in America than he was in his native Norway. Although no Norwegian geneticists worked with Mjoen or contributed to his journal Den Nordiske Rase, in Sweden and Denmark Mjoen found important supporters among the internationally renowned geneticists Hermann Nilsson-Ehle and Wilhelm Johannsen.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> This aura of scientific respectability also influenced the historical record. Frederick Osborn, in referring to the Third International Conference of Eugenics held in New York in 1932, cited papers by Mjoen, Raymond Pearl, Tage Kemp, H. J. Muller and Morris Steggerda as examples of scientific papers representing "the best knowledge available at the time." Even at the time, Mjoen was more of a propagandist than a scientist. He hardly belongs in the company of Pearl, Kemp, and Muller who were primarily research scientists. F. Osborn, "History of the AES," Social Biology 21 #2 (1974) p. 118.

In America he played a important role in the organization of the American Eugenics Society and was an important advocate of immigration restriction and anti-miscegenation legislation. Mjoen introduced the resolution creating the committee which ultimately organized the AES. Like Lapouge he was a favorite of Osborn, Grant, and Stoddard. In America he was generally considered a scientist of the highest merit and the Eugenics Society that he helped create would in the twenties and thirties sponsor a number of lucrative American lecture tours for him.<sup>33</sup>

Mjoen's interest in eugenics had been stimulated in Germany where, in 1897, he met and became acquainted with Alfred Ploetz, the father of German eugenics. Like Galton, Mjoen was a man of substantial means, and in 1906, he established the Vinderen Biological Laboratory, a private research institution for the study of eugenics. He was especially interested in mental properties, and his studies in musical ability were quoted in Erwin Bauer's classic, Menschliche Erblchkeitslehre.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Chase, Legacy of Malthus, p. 287; Nils Roll-Hansen, "Eugenics Before World War II: The Case of Norway," History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 2 (1981) pp. 269-98. For a summary of one of Mjoen's lecture tours see Eugenical News 12 #1 (January 1927) p. 24.

<sup>34</sup> Bauer, Fischer, Lens, Menschliche Erblchkeitslehre (Munchen 1927) p. 475. Bauer quotes from Mjoen's study, "Zur Erbanalyse der Musikalischen Begabung," which appeared in Hereditas 7 (1925).

In 1908 Mjoen gave a talk before the Norwegian Medical Society at the University of Oslo. He sketched what later became known as the "Norwegian Program for Race Hygiene," a program which influenced American eugenicists. According to Mjoen, modern industrial life and social welfare legislation was endangering the welfare of the race. Modern social policy aimed at improving conditions for the poor neglected biological heredity. The natural "cleansing processes" had been upset by social intervention. "The present social services may increase the health of the individual, but as a rule it lowers that of the race - the nation." While Mjoen was not opposed to social welfare legislation, he did believe that it must have a eugenic rather than a dysgenic thrust.<sup>35</sup>

From 1915 on a group of Norwegian biologists led by Otto Mohr denounced Mjoen for his scientific incompetence. Nevertheless, Mjoen found considerable support for his eugenic ideas from the governing Liberal Party of which he was an active member. By 1915, the party platform included a call for the study of practical methods for treating folk-disease - "fokesykdommer." In 1916 the Norwegian Parliament created an Institute for Genetics at the University of Oslo.

Although Mjoen was important in convincing the Parliament to create the Institute for Genetics, he had no

---

<sup>35</sup> Nils Roll-Hansen, "Eugenics Before World War II: The Case of Norway," History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 2 (1981) pp. 275-77.

official connection with it. One of his chief critics, Ragnar Vogt, founder of Norwegian psychiatry, was placed in charge of it. Vogt's work was considered more scientific than Mjoen's and his outlook more conservative. It is telling that a moderate could still agree that

It is not seeming for a blond blue-eyed intelligent Nordic to degrade his hereditary material by marrying a negro. Neither is it right that the lower races are granted franchise to such an extent that the common state risks being governed by inferior motives. Least of all the high-grade races have any good reason to further the procreation of the lower elements of the population.<sup>36</sup>

While some historians have claimed that the American and English eugenics movements imported "surprisingly little" from the European eugenics movement, the importance and influence of eugenics leaders in Europe is clear from an examination of the Eugenical News and the Minutes of the Eugenics Committee. In this particular case, Mjoen was the actual instigator for the creation of what was to become one of America's most influential eugenic organizations. Furthermore, many aspects of Mjoen's "Norwegian plan" were used by American leaders.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Ragnar Vogt, Avrelighetslaere og Racehygiene Kristiania, Cammermeyer (1914) p. 123, quoted from Nils Roll-Hansen, "Eugenics Before World War II," History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 2 (1981) p. 278.

<sup>37</sup> Horace F. Judson's review of Daniel Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics in The New Republic (5 August 1985) p. 30. See also the Preface to Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics. Kevles writes that he has "given attention to its (eugenics) expression elsewhere, especially in Germany, insofar as they affected Anglo-American developments." p.

At the Second International Congress of Eugenics the Scandinavian eugenics leaders were very popular. Henry F. Osborn greeted Mjoen as "the leader in the vigorous movement of race hygiene in Scandinavia." Mjoen was particularly concerned with the pernicious consequences of the crossing of distant races such as Norwegians and Lapps. At the Conference he gave a lecture entitled "Harmonic and Disharmonic Racecrossings." The lecture dealt with a number of his pet theories including the inheritance of musical ability and segregation of defectives, but the main point of the talk was a polemic against miscegenation. In America Mjoen's discussions of miscegenation seemed especially objective and scientific since it referred not to black/white mixes but to the emotionally neutral Norwegian/Lapp mixes.<sup>38</sup>

Mjoen was a major figure in the international eugenics movement and a key figure pushing for coordination among eugenics institutions. During the Executive Session of the Congress, Mjoen pressed for better coordination of the international eugenics movement by introducing a resolution from the Consultative Eugenics Committee of Norway for the establishment of

---

x. A reading of the book indicates that Kevles believes the influence to have been extremely slight.

<sup>38</sup> Henry Fairfield Osborn, "Address of Welcome," Eugenics, Genetics and the Family (Baltimore 1923) p. 1; Roll-Hansen "Eugenics Before World War II," History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 2 (1981); Mjoen, "Harmonic and Disharmonic Race Crossings," Eugenics in Race and State II, pp. 41-61.

... central eugenics organizations in each country, with advisory powers to the government relating to the prophylactic work for public health, to control of the biologically important movements of the population, also to the spread of popular information regarding eugenics, namely; race hygiene, race biology, the value of races, and the advantages and dangers of race crossing <sup>39</sup>

The resolution stated that such organizations were needed to educate people regarding the need to prevent imbecile, abnormal, and weak-minded individuals from "procreating an ever-increasing number of criminals, imbeciles, and anti-social persons." Such organizations were also needed since "at present ... the governments in many countries have no power to protect themselves against infection from foreign defective germ plasm."

It was Mjoen's proposal which prompted Irving Fisher to present a motion to form an "American Ad Interim Committee"

---

<sup>39</sup> Minutes of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, 9/27/21, p. 6. AES Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

The Executive Committee consisted of Henry Fairfield Osborn, President of the Congress; L. Darwin, Chairman of the International Eugenics Commission; Lucien March; Charles Davenport; Jon Alfred Mjoen; Raymond Pearl; C.C. Little, Sec-Gen of the Congress; Madison Grant, Treasurer; H.H. Laughlin, Chairman, Exhibits Committee; H.E. Crampton, Executive Committee; H.J. Banker, Sec. Section 2; Helen Dean King, Sec. Section 1; Clark Wissler, Sec. Section 3; Irving Fisher; Judge Harry Olson, General Committee; Dr. George Bech, delegate, Government of Denmark; Phya Medra, delegate of the Government of Siam; Dr. Santa Naccarati, delegate from the Italian Society of Genetics and Eugenics; Dr. F. Ramos, delegate from Cuba and Dr. Arturo Scroggie, delegate from Chile.

to prepare a report on a plan for securing widespread international cooperation. The motion was seconded from the floor and passed unanimously.<sup>40</sup>

Osborn appointed Irving Fisher chairman of the Ad Interim Committee and himself, Charles Davenport, Madison Grant, C.C. Little, and Harry Olson, Chief Justice of the Chicago municipal court, as members. Thus was born the International Commission on Eugenics Ad Interim Committee of the United States of America later to be known simply as the American Eugenics Society.

#### Part II: The Eugenics Committee of the U.S.A.

1922-1926

The first meeting of the International Commission on Eugenics Ad Interim Committee of the United States of America took place on 28 February 1922. The Committee quickly decided to change the name of the organization to the Eugenics Committee of the United States of America.<sup>41</sup> It very soon became evident that the new Committee was both

---

<sup>40</sup> Minutes of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, 9/27/21, p. 7. AES Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

<sup>41</sup> The name change was made at the Second Meeting of the Ad Interim Committee held at the Museum of Natural History, April 1922. AES Papers, APS, Philadelphia.



to have a shorter name and a narrower purpose than that envisioned by the Norwegian Eugenics Commission.<sup>42</sup>

The first meeting of the new Committee took place at the American Museum of Natural History. There were four participants, Charles Davenport, Irving Fisher, Henry Fairfield Osborn, and C.C. Little. Davenport reported renting office space to serve as the New York City headquarters for the Eugenics Research Association (ERA), the Eugenics Record Office (ERO), and the Eugenics Committee.<sup>43</sup> From the very beginning all three organizations were closely related, their overlapping leadership emanating from Cold Spring Harbor. It was quickly decided that the Eugenical News published by the ERA, would be "available for notices and reports of the Eugenics Committee" and "that it is expected that the two organizations will work in close touch with each other." By July 1923, the Eugenical News was being jointly published by the ERA and the Eugenics Society.

---

<sup>42</sup> The Committee received \$897.09 from the Executive Committee of the Congress in November 1921. That sum represented the balance of funds left over after all the bills for the Congress had been paid and was to be used for the initial expenses of the Committee. See, Minutes of the Exec. Comm. Second Int. Cong., 11/2/21; Minutes of the Ad Interim Committee, 2/28/22; 4/13/22; 6/9/22.

<sup>43</sup> The Penn Terminal office was given up in May as an unnecessary extravagance. See, Minutes of the Ad Interim Committee, 2/28/22; 4/13/22. Manuscript entitled, "Eugenics Committee of the United States," Minutes, Eugenics Committee, January 1924. Minutes of the Eugenics Committee of the U.S.A., 6/6/22; 6/16/23. AES Papers, APS Library, Philadelphia. For a brief description of the ERO and ERA see above, p. 24.

From the beginning the Committee was interlocked with the Eugenics Record Office (ERO), the Eugenics Research Association (ERA), and the Galton Society. Davenport, Fisher, and Olson were members of the Eugenics Committee and on the Executive Committee of the ERA and Grant, Davenport, and Fisher were leading members of the Galton Society.

Where the new Eugenics Committee would differ from the ERA, Galton Society, and ERO was that the Committee would emphasize political and educational goals rather than research and information exchange among professionals. This orientation was clearly present in the letters sent by the Committee to prominent Americans urging them to join this new eugenics endeavor. Reflecting the concerns raised at the Second International Congress the letter declared: "The time is ripe for a strong public movement to stem the tide of threatened racial degeneracy.... America needs to protect herself against indiscriminate immigration, criminal degenerates, and... race suicide." The letter called for resistance to the threatened "complete destruction" of the "white race." It stated that eugenics was the only movement which stood "against the forces ... [of] racial deterioration and for progressive improvement in the vigor, intelligence, and moral fiber of the human race." Eugenics represents "the highest form of patriotism and humanitarianism" and "offers immediate advantages to ourselves and to our children. By eugenic measures, for instance, our burden of taxes can be reduced by decreasing

the number of degenerates, delinquents, and defectives supported in public institutions; such measures will also increase safeguards against our persons or property."<sup>44</sup>

Irving Fisher hoped that there might also be a working relationship between the Committee and the American Genetics Association. It was decided to "cooperate with the American Genetics Association" and members of the Committee were urged to subscribe to the Journal of Heredity. David Fairchild, son-in-law of Alexander Graham Bell, a botanist with the Department of Agriculture and President of the American Genetics Association, joined the new Committee and was appointed to the advisory council. Many other active members of the AGA also joined the AES. While relations with the AGA were cordial in the late twenties and early thirties, the ties with the AGA were not as close as those with other eugenic organizations.<sup>45</sup>

By June the Committee had hired an executive secretary, Miss Margaret Andrus, and had chosen Dr. Henry E. Crampton (1875-1956), curator of invertebrate zoology at the American Museum of Natural History, as Secretary to replace C.C. Little. Crampton, a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, had just been appointed to the National Research Council (1921-1923). He was also the

---

<sup>44</sup> Sample membership letter in AES archives, 1922. See Minutes of the Eugenics Committee of the U.S.A.

<sup>45</sup> Minutes, 11/9/22.

corresponding secretary of the New York Academy of Science (1908-1925, president 1926-7) and a member of the Royal Geological Society. He traveled extensively, had a world-wide reputation, and served in various capacities in a number of international conferences relating to zoology and geology. He was very active in state and university physical education programs and had numerous government appointments, especially with the Department of Labor where he served as chairman of the committee on standards for child labor. He was thus in an excellent position to integrate the work of the eugenics committee with other progressive endeavors on state, federal, and international levels as well as in academia.<sup>46</sup>

The name was officially changed to the Eugenics Society of the United States and the search was on for charter members who might constitute an "advisory council." The call to join the struggle against "racial degeneracy," "indiscriminate immigration" and "race suicide" was signed by the seven members of the executive committee.<sup>47</sup>

Although several rabbis were suggested for the advisory council, including the well known Steven S. Wise, it was

---

<sup>46</sup> Biographical information on Henry Crampton can be found in the National Cyclopedia of American Biography 42 and Who Was Who in America 3. See Appendix A.

<sup>47</sup> The members were, Irving Fisher, Charles Davenport, Henry Fairfield Osborn, Madison Grant, Henry Crampton, C.C. Little and Harry Olson. Sample letter, no date, circa 1922. AES Papers, APS, Philadelphia.

voted "to postpone the election of a Jewish representative." There may have been some difficulty in finding the right rabbi for the job. Considering the prevalence of antisemitism among the leadership of the Committee it is hard to understand how any Jewish leader could belong. Davenport had publicly expressed concern over the "hordes of Jews" that were coming to America from Russia. They "show the greatest proportion of offenses against chastity, and in connection with prostitution, the lowest of crimes. There is no question that, taken as a whole... [they] represent the opposite extreme from the early English and more recent Scandinavian immigration... with their ideals of... advancement by the sweat of the brow, and the uprearing of their families in the fear of God and the love of country."<sup>48</sup>

Madison Grant was particularly well known as an antisemite and nordic supremacist. His best selling<sup>49</sup> The Passing of the Great Race, which became a favorite of Adolf Hitler, contains anti-Jewish slurs. He warned native Americans that "the dwarf stature, peculiar mentality and ruthless concentration on self-interest" of the Polish Jew

---

<sup>48</sup> Minutes, 6/9/22. Charles Davenport Heredity in Relation to Eugenics (New York 1911) quoted from Chase, Legacy of Malthus p. 161.

<sup>49</sup> The book went through four editions (1916, 1918, 1920, and 1921) as well as numerous printings. It was translated into German, French, and Norwegian. See "Notes on Madison Grant," in the Harry Laughlin Papers, NEMSU, Kirksville, Mo. For a discussion of the influence of the book see Alan Chase, Legacy of Malthus pp. 166-175.

might be "engrafted upon the stock of the nation" unless immediate action were taken to stop the immigration from eastern Europe. "Whether we like to admit it or not," he wrote:

the result of the mixture of two races, in the long run gives us a race reverting to the more ancient, generalized and lower type. The cross between a white man and an Indian is an Indian; the cross between a white man and negro is a negro; the cross between a white man and a Hindu is a Hindu; and the cross between any of the three European races and a Jew is a Jew."<sup>50</sup>

Such well-known and oft spoken sentiments may have made the task of finding a "Jewish representative" difficult. It was probably also difficult to find a prominent American rabbi before 1924 who opposed Jewish immigration. Although a 99-member advisory council was in place by February 1923, the "Jewish problem" was not solved until 1927, when Rabbi Louis Mann joined the advisory council.<sup>51</sup>

Confusion existed over the relationship between the Committee, the advisory council, and the Eugenics Society.

---

<sup>50</sup> Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race (New York 1916) p. 14-16.

<sup>51</sup> There was at least one Jewish scientist on the advisory council - Aaron J. Rosanoff, the psychiatrist. Rosanoff was almost certainly a Jew by birth. None of his biographies refer to any religious affiliation. He was a student of Ernst Rüdin, who later became a high Nazi official and propagandist for Nazi race science. Rüdin had several Jewish students, Franz Kallmann among them, working with him at the Kaiser Wilhelm in Germany. He is reputed to have helped some of them escape. It was not uncommon to find eugenic leaders rejecting the irrational antisemitism of the Nazis while supporting the regime and its emphasis on eugenics.

At the June meeting, Henry Crampton asked Irving Fisher to clarify the relationship of the three entities. Fisher explained that the advisory council was a body elected by the Committee to give advice and direction to the Committee. The Society was a creation of the Committee and the Committee might at some future time dissolve into the Society, but that would have to be decided at the next International Congress since the Committee was a creation of the Congress.<sup>52</sup>

In its day-to-day activities, however, there was little real distinction between the Committee and the Society. On occasion a distinction might be drawn, as when a complaint was received criticizing the Committee for a review of Earnest S. Cox's White America (Richmond 1923). The review appeared in the January 1924, issue of the Eugenical News. The reviewer (probably Harry Laughlin) observed that "the worst thing that ever happened" to the United States "was the bringing of negroes, nearly the lowest of races, to our shores."

---

<sup>52</sup> Minutes, 6/9/22.

The history of the death of nations through miscegenation is vividly told, our own danger clearly stated, and the 'only way out' made clear -- the expatriation of negroes of breeding age to Africa. It is to be imagined that many of the negroes and their parasites will object strenuously. But America is worth saving for the white race and it can be done. If Mr. E.S. Cox can bring it about he will be a greater savior of this country than George Washington. We wish him, his book and his 'White America Society' godspeed.<sup>53</sup>

In response to the complaint the Committee decided that "the Eugenics Society is not responsible for book reviews" since the Eugenical News was not an official organ of the Eugenics Committee. This apparently satisfied the Committee, although it made little sense to draw such fine distinctions.

The organization grew rapidly in its first three years. By February 1923, the Society had 100 members and about a thousand dollars in the bank. Membership more than doubled by June by which time the bank balance was approaching two thousand dollars. By 1930 membership had risen to over 1200 members across the country. The Committee's total disbursements for 1922 was a modest \$2,030. This more than doubled in 1923 and was up to \$25,000 by 1926.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> "White America" Eugenical News 9 #1 (January 1924) p. 3.

<sup>54</sup> The Pamphlet, "The American Eugenics Society," (New Haven 1927-2) contains a financial statements for the Eugenics Committee and Society from 1 December 1921 to 31 December 1926. AES Papers.



By February 1923, the Eugenics Committee had completed choosing its 99-member advisory council. This group represented an astonishingly diverse and prestigious body. The majority were academics with degrees from schools such as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Johns Hopkins. Many of them had international reputations. Virtually every well known biologist joined the group<sup>55</sup> as well as numerous physicians, statisticians, clergymen, educators and philanthropists. The psychologist were represented by Lewis Terman, Edward L. Thorndike, and C. E. Seashore. Henry Goddard, Carl C. Brigham, and Robert M. Yerkes joined the advisory council by 1928.<sup>56</sup>

The Council was composed primarily of those kinds of people who Robert Wiebe describes in his book, Search for Order (New York 1967). They were the new professional, middle-class progressives. The majority were Republicans and liberal Protestants. Their number included Charles W. Eliot, educational reformer and president of Harvard, Senator Robert L. Owen, an ardent leader of the Progressive

---

<sup>55</sup> The notable exception was the Morgan group of *Drosophila* geneticists at Columbia University including, Thomas Hunt Morgan, A. H. Sturtevant, Calvin Bridges, and H. J. Muller. J. M. Cattell and Raymond Pearl also refused to join. On the other hand, W. E. Castle, E. G. Conklin, Henry Crampton, E. M. East, H. S. Jennings, Frank Lillie, and William Wheeler were among the prominent members of the advisory council.

<sup>56</sup> Eugenical News 8 #1 (1923) p. 5.

movement in Oklahoma, and Homer Folks, well-known advocate of social welfare legislation in New York.<sup>57</sup>

This group helped define the goals and priorities of the society. They advised on candidates for various committees, revisions of reports and programs, as well as administrative policy. The Committee went out of its way to solicit opinion from the Council. By 1923, the Committee decided that its main efforts, for the immediate future, would be directed towards working for immigration restriction, educational efforts emphasizing the importance of intelligence testing, and lobbying efforts for the "elimination of the feeble-minded classes." It was decided to stay clear of the birth control movement.<sup>58</sup>

The Committee was sensitive to criticism, especially from the advisory council. When James McKeen Cattell received a copy of the 'time is ripe' letter, he resigned from the Eugenics Committee. He later wrote to H. S. Jennings, "I resigned from the advisory council almost from the start on account of a letter they were sending out. ... This letter ... contains, in my opinion, a number of misstatements concerning race, eugenics, etc."<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> See Chapter 4 for a detailed prosopography. Robert Wiebe, Search for Order (New York 1967).

<sup>58</sup> Minutes, Eugenics Committee, 9/6/22.

<sup>59</sup> Raymond Cattell to H.S. Jennings, 2/25/24 in Jennings Papers, APS Library, Philadelphia. Cattell did not specify his objections in detail.

As a result of this criticism and a complaint by Raymond Pearl, who also refused to join the Society, Irving Fisher suggested that "no important educational program or propaganda shall be conducted by this Committee without giving opportunity to members of the Advisory Council to object." Grant suggested adding to Fisher's proposal that "the Committee will not proceed with any educational program or propaganda to which a substantial number of the Advisory Council objects." These suggestions were approved and few further problems were encountered.<sup>60</sup>

In April Madison Grant, Harry Laughlin, and Robert DeCoursey Ward were appointed by the Executive Committee as a committee to plan lobbying efforts on behalf of Albert Johnson's immigration restriction bill. Harry Laughlin also suggested the Society might do some educational work concerning two bills before the New York State Legislature. One of the bills related to feeble-mindedness among school children and the other related to birth control.<sup>61</sup>

In 1925, the Committee on Crime Prevention headed by Harry Olson, Chief Justice of the Chicago Municipal Court, introduced into the Illinois legislature a bill providing

---

<sup>60</sup> Minutes, 9/6/22. Another example of the tendency to proceed with caution may be seen in the decision not to affiliate with the Minnesota Eugenical Association. In February 1923, Charles Dight's newly formed Minnesota Eugenical Association requested permission to affiliate with the Eugenics Society. After some consideration it was decided not to affiliate. Minutes, 2/24/23; 4/28/23.

<sup>61</sup> Minutes, 4/28/23.

for the establishment of "segregation farms" for "potential criminals" -- boys who have come into the court twice or more.<sup>62</sup> The Hearst newspapers were backing the bill and the Committee felt confident that it would pass. The Illinois bill failed, but a similar bill which allowed for the incarceration of suspected criminals did pass in Massachusetts.<sup>63</sup>

The close relationship between the Eugenics Committee and the Eugenics Research Association can be illustrated by the joint meeting of the two organizations at Cold Spring Harbor in June 1923. Fisher, Davenport, Laughlin, and Olson were on the Executive Committees of both organizations. Madison Grant represented the Committee and Princeton Psychiatrist, Stewart Paton, represented the Association.<sup>64</sup>

Davenport reported having spoken with certain officers of the Life Extension Institute in regard to cooperation with the Eugenics Research Association. It was suggested that efforts should be made to get close cooperation between the Galton Society, the Life Extension Institute, the Eugenic Record Office (ERO), the Eugenics Research Association (ERA) and the Eugenics Society. In fact in discussing the incorporation of the ERA it was suggested

---

<sup>62</sup> Minutes, 10/31/25.

<sup>63</sup> "The American Eugenics Society," a pamphlet published in 1927, p. 14. AES Papers.

<sup>64</sup> Minutes, 6/13/23. For a brief description of Paton see p. 173.

that a joint incorporation with the Eugenics Society might be desirable. It was also decided that the Eugenical News be jointly published by the ERA and the Society.<sup>65</sup>

The Life Extension Institute was the creation of industrialist Harold Ley. The object of the Institute was to lengthen human life through preventive medicine. It was vigorously supported by various life insurance companies "which recognize that whatever can be done to prolong the life of a policy-holder will be of enormous financial benefit." Since the six million policy holders of life insurance were among the "most thrifty and intelligent citizens," the program was viewed also as having a eugenic impact. The support of the Life Extension Institute was yet another example of the confluence of ideas and goals of those involved in public health with the eugenics movement. Irving Fisher was among the founders of the Institute. Eugene L. Fisk, also a member of the Eugenic Societies Advisory Board was chairman of the Board of Directors of the Institute.<sup>66</sup>

There was great enthusiasm in the Society at this point for a large scale membership campaign. Two assistants were hired to help Margaret Andrus with a mailing campaign in May and June. The call to "stem the tide of racial degeneracy"

---

<sup>65</sup> Minutes, 6/16/23.

<sup>66</sup> For biographical information on Harold Ley including information on the Life Extension Institute, see National Cyclopedia of American Biography 14, p. 69.

was sent out to thousands of prospective members. There was also a flurry of organizing activity. At the June meeting the Society was pushing ahead with the establishment of numerous assorted committees, each of which was to have its own paid executive secretary. There were to be committees on legislation, crime prevention, cooperation with the clergy, popular and formal education, survey of the movement, and organization.<sup>67</sup>

The advisory council was officially installed at the meeting of 26 October 1923. Eighteen Committees were suggested along with a program for the Society which was published in the August issue of the Eugenical News -- an issue devoted to the Eugenics Society of the United States. Since this represented the first official statement of the goals and vision of the new Society it is worth examining in some detail.<sup>68</sup>

The general aim of the Society was "the improvement of the American population." This goal encompassed four basic elements, which were, in order of priority, research, education, legislation, and administration. The most fundamental work of the Society, therefore, was the stimulation of eugenical research, especially research to

---

<sup>67</sup> Minutes, 4/28/23.

<sup>68</sup> "Report of the Sub-Committee on the Ultimate Program to be Developed by the Eugenics Society of the United States." Eugenical News 8 #8 (August 1923) pp. 73-6.

determine "the modes in which physical, mental and temperamental traits are inherited."

But research, the program continued, must also encompass the study of human migrations, the effects of birth control, the effects of urbanization and education on fertility, differential selection, and fecundity. The report expressed the concern that universities might be attracting the most intelligent elements of the population and "virtually sterilizing them." Other questions thought worthy of investigation were the effects of the automobile on such phenomena as in-breeding and assortative mating and the eugenic or dysgenic effects of trade unions. Research was also needed to determine the eugenic effects of religion, philanthropy, modern sanitation, and medical progress.<sup>69</sup>

There was a widely held belief that the intellectual and temperamental qualities of a population could decline very quickly under certain dysgenic influences. For example, rural populations had a much higher birth rate than urban populations. It was estimated that in four generations 50% of the rural population would become 88% of the total stock. Since there was a large migration from rural to urban areas this could have a serious dysgenic

---

<sup>69</sup> Eugenical News 8 #8 (August 1923) pp. 73-74.

effect if those migrating tended to be the superior elements.<sup>70</sup>

Immigration was a central focus of the Society's program: "The effects of immigration should be studied with reference to physique and intelligence, and with reference to the eugenics or dysgenics of blending different races." Leaders of the Eugenics Society thought that in America there existed a unique opportunity to study the effects of hybridization of different races "distant as well as more nearly related. This opportunity should be used." <sup>71</sup>

Although the program statement indicated that research was paramount, the Society found ample "justification for a far-reaching eugenic campaign." A "widespread and profound interest must be stimulated in the recognition... of the biological factors in civilization." The first step was to "teach the teachers." To further that goal eugenic information had to be readily available to teachers, preachers, and lecturers.<sup>72</sup> The Society would endeavor to stimulate interest in eugenics among American educators and to produce pamphlets and articles that could be easily integrated into formal and informal educational environments.

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 73.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p. 75.



The Society also hoped to stimulate courses in genetics and eugenics at colleges and universities. A special effort was planned to introduce eugenics to the medical and law school curriculum. The Eugenics Society members thought it particularly important to start with medical school education. Physicians were thought to be the foundation upon which to build a eugenically conscious society. They would be called upon to help determine who was fit to rear children and it was they who would perform the sterilization procedure.<sup>73</sup>

The Eugenics Society envisioned a future in which eugenic education would be the foundation of virtually all professional work. Preparation for diplomatic and consular services would include instruction in biology and eugenics. Law students and theologians would take courses in eugenics as would students of sociology, education, biology, and zoology. All large universities would have courses in eugenics.<sup>74</sup>

It was hoped that psychopathic laboratories could be attached to the Criminal Courts in large cities. The psychopathic laboratory would help in the determination of the biological aspect of crime. The eugenicist believed in progressive criminal detention aimed at rehabilitation and many of the eugenics leaders were at the forefront of prison

---

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., p. 76.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., p. 76.

reform but they also believed that a certain proportion of the criminal population were biological degenerates for whom no amount of rehabilitation would be effective. Above all, these biological degenerates should be prevented from producing yet another generation of miserable misfits.<sup>75</sup>

The psychopathic laboratories could also be used to help in the education of police, law, and medical students. The eugenics society envisioned internships at large psychopathic institutes as a standard part of such an education. Thus, a new generation of professionals would be taught to recognize the the biological aspects of criminal behavior. Such laboratories already existed in some states. Using specially trained eugenic field workers they were separating the "biological" degenerates from those for whom rehabilitation was possible.<sup>76</sup>

It was essential that the supreme importance of biological factors in human life be an integral part of the entire school system beginning with the elementary school grades. "The essential facts of eugenics should become as familiar as the multiplication table." Individual and race hygiene "should be linked together in the pupil's mind and

---

<sup>75</sup> Katherine B. Davis, for example started out as a progressive prison reformer and was recruited into the eugenics movement by John D. Rockefeller Jr. and Charles Davenport. See, Appendix A: Biographical sketches of AES leadership.

<sup>76</sup> Mehler, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers," Mendel Newsletter #16 (November 1978) pp. 6-11.

the greater importance of the latter emphasized."

Furthermore, the Society needed to encourage the production of educational materials including suitable textbooks, teachers manuals and supplementary reading lists.<sup>77</sup>

Eugenic education had to extend beyond the confines of the schools system. It had to be pursued through the popular press, the YM and YWCA's, the Boy and Girl Scouts, army, navy, lecture platforms, lyceums, chautauquas, and summer schools. It should be pursued through university extension services, baby shows at county fairs, moving pictures and radio addresses as well as popular articles, intelligently written and presented in Sunday newspapers. And above all:

The subject should be handled with earnestness and seriousness and the idea of eugenics as a fad or joke should be combated.<sup>78</sup>

The Society wanted to insure that public libraries and Departments of Health were well stocked with books and pamphlets that contained simple convincing presentations of eugenics. They wanted to see eugenics preached from the pulpit and made the subject of drama, fiction, and art. The effort would not simply to impart information but to

---

<sup>77</sup> Eugenical News 8 #8 (August 1923) p. 76. One can understand why the American progressive eugenicists were so impressed with the Nazi eugenic education programs. Here was a model of an educational system that was permeated with a concern for biological fitness.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., p. 77.

stimulate an earnest interest and develop a "eugenic attitude and habit of mind." The goal of the Society was to turn eugenics into a civic religion.

It was thought highly desirable to encourage the widespread use of mental and physical tests in schools, and other social institutions. The results of these tests should be carefully preserved. Practical use of these tests would be to help in the selection of occupations and educational programs for both gifted and normal children. "The work of the Eastman School in Rochester, in classifying children as to innate musical ability is an instance" of this.<sup>79</sup>

It was thought that eugenics would develop most rapidly as race hygiene if it was presented as an outgrowth of social hygiene. "We should endeavor to show that eugenics supplies the most effective and permanent solution" to the problems of combating disease, disability, defectiveness, degeneracy, delinquency, vice, and crime. Moreover, some aspects of the social hygiene movement were thought to be dysgenic, especially the programs which aided the survival and reproduction of dysgenic elements in the population. The integration of eugenics and social hygiene would help redirect public health programs.

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., p. 78.

Finally, the Society wanted the better administration and enforcement of eugenic laws already in existence and the better administration and coordination of voluntary agencies. "If applied eugenics ever accomplishes very much in the United States it will require the use of much better institutional, court, social organization, and educational rosters than those which are at present maintained." This is especially true for all agencies dealing with the "socially inadequate."

This then was the broad program which the Eugenics Society envisioned for itself. As will be seen, it reflected to a remarkable degree the actual work of the society over the ensuing years. It was a program that looked forward, not to a short campaign, but rather, "like the founding and development of Christianity, something to be handed on from age to age."<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 78.

### Chapter Three

#### The American Eugenics Society, 1926-1940

The American Eugenics Society was officially incorporated in January 1926. The first meeting of the incorporators was held at the home of Madison Grant in New York City on January 30th.<sup>1</sup> The incorporators were Harry Laughlin, H.F. Osborn, Henry Crampton, Irving Fisher, Madison Grant, Henry P. Fairchild, C.B. Davenport, C.C. Little, and Harry Olson. Fisher was elected the Society's first President, Davenport was elected Vice-President, and Henry P. Fairchild was elected Secretary-Treasurer. Leon Whitney was officially appointed Field Secretary with an annual salary of three thousand dollars.

Immediately following the first meeting of the new American Eugenics Society the group held the last meeting of the Eugenics Committee of the United States of America. Irving Fisher moved that the new American Eugenics Society take over the functions of the Committee and that the funds of the Committee be transferred to the new Society. The motion carried and the Eugenics Committee dissolved itself.

The new Society was off to a good start. There were 928 charter members in 45 states, the District of Columbia, Canada, Cuba, England, Germany, Hawaii, Italy, the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, and Switzerland. New York

---

<sup>1</sup> Minutes, 1/30/26.

supplied the largest contingent with over two hundred members including over a hundred active and sustaining members.<sup>2</sup> There were eighty-eight members in Massachusetts, seventy-one members in California, sixty-six in Illinois, and fifty-nine in Pennsylvania. Most other states had between one and ten members.

The office staff of the society consisted of eight full-time paid staff workers including Leon Whitney, Field Secretary; Lillian Armstrong, Corresponding Secretary; Margaret Andrus, Executive Secretary of the Committee on Formal Education; Vassa Fedoroff, General Secretary; and two stenographers. Miss Anna Wallace was in charge of the New York Office, located at 370 Seventh Ave and finally, Miss Martha Feser was Secretary of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Legislation in Chicago. Besides these eight full time staff people Mrs. Mary T. Watts served as a full time volunteer Chairman of the Committee on Popular Education. Her efforts were primarily devoted to organizing Fitter Family Contests at State Fairs.

The budget for 1925 was \$17,000. The Society actually had more money than it could use. The largest portion of the budget came from wealthy financiers. George Eastman contributed ten thousand dollars in 1925 and repeated that donation in 1926. John D. Rockefeller Jr. contributed five

---

<sup>2</sup> Active members donated at least ten dollars, sustaining members donated at least one hundred dollars. Professional membership cost two dollars per year.

thousand dollars in 1925 and again in 1926. The Society received \$2,530.05 from "Active Members." Professional membership brought in \$720.20. There were also a number of one-thousand-dollar donations over the years.<sup>3</sup> By 1927 the expenditures of the Society had grown to forty-one thousand dollars,<sup>4</sup> representing growth of over 240 per cent in two years!

These were years of tremendous energy and activity on a host of different fronts both nationally and internationally. The Committees of the Society produced a flood of pamphlets and reports. They set up exhibits at county fairs, municipal buildings, schools, and libraries. They surveyed college campuses for courses in genetics and eugenics and encouraged eugenic course work. They ran sermon contests, organized lectures, participated in local and national legislative initiatives. They set up state committees in most states and helped launch a number of national and international organizations in the field of population control. They sent representatives to national

---

<sup>3</sup> See "Report of the President of the American Eugenics Society, Inc.," 26 June 1926 (American Eugenics Society, New Haven, 1926). p. 3-4, p. 21. Eugenical News 10 #2 (February 1926) p. 16; "Abstract of the Report of the President," Eugenical News 11 #8 pp. 124-25. There is a discrepancy between the two reports. According to the Report of the Treasurer the Society received \$21,428.99 from 1 January to 31 December 1925 and had budgeted \$14,248.89 in expenses and \$614.04 in capital disbursements. The Eugenical News report claims the budget was \$17,000.

<sup>4</sup> Minutes, 1/3/27. The total budget was \$41,275.



and international conferences, worked with the League of Nations and the International Federation of Eugenics Organizations, and made a serious effort at networking the numerous organizations with eugenic interests.

The first annual meeting of the American Eugenics Society took place in June 1926, in joint session with the fourteenth annual meeting of the Eugenics Research Association. The meetings were held at the Eugenics Record Office in Cold Spring Harbor, New York. Arthur Estabrook, President of the ERA, delivered the opening address, "Blood Seeks Environment." After the address Charles W. Burr introduced Irving Fisher who gave the Report of the President on the status of the AES.

Fisher began with a brief review of the history of the Eugenics Committee from 1921 to 30 January 1926, when the AES was officially incorporated. He explained that the Committee laid the foundations of the Society with "the utmost care in the hope that the structure to be gradually erected on these foundations would be strong and enduring." The cornerstones of this foundation were "prestige," a "suitable program," suitable personnel, and an adequate financial base.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> "Report of the President," Eugenical News 11 #8 p. 3.

"With surprisingly few exceptions," Fisher explained with regard to the selection of the advisory council, "we secured the acceptance of all those who were deemed of especial importance in lending the movement the prestige of their names and in making available the counsel needed from time to time. We have the assurance of one of the best eugenic authorities and observers in the world that in no other country does the eugenics movement command such complete support from geneticists and other technical authorities. This advisory council has been consulted as to each important step taken, and has shown interest in our program...".<sup>6</sup>

The entire program of the Society, he continued, was hammered out slowly in stages and at each stage, it was submitted to the entire advisory council for comment and then presented at the annual meetings for discussion. The first outline of the program was adopted in February 1923.<sup>7</sup>

"As will be seen by anyone reading this program, it was developed not to cover a few years merely but rather the whole future, so far as we can now see it. While we do not anticipate that this program will remain in its present form without change, it is serving to set the grooves along which our movement is to proceed as far as we now know."<sup>8</sup>

There were fourteen active committees. One hundred-twenty-five members of the Society belonged to one or more of these committees. The Committee on Selective Immigration and the Committee on Popular Education created the most

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Minutes, 2/24/23.

<sup>8</sup> "Report of the President," Eugenical News 11 #8 p. 4.

public interest and generated the largest number of newspaper and magazine articles.<sup>9</sup>

"We are naturally most pleased," Fisher told the membership, "when we realize the important part our Committee on Selective Immigration played in the passage of the recent Immigration Act by Congress." He expressed the hope that the law would have a far reaching effect "upon the future character of America." He also read a letter from Albert Johnson, Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the chief architect of the legislation which bore his name -- the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act. Johnson personally thanked the Eugenics Society, noting that the work of the Committee was "of the greatest value to the House Committee" in preparation of the law.<sup>10</sup>

Newspapers and magazines were also interested in the Fitter Families Contests which generated valuable propaganda. Fisher pointed out that the publicity from the contests were equal to many thousands of dollars. Mrs. Watts, the originator of the "Better Babies Contest," joined with Florence Sherborn to convince the managers of the Kansas State Free Fair to hold the first Fitter Family Contest in 1921. There were three contests in 1924 and seven in 1925. By 1926 the Society was supervising fifteen

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. p. 6.

or more contests per year and many more were held under local supervision. In 1927, the Society purchased a Ford truck, an exhibition tent and other materials for its permanent traveling fair exhibit.<sup>11</sup> "Eugenics Exhibits" were held in connection with the contests and thousands of fair-goers were exposed to such exhibits.<sup>12</sup>

The Society prepared special traveling exhibits which were set up at expositions, fairs, and museums across the country. One of the Society's traveling exhibits, entitled "Some People are Born to Be a Burden on the Rest," consisted of a series of flashing lights mounted on a large display board. One light flashed every 15 seconds and a sign under it declared: "every 15 seconds \$100 of your money goes for the care of a person with bad heredity...." A second light flashed every 48 seconds, indicating the birth of another "defective." "Every 50 seconds," the viewer was informed by another light, "a person is committed to jail." To make the point explicit the display commented, "Very few normal people ever go to jail." The slowest light of all flashed every seven and half minutes, indicating the birth of a "high grade person."<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Eugenical News 12 #10 (October 1927) p. 138.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. p. 5.

<sup>13</sup> AES photo collection. See also, Mehler and Allen, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #1," Mendel Newsletter, (June 1977) p. 10. I have been unable to discover the source for these calculations, nor have I found any definition of "high grade person." I do not think the reference is simply to IQ. These contests judged

The Committee on Cooperation with Clergymen consisted of thirty-five members representing almost all denominations of Protestant Christianity, Catholics, and Jews. Among the membership were some of America's most prominent clergymen, including Harry Emerson Fosdick, Henry Huntington, Bishop John M. Moore, and Francis J. McConnell, as well as rabbis Louis L. Mann and Daniel De Sola Pool.<sup>14</sup>

---

children and families on many qualities including standing the in community. Thus, ministers were considered "higher grade" than workers. General appearance was also important.

- <sup>14</sup> To take one of these men as an example, Rabbi Louis L. Mann graduated Johns Hopkins University (B.A. 1908), University of Cincinnati (M.A. 1912), Hebrew Union College (BHL, 1912, rabbi, 1914) and finally, Ph.D. (psychology) from Yale in 1920. He stepped into the most prestigious pulpits in the country including the Sinai Congregation in Chicago. He lectured on ethics at Yale between 1920 and 1923. He became Vice Chancellor of the Jewish Chautauqua Society and a member of the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College. He also served as national director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation. He was a member of the executive board of the of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. He is one of the few rabbis honored with a biography in the National Cyclopedia of American Biography.

When Louis Mann became the rabbi of Chicago Sinai Congregation in 1923 "he was only 33 years old; but he quickly established himself as a new voice in Chicago," wrote Richard Hertz in a speech before the Central Conference of American Rabbis. "Throngs followed his messages Sunday after Sunday. He made a great pulpit even greater. He brought new life to the relevancy of the pulpit..." See Central Conference of American Rabbis: Seventy-Seventh Annual Convention, June 21, 1966. Toronto, Canada, Volume LXXVI, edited by Sidney L. Regner.

The biographies of the others are equally illustrious. These were all nationally prominent ministers.

The committee organized the best eugenic sermon contest, which offered prizes of five, three, and one hundred dollars for the best sermon on eugenics. The contest brought inquiries from every state of the union and was mentioned in almost all the religious press. An estimated 300 sermons were inspired by the committee and over seventy of them were submitted for judging. The Society was thus able to send eugenics literature to clergymen across the country.<sup>15</sup>

The sermons emphasized that we are at the dawning of a new day "when man may understand and control the stream of his creative power." Ministers told their parishioners that "worthy citizens do not spring from the loins of the unfit any more than silk-purses are made from sow's ears." Rabbi Harry H. Mayer told his Kansas City Temple Sisterhood: "May we do nothing to permit our blood to be adulterated by infusion of blood of inferior grade." Ministers told their congregations that eugenics was a religious obligation; that if future generations were born diseased, defective, and feeble-minded it would weigh as a sin against them. Thus

---

<sup>15</sup> There is no article or monograph on the religious component to the eugenics movement. Why the biologist and psychologist get all the attention is an enigma to me. The clergymen should be studied just as carefully. The mistake that seems to be made most often is to consider the "eugenics" movement as more inspired by genetics than other social ideas. There was an important theological component to eugenics. The leading eugenicists did not wish to replace Judaism or Christianity with eugenics; they wanted to infuse eugenics into religion.

ministers helped carry the message of eugenics as a moral imperative. Galton himself hoped that eugenics could be established as a "civic religion," and the American Eugenics Society was probably the most active eugenics organization promoting this view. One of the largest committees of the Society was the Committee on Cooperation with Clergy and the Society regularly published a "catechism."<sup>16</sup>

Ministers were called upon to translate eugenic theory into eugenic theology. While they supported immigration restriction, they called for wiser regulation of the "immigration from Heaven"<sup>17</sup> and demanded segregation and sterilization as moral imperatives. It was their job to deliver homilies on eugenics. Eugenics, they argued, would not only lead to sounder bodies but to sounder, purer souls. Sin, disease, alcoholism, and sexual degeneracy were all linked to degenerate and weak bodies.

Until the impurities of dross and alloy are purified out of our silver it cannot be taken in the hands of the craftsman for whom the refining was done. God the refiner we know: do we yet dream of the skill or the beauty of God the Craftsman with His once purified silver?<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> F. Olin Stockwell, Methodist Episcopal Church, Lamont, OK. Third Prize Sermon for 1926. AES Papers. See also, Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics (New York 1985) p. 61.

<sup>17</sup> This phrase is taken from Reverend Osgood's sermon and refers to birth regulation. Just as eugenics sought to regulate the immigration from abroad, it also had to regulate the "immigration from heaven" i.e. births.

<sup>18</sup> Phillip E. Osgood, St. Marks Church, Minneapolis. First Prize winner, 1926. AES Papers.

The Committee on History and Survey of the Eugenics Movement chaired by Samuel J. Holmes produced a number of extensive bibliographies of eugenics which were widely distributed by the Society. There were also committees on organization, finance, an editorial committee, a committee on biologic genealogy, and a committee on cooperation with social workers. All in all, the AES in 1926 was embarked upon a grand attempt to organize eugenic activity throughout the country and interlock American eugenic efforts with the international eugenics movement. Within a year the AES had set up twenty-nine state committees and was actively seeking to set up committees in most other states.<sup>19</sup>

The Society also began working on a "Eugenics Catechism" which was presented to all members of the advisory council for comment. The council and committee members were quite active in the Society. Even a subject as mundane as the Society's Constitution generated 40 replies from the council members. The "Eugenics Catechism," first published in 1926 as a ten page pamphlet, went through numerous changes until it was finally published by Ellsworth Huntington as a one hundred thirty-five page book entitled Tomorrows Children.<sup>20</sup> By that time it represented nearly a decade of debate within the advisory council.

---

<sup>19</sup> See "Membership lists and State Committees". The first 26 state committees were set up by June 1927. Minutes, 6/25/27.

<sup>20</sup> Ellsworth Huntington, Tomorrow's Children: The Goal of Eugenics (New York 1935).



Committees continued to proliferate in the years between 1926 and 1930. A committee on publications was established.<sup>21</sup> The Committee on Crime Prevention and Legislation was divided into two committees. Harry Olson took the chair of the Committee on Crime prevention which operated out of Chicago and began a large project to compile statistics on the national origins of criminals.<sup>22</sup> Roswell Johnson took the Chair of the Committee on Legislation which drafted model laws regarding marriage regulation, sterilization, segregation, and other issues. These two committees kept a close watch on state legislatures and were prepared to act both through their state committees and directly to promote laws that would have a eugenic effect.

At the November 1927 meeting of the Board, Madison Grant complained that the "important question of mixed marriages" had not been properly dealt with by the Committee on Legislation. He noted that "colored people have an elaborate program to defend mixed marriages" and the Committee needed to respond in some way. This was not the first time he had raised the issue of miscegenation. It was his feeling that the Society ought to work more vigorously for antimiscegenation legislation and its position should be more explicitly stated. As with other delicate matters it was decided to circulate the proposal among the Board.

---

<sup>21</sup> Minutes, January 1927.

<sup>22</sup> Minutes, 11/29/27.

Although the society did oppose miscegenation, Madison Grant was never satisfied with the vigor of the Society's position.<sup>23</sup>

While the Committee on Legislation needed prodding regarding the issue of race-mixture, the Committee on Research headed by Charles Davenport certainly did not. In the 1926 pamphlet, "Research Problems in Eugenics," the committee stated that race mixture was a topic which required "immediate investigation." Not only was it imperative to understand the consequences of the mixture of whites with Negroes and Asiatics, but it was also necessary to understand the consequences of the mixture of northwest Europeans with Jews and Italians.<sup>24</sup> Davenport had already stated his belief that the Jews had a propensity for "crimes against chastity,"<sup>25</sup> particularly with regard to prostitution. They also showed an intense individualism and were concerned with financial gain at any cost. On the whole, their character was the opposite of northern Europeans in these regards.<sup>26</sup> Madison Grant expressed the

---

<sup>23</sup> Minutes, 11/29/27.

<sup>24</sup> The mixture of Jews with Negroes and Asians with Italians was of less interest. The obvious focus was on the impact of racial mixture on the "white race".

<sup>25</sup> Davenport used the phrase "crimes against chastity" with specific reference to Jews in Heredity in Relation to Eugenics (New York 1911) p. 216. He used the phrase to connote Jewish participation in the white slave trade as well as a general vulgarity.

<sup>26</sup> Research Problems in Eugenics: Being a report of the Committee on Research, 26 March 1926, AES Papers;

fears of many in the Society that the "peculiar mentality" of the Polish Jews were "being engrafted upon the stock of the nation."<sup>27</sup>

Unfortunately, the committee report stated, "the whole work stands still for lack of research and invention in the field of measurement of temperamental and social traits." What was desperately necessary, the Committee believed, were instruments to measure the propensity to crimes against chastity and similar behavioral traits. This problem was never solved, but it is worth noting that no one on the Committee, which included Harrison Hunt, C.R. Stockard, F.A. Woods, and Sewall Wright seemed to think the task impossible.<sup>28</sup>

Despite these problems the AES supported anti-miscegenation bills in Virginia, Washington, D.C., Michigan, and Texas. Madison Grant was particularly concerned with the situation in Virginia, where "many mulattoes are claiming to be Indian." Although the Indian was not a "serious sociological problem" since one could assume they would "gradually disappear," the Negro posed a serious threat. Negroes formed about nine percent of the American population and included a considerable number of mulattoes

---

Davenport, Heredity in Relation to Eugenics, (New York 1911) p. 216.

<sup>27</sup> Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race (New York 1916) p. 14.

<sup>28</sup> Research Problems in Eugenics: Being a report of the Committee on Research, 26 March 1926. AES Papers.

who were passing as white. "We have gone a long way... towards absorbing negro germ-plasm," Edward M. East said, and "we can find no probability that the negro will contribute hereditary factors of value to the white race..."<sup>29</sup>

In addition to anti-miscegenation legislation, the AES resolved to support legislation requiring applicants for marriage certificates to state in writing that "neither of the contracting parties [had] a father, mother, sister brother, or cousin who was born blind."<sup>30</sup> If this could not be done a bond of \$1000 would be required to ensure that the children resulting from such a marriage would not become public charges. The AES later extended this marriage law to include other defects.

In 1929, the Society enlisted the aid of Professor Albert C. Jacobs of Columbia University's School of Law to draft a model eugenic marriage law. Under Jacob's model bill a person would be refused a marriage license, unless

---

<sup>29</sup> Minutes, 10/31/25; Edward M. East, Heredity and Human Affairs (New York 1927) pp. 188/9. Bently Glass notes that East was "perhaps the most outstanding of the Harvard professors at the Bussey Institute." Furthermore, according to Glass, geneticists considered East among the worlds leading authorities on the consequences of inbreeding and outbreeding. Thus his statements on the subject of race crossing were highly influential. See Bently Glass, "Geneticists Embattled: Their Stand Against Rampant Eugenics and Racism in America During the 1920s and 1930s," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 130 #1 (1986) p.132.

<sup>30</sup> Minutes of the Joint Session of the AES and the ERA, 6/2/28. See "Dr. Howe's Resolution."

bond were posted, if any close family member suffered from "hereditary" blindness, deafness, epilepsy, feeble-mindedness, or insanity. The Committee on Legislation also drafted legislative programs which called for "authorization of approved physicians to sterilize insane, feeble-minded, epileptic, and genetically blind or deaf individuals." The committee furthermore called for the legalization of prescription sale of contraceptives, the restriction of immigration to "those who are superior to the median American in intelligence tests" and changes in sentencing and parole laws to take into account the "possible social and hereditary menace" of the individual.<sup>31</sup>

The Society had come to accept and vigorously promote birth control and population control, so much so, in fact, that in 1929 the AES board discussed merging the Birth Control Review and the Eugenics magazine.<sup>32</sup> In 1931, Henry P. Fairchild, then president of the Population Association of America, proposed that the AES, the Birth Control League, and the Population Association merge into one organization. Neither proposal was accepted, but they did garner serious support and continued to be discussed through the mid-thirties.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> "State Legislative Programs," typescript, no date, see Minutes, 1929.

<sup>32</sup> Minutes, 2/14/29 .

<sup>33</sup> F. Osborn, "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (Spring 1974) p. 118.

Another indication of change within the Society in these years was the election of Henry P. Fairchild, an eminent sociologist, as president of the AES in June 1929. This was an indication of the increasing status of sociology within the eugenics society. Fairchild was one of the original incorporators of the Society and clearly part of the inner core of the Society's leadership. A strong advocate of the sociological view of eugenics, he came to be a key critic of the genetic determinism of Davenport.

Fairchild served as president of the AES from June 1929 to June 1930. While his perspective on the importance of genetics to the eugenics program differed from previous presidents of the Society, his view of the goals and methods of eugenics was substantially the same as his predecessors'. He was particularly active in the anti-immigration movement, but his opposition to immigration was primarily from a sociological perspective. He emphasized that eugenics was composed of two main fields: genetics, the science of heredity and sociology, the science of society.<sup>34</sup>

Fairchild, for example, rejected the notion that Southern and Eastern Europeans were inherently inferior to Northern Europeans. Instead, he argued that small numbers of immigrants could be acculturated without any great harm.

---

<sup>34</sup> Henry P. Fairchild, Greek Immigration to the United States (New Haven 1911); Immigration: A World Movement and its American Significance (New York 1913), and The Melting Pot Mistake (Boston 1926).

The problem of immigration was that races and ethnic groups were specialized to different environments and the mixing of nationalities from diverse environments resulted in a cultural mongrelization. The attempt to mix nationalities of different religion, language, and culture destroys culture. The destruction of culture and disorientation of society in turn leads to dysgenic trends in births.<sup>35</sup>

In an address before the Galton Society in January 1930, Fairchild rejected the notion that the new immigrants were genetically inferior to the old. "The real harm in immigration," he told the fellows of the Galton Society, was "the introduction of large numbers of people whose community standards are different from our own." As a result the "social unity of the country is inevitably broken down." Sidestepping entirely the question of heredity, Fairchild based his opposition to immigration wholly on sociological factors. Immigrants were still seen as a threat to the germ plasm of the nation, but the threat was less direct. The breakdown of American culture was inimical to eugenic development. A sound and stable culture was essential for sound and stable families.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> H.P. Fairchild, The Melting Pot Mistake (Boston 1926) quoted from a review in Eugenical News 11 #7 (July 1926) p. 95.

<sup>36</sup> Frederick Osborn, a leading advocate of the sociological view in the mid-thirties, believed that the opponents of the sociological view "forgot, perhaps, that Galton once defined eugenics as the 'study of factors under social control.'" see F. Osborn, "A History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (1974) p. 119.

After Fairchild's talk, Davenport, who presided at the meeting, thanked him for presenting "a new aspect of a vital and much argued subject" and opened the meeting for discussion. E.G. Conklin immediately disputed Fairchild's claim, maintaining that "there are races that are not by inheritance capable of being socially-minded." Davenport agreed, stating that although there is "no inheritance of crime" there was inheritance of traits such as altruism. Davenport put forward the hypothesis that "there is a difference in mean incidence of crime in racial stocks due to a difference in incidence of a strong altruism in the people to be governed by it." In this context, Francis Kinnicutt, commenting on the Leopold-Loeb case in which two Jewish boys from wealthy homes had committed a murder as "an experiment" to see if they could get away with it, said he believed this was a clear indication of "a racial difference in ethics."<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Eugenical News 15 #1 (January 1930) p. 9. Kinnicutt was saying, in effect, that Jews have a racial difference in ethics which allows them to see murder as a "legitimate experiment." No one at the meeting took this as in any way an antisemitic statement. Fairchild answered Kinnicutt by telling a story of a young Albanian in Paris who committed a murder in accord with the Albanian code of honor. The point of the story was that here was another case of murder committed in accord with a different moral code based on a cultural difference. The exchange was published in the Eugenical News. Throughout the thirties one finds racist remarks apparently passing without notice. It is clear that at the time racial bias was so prevalent it went unnoticed. In a single issue of the Eugenical News in the 1930s you can find the most liberal advocates of eugenics side by side with praise for Hitler and the Nazis. See, for example, volume 21 #4 (July/August 1936) pp. 65-73. The first article is by C.M. Goethe praising Hitler and the second article is



Fairchild maintained throughout that he found no convincing statistical evidence to show that the new immigrants engaged in substantially more crime than the old. The second generation, on the other hand, "shows a striking and opposite result." This claim supported his contention that it was the dilution of culture, not genes that caused crime. If crime were a racial trait, Fairchild claimed, "there would no variation; consequently it is an environmental character."<sup>38</sup> Eugenics, Fairchild argued, was not concerned solely with genes. It was also concerned with bringing out the best in a population and this could not be accomplished in mixed populations. Nationalities were best off remaining homogeneous.

While the majority of those at the meeting disagreed with Fairchild, it is clear that the debate over the sociological perspective was taking place in these years within the eugenic society and was accepted as a legitimate perspective. It is also clear that the debate was not over changing policies towards immigrants or blacks. Fairchild's election as president of the AES in 1929 may indicate a growing acceptance of the "sociological" perspective, but it did not indicate a change in policy.

---

Frederick Osborn explaining the "new" or "reform" eugenics. This is not to say that Osborn and Goethe held similar views. It is to say that both views were considered legitimate and despite differences in orientation they agreed in principle on goals. For a report by the Eugenical News on the Leopold-Loeb case see Eugenical News #10 (October 1924) p. 87.

<sup>38</sup> Eugenical News 15 #1 (January 1930) p. 6.

In an article entitled, "The Science of Larithmics," published in the Eugenical News in March 1931, Fairchild argued that eugenics and "larithmics", a term he coined to mean the branch of population theory dealing with questions of quantity, should both be considered subdivisions of population theory. Thus, population problems would be divided into two classes, quantity and quality.<sup>39</sup> Later that year he helped found the Population Association of America "to organize, promote, and support research with respect to problems connected with human population in both its quantitative and qualitative aspects." The officers of the new organization included Frederick Osborn, C.C. Little, Raymond Pearl, and Ellsworth Huntington.<sup>40</sup>

In 1931, leadership of the Society was handed over to H.F. Perkins, professor of Zoology at the University of Vermont. Perkins' presidency marked another kind of change in the Society. While he had been a member of the advisory council since the organization of the Eugenics Committee, he clearly had less stature than former presidents. According to Frederick Osborn, Perkins, "had a more limited acquaintance with influential people than his predecessors."<sup>41</sup> His elevation to a leadership position

---

<sup>39</sup> Eugenical News 16 #3 (March 1931) pp. 31-33.

<sup>40</sup> Eugenical News 16 #6 (June 1931) p. 84.

<sup>41</sup> F. Osborn, "A History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (1974) p. 118.

appears to be related to his relationship with the Rockefeller Foundation and his orientation to eugenics.

The Rockefeller interests in these years included several foundations and important institutions. There was the Rockefeller Foundation, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, and the Bureau of Social Hygiene - to name just a few of those most directly interested in eugenics. No clear policy united these different institutions. Thus, eugenics projects such as the Institute of Criminology and W. Carr-Saunders' eugenics survey were financed by the foundations at the very same time that criticism of eugenics was emerging within parts of the Rockefeller camp.

By the mid-twenties a new direction was emerging within the Rockefeller foundations which was to influence the AES in the early thirties. The tendency was to move away from projects that aimed at the "root cause" of social problems and to support projects that focused on rationalizing the institutions of social control. For example, the Bureau of Social Hygiene began its work in 1914 by investigating the biological "root causes" of crime with an eye towards eliminating crime via sterilization and segregation of criminals.<sup>42</sup> This approach was abandoned by the mid-

---

<sup>42</sup> Mehler, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers," Mendel Newsletter (November, 1978). See also, David Grossman, "Professors and Public Service, 1885-1925: A Chapter in the Professionalization of the Social Sciences," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis 1973) and "Philanthropy

twenties when funding turned to ballistics and finger print identification studies as well as studies of European Police systems. Thus, there was a tendency to reject the notion that eugenics could solve problems such as crime, pauperism, and feeble-mindedness. This did not mean that eugenics was not useful in social policy formation particularly in the area of population management.

The Rockefeller Foundations continued to fund eugenic projects but the new projects tended to emphasize migration patterns, resource potentials, differential fertility, and human migration patterns as well as sophisticated attitudinal studies regarding family planning and birth control. These studies were obviously much more useful for planning ongoing projects including planning for regional development. Thus, the new eugenics studies funded by the Rockefeller foundations were much broader in scope and aimed not so much at improving the germ plasm but at industrial needs and resource potentials. This broader scope did not preclude concerns over the quality of the germ plasm, but encompassed them.<sup>43</sup>

---

and Social Science: The Rockefeller Foundation and Economists, 1913-1929," unpublished paper, no date.

<sup>43</sup> Mehler, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers," Mendel Newsletter (November 1978). For a typical example of the style of eugenic project funded by the Rockefeller group see, "Eugenics Survey of Vermont," in the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund (LSRMF) Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York.

It was not only the Rockefeller Foundations which were moving away from straight eugenic projects. In 1922, the Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems was established under the direction of Warren S. Thompson and P.K. Whelpton. Frederick Osborn and Warren Thompson worked closely together on population issues and Thompson joined the newly constituted AES Board in 1935. These men represented a new breed of demographers who were applying advanced statistical methods to population problems. The Milbank Memorial Fund was sponsoring work in the area of differential fertility, contraception, and census analysis, the emphasis being on factors which made for change in population trends. The Milbank granted \$250,000 to Princeton University to establish the Office of Population Research. The Rockefeller Foundation began funding the National Research Council's Committee for Research in Problems of Sex in 1931. The Committee's focus was on fertility control. In 1931, the Carnegie Corporation of New York approved grants to the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population Policy (IUSSPP) and the Population Association of America. In 1932, the Macy Foundation began a series of grants to Dr. Gregory Pincus for his work on ovulation which eventually led to the development of the birth control pill. Collectively these grants broke new ground in population and fertility studies. They were used to train demographers to develop new statistical techniques for population trend analysis, and

perhaps most importantly, to develop methods for fertility control such as the birth control pill and IUD.<sup>44</sup> Thus, between 1930 and 1935 foundation funding was turning away from the older eugenics organizations, but not away from eugenics.

In 1926, H.F. Perkins began a Eugenics Survey of Vermont sponsored by the Vermont branch of the American Eugenics Society and the University of Vermont. The study was a modest affair styled after an earlier study conducted by the AES in Shutesbury, Massachusetts. The idea was to determine whether the deterioration of small New England towns in the late 19th century could be traced to deterioration in the genetic stock of the area. It was believed that this could be done by collecting family histories. If it could be shown that the best stock migrated out of the area leaving the worst behind, this would be an indication that deterioration in genetic stock was a cause of social decay. If this were true, it would bode ill for the future of the country since those who

---

<sup>44</sup> For a history of the funding of population control efforts by American Foundations see, Thomas M. Shapiro, Population Control Politics: Women, Sterilization and Reproductive Choice (Philadelphia 1985). Frederick Osborn, "Population" in Warren Weaver, U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History, Structure, Management, and Record (New York 1967) pp. 365-375; and Dennis Hodgson, "Demographic Transition Theory and the Family Planning Perspective: The Evolution of Theory within American Demography," Cornell University Ph.D. Thesis, 1976.

migrated to the cities from the rural areas had fewer children than those who remained behind.<sup>45</sup>

The results of the first year's investigation were cause for concern. A pedigree study of sixty-two selected families revealed 4,624 paupers, 380 feeble-minded, 119 with prison records, 73 illegitimate children, 202 sex offenders, and 45 with serious physical defects. Perkins concluded:

...the characteristics which are pronounced in past generations are still plain to be seen in the living members of a family. This is true whether the family has moved from the original section of the state in which we found the records of the earlier members or whether, as has been the case in a few instances, they are still living in the ancestral home. The effect of heredity contrasted with that of environment seems to be very strongly emphasized as a result of our study. Without making too positive an assertion, I think we can safely say that in the sixty-two families that we have studied at any rate, 'blood has told,' and there is every reason to believe that it will keep right on 'telling' in future generations."<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Eugenics Survey of Vermont, LSRMF Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, N.Y.; Annual Reports of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, 1927-1931. H.F. Perkins, "The comprehensive survey of rural Vermont, conducted by the Vermont Commission on Country Life," in American Geographical Society of New York. Special publication no. 16; Perkins, "Hereditary factors in rural communities," Eugenics 3 #8 (August 1930) pp. 287-292; "Lessons from a Eugenical Survey of Vermont," Eugenical News 12 #3 (March, 1927) p. 29; "The Findings of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont," Eugenical News 12 #8 (August 1927) p. 106.

<sup>46</sup> "Lessons from a Eugenical Survey of Vermont," Eugenical News 12 #3 (March 1927) p. 29. See also, "The findings of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont," Eugenical News 12 #8 (August 1927) pp. 106-08. The emphasis is in the original.

As to the means the state should take to prevent the reproduction of defectives and other social inadequates, increased institutional aid, special classes, and psychiatric clinics were recommended. Nevertheless, Perkins maintained, "there is no possible chance during the next decade of increasing the facilities enough to segregate anywhere near all the feebleminded.... It then raises the question whether, after exhausting the above mentioned means for eugenical control, eugenical sterilization would not prove the most effective preventive." Perkins stated his belief that "the time is ripe for the introduction of a bill permitting eugenical sterilization in Vermont."<sup>47</sup>

In 1927, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund took an interest in the Vermont project and donated \$87,000 to do a thorough study. The Rockefeller input changed the complexion of the study. Eugenics became a minor part of a large scale study of human migration patterns, resource potentials, land utilization, conservation problems, and a whole series of attitudinal studies. The project no longer sought the simple "cause" of the deterioration of the area. The focus of interest was now trend analysis and resource utilization. The eugenics factor was not lost sight of, but it was relegated to a less prominent position. The project brought Perkins a good bit of recognition within the

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.



eugenics movement because of the huge sum appropriated for what was ostensibly a eugenics study.<sup>48</sup>

Dissension had been mounting in the AES in the late twenties. Leon Whitney, Executive Secretary of the organization, wrote in a confidential letter to Paul Popenoe, Executive-Secretary of the Southern California branch of the AES, that "it was a great shame that Dr. Davenport... was able to block the desires of almost all other members of the Society that the Eugenics Research Association and the American Eugenics Society [should combined] ... to my way of thinking [they] should be one organization. It was also a pity that he was able to block the discontinuance of the Eugenical News. Laughlin does most of the work on it and Laughlin was for giving it up... and so was practically every other person, but they had to toady to Davenport since he wanted to run it so much... it is nothing but a financial drain... Now we have the new improved 'Eugenics'... and the old Eugenical News continues just the same. It is simply a waste of good effort." Whitney went on to say that there were also too many organizations, too much overlapping effort and energy. The eugenics movement, he believed, needed to be streamlined and it was Davenport who stood in the way.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> See folder marked, "Eugenics Survey of Vermont" (1927) in the LSRMF Papers, Tarrytown, N.Y.

<sup>49</sup> Minutes, 2/21/29.

Later that year an old bone of contention reared up again within the organization -- the question of the place of sociology within the eugenics movement. Fairchild, Perkins, and others felt "that the time has come when the American Eugenics Society should emphasize the sociological aspect of the subject." It was argued that a eugenics program should include more than sterilization and educational programs. Davenport believed that social welfare constituted a burden "that is crushing our civilization." As far as he was concerned sound heredity would find a way to show itself.<sup>50</sup> As noted in our examination of the Society's goals and committees, Davenport's narrow view of eugenics was never shared by the majority of the leadership. Nevertheless, he wielded a disproportionate amount of power with the Society because of his position as Director of the Carnegie Institution's Department of Genetics. That is why he became the center of criticism from the "sociological" camp.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Minutes, 11/16/29. Davenport to Osborn 12/23/32, Osborn Papers. See also, Davenport to Osborn, 9/11/35 Davenport Papers. Davenport wrote: "The black buzzard of despair still seems to hang over me... Socio'logy' is in the saddle, and I fear [it will] ... bring down the race nearly to extinction; but I suspect that the species will be able to rise again from the remnants."

<sup>51</sup> The "sociological" camp included all those who felt that society ought to tax its citizens for such social welfare projects as prenatal care, public health care, etc. Davenport opposed social welfare on principle. He believed all social welfare programs were dysgenic. In this opinion he was a clear minority in the Society.

At the same time that dissension within the organization was growing, the Depression was having its effect. Money was drying up. Salaries and expenses could not be met and the Society was moving rapidly into the red. In 1931, Whitney tendered his resignation but was persuaded to stay on a while longer. Both Fairchild and Perkins were turned down for grants by the Milbank and Carnegie Institutions.<sup>52</sup> By the end of 1931 the Society was nearly seven thousand dollars in debt. At that point Whitney insisted his resignation be accepted.<sup>53</sup> Whitney's resignation was the last of a number of resignations which included C.G. Campbell (who resigned only months after being elected to the presidency), Dr. H.H. Laughlin, Charles Davenport, Madison Grant, Harry Olson, Mrs. Lucien Howe and H.J. Banker.<sup>54</sup> By 1933 the 1260 members had shrunk to four or five hundred.<sup>55</sup> Membership continued to decline until the end of 1935 and then began to rise again between 1936 and 1939.

It was at this point that Frederick Osborn emerged as the new leader of the Eugenics movement. Kenneth Ludmerer described Osborn's entrance into the eugenics movement as

---

<sup>52</sup> Minutes, 11/11/31.

<sup>53</sup> Minutes, 6/4/32.

<sup>54</sup> Minutes, 10/3/31; 10/13/31/ 3/6/32/ 4/15/32 and 8/22/32.

<sup>55</sup> F. Osborn, "A History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (1974) p. 117.

"sudden and unexpected."<sup>56</sup> In fact, Osborn's father, William Church Osborn, was a Patron member of the American Eugenics Society. Frederick's grandfather, Cleveland Dodge, helped finance the Second International Congress of Eugenics in 1921; and his uncle, Henry Fairfield Osborn, a founder of the American Eugenics Society and member of the advisory council from 1923 to 1935, was curator of the American Museum of Natural History where Frederick Osborn studied eugenics from 1928 to 1930. Allan Chase comes closer to the truth in describing the American Eugenics Society as "an Osborn fiefdom."<sup>57</sup>

Frederick Osborn is without doubt the most important figure in American eugenics in the post-World War II period. He was at the heart of the struggles which went on within the movement in the thirties. From 1930 to his retirement in 1972, he was a leading figure in the American Eugenics Society.<sup>58</sup> An examination of his views will help clarify

---

<sup>56</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174.

<sup>57</sup> For background on Frederick Osborn see, Who's Who in America, volume 40 (1962-3); National Cyclopedia of American Biography Supplement I (1960); Who Was Who in America volume 8; Current Biography (1941), pp. 640-41; There is also a memorial volume in Social Biology 29 #1-2. The quote from Chase is from personal correspondence, 21 January 1979, see also Chase, Legacy of Malthus, p. 326.

<sup>58</sup> Carl Bajema described Osborn to me at the 1987 History of Science Society Meeting as "a man who could make things happen."

the ideological orientation of American eugenics in the thirties.

Frederick Henry Osborn was born in New York on 21 March 1889 to William Church and Alice Dodge Osborn. William Church Osborn was a lawyer and President of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The Osborns were Hudson River Squires whose family of bankers, lawyers, and financial magnates had lived on the Hudson for over a hundred years. Frederick was the grand-nephew of J. Pierpont Morgan and had been raised in an environment in which the business approach to problems was hammered into him from an early age.<sup>59</sup> As a boy he recalled discussing problems of heredity with his uncle Henry Fairfield Osborn.<sup>60</sup>

Osborn graduated from Princeton in 1910 and began a career in the family businesses as treasurer and Vice-President of the Detroit, Toledo, and Ironton Railroad. After World War I, he sold the railroad to Henry Ford and in 1921 went into banking as a partner in G.M.P. Murphy Company, a New York banking house. He also served in

---

<sup>59</sup> I am indebted to Allan Chase for this observation (personal correspondence with the author, 1/21/79). Chase went on to comment, "Osborn set out to turn a failing venture -- the American eugenics movement -- into a successful operation. This he did by making cosmetic changes ... and by spreading money around liberally to younger scholars of promise."

<sup>60</sup> Current Biography (1941) p. 641; Geoffrey Hellman, Bankers, Bones & Beetles: The First Century of The American Museum of Natural History (Garden City 1969) pp. 121-123, 207-209.

various executive capacities on the boards of at least a dozen major corporations.

In 1928, at the age of forty, he retired to spend the rest of his life in philanthropic and scientific endeavors. Between 1928 and 1930, his uncle Henry Fairfield Osborn arranged for him to have an office in the American Museum of Natural History, where he studied eugenics. As early as 1929 he emerged as an important figure in the movement, becoming one of the original incorporators of the Eugenics Research Association.<sup>61</sup> He joined the AES in 1930 and by 1931 was put in charge of the important Nominating Committee which chose new members for the Board of Directors and the advisory council.<sup>62</sup> He also became a regular at the meetings of the Galton Society.<sup>63</sup>

Osborn's earliest expression of what has been called "the new eugenics" appears in an important policy address at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Eugenics Research Association in May 1930 in which he argued for a change of priorities within the eugenics movement. While noting that the "larger progress of eugenics" depended on advances in

---

<sup>61</sup> Eugenical News 14 #2 (February 1929) p. 25. The ERA had been established in 1913 but was not incorporated until 1929.

<sup>62</sup> Minutes, 6/6/31.

<sup>63</sup> See the Eugenical News for 1928-1935. He first attends the 72nd meeting in January 1929 as a guest of the Society. By June 1930 he was a member of the Galton. See Eugenical News 15 #6 (June 1930) p. 79.

genetics, he went on to stress the effects of the social environment on evolution.<sup>64</sup>

Osborn believed that the factors relating to the effect of the social environment on human evolution were "lagging behind to an extent which seriously endangers the advance of practical Eugenics." Osborn went on to say that the current trends in human evolution were still not well understood. "Until some clearer knowledge is obtained... the efforts of practical eugenics ... [will be] much handicapped."<sup>65</sup>

Osborn believed that the eugenics movement would "ultimately stand or fall" on the validity of practical eugenic proposals. In this regard, he vigorously defended the "important studies" of Harry Laughlin, E.S. Gosney, and Paul Popenoe which advocated a vigorous role for widespread eugenic sterilization. He concluded:

The most effective studies of this sort ever done were the studies and papers of Dr. Laughlin reporting on the effect of immigration into the United States which so greatly influenced Congress in the passage of the acts restricting immigration.<sup>66</sup>

While Ludmerer claims that Osborn used his influence to replace "men like Grant and Laughlin" with "individuals of

---

<sup>64</sup> Eugenical News 15 #8 (August 1930) pp. 111-15. "The Field of Eugenic Research," address read before the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Eugenics Research Association, Hotel McAlpin, New York, 17 May 1930 by Frederick Osborn.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid. p. 114.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid. 115.

more balanced views,"<sup>67</sup> the fact is that there was a good deal of mutual admiration between Harry Laughlin and Frederick Osborn. Osborn and Laughlin worked closely together in the thirties running the Eugenics Research Association and publishing the Eugenical News.<sup>68</sup> In praising a manuscript, "Social Eugenics," which Osborn had prepared for the Eugenics Research Association, Laughlin commented that "the science of eugenics is greatly indebted to you" for this "fine piece of work." Laughlin was particularly impressed with Osborn's work on differential fecundity. "When all is said and done," he wrote to Osborn in 1932, what really counts is the differential birth-rate "between fine stocks and races on the one hand and incompetent and degenerate races and stocks on the other."<sup>69</sup>

That Osborn admired Laughlin is clear from their correspondence throughout the thirties. They worked closely together on a number of projects and Osborn praised Laughlin's work both publicly and privately. How much Osborn actually thought of Laughlin is partially revealed in a letter to Laughlin written in 1937. Osborn and Laughlin were involved in helping to set up the Pioneer Fund, a

---

<sup>67</sup> Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society, (Baltimore 1972) p. 174.

<sup>68</sup> Osborn was the Treasurer and Laughlin was the Secretary of Eugenics Research Association. There is a good deal of correspondence between them in both the Laughlin and Osborn Papers.

<sup>69</sup> Laughlin to Osborn, 11/17/32; Osborn to Laughlin 1/4/33. Laughlin Papers, Kirksville, MO.



eugenics foundation established in 1937 with funds from Wycliffe Draper, a New England textile manufacturer.<sup>70</sup> One of the first projects of the Fund was to give cash grants to junior flying officers of superior quality "whose income limits the number of children" they can afford. Laughlin was so excited about the project he was thinking of running it himself.

Osborn wrote to Laughlin that "I think it would be a great mistake in generalship for you to try it. ... It would be like a general, responsible for the strategy of the army, wanting himself to drive one of the tanks in the attack."

You and I are exactly in the position of the general. We have long experience and contacts with people who are supplying the sinews of war. We know the strategy required. And it is our job to find the men specially trained to carry out that strategy....

---

<sup>70</sup> The Pioneer Fund supported the AES through the 1950s. The Pioneer Fund today is closely associated with Jesse Helms multi-million dollar political machine. In 1985, The Washington Post reported that Thomas F. Ellis, a close associate of Jesse Helms and a former director of the Pioneer Fund, was co-founder of Fairness in Media and Chairman of the Coalition for Freedom. Harry F. Weyher, director of the Pioneer Fund, was lead council for Fairness in Media. The Pioneer Fund continues to support very controversial studies aimed at proving racial differences in intelligence and character. See, "CBS Fight a Litmus for Conservatives: Helms Group Faces Legal Hurdles in Ideological Takeover Bid," The Washington Post (Sunday, 31 March 1985) p. 1, A16; "Fund Backs Controversial Studies of 'Racial Betterment'," New York Times (11 December 1977) and "Tax Exempt Fund Promotes Theory of Black Inferiority," St. Louis Post-Dispatch (11 December 1977) p. 6G.

It is the same thing in many of the activities of the Record Office in which I am so much interested. If we can get you the backing so that you can have a real staff to direct, you can win some real battles. ...<sup>71</sup>

Osborn was a member of the Board of Directors of the Carnegie Institution of New York and the Milbank Memorial Fund, and had numerous connections with executives of major east coast foundations. In May 1933, he wrote a revealing "Memorandum on the Eugenics Situation in the United States" for "the Rockefeller interests." In that memorandum he noted that the "rediscovery of Mendel... and the marvelous development of a science of genetics in the succeeding years distracted attention from the social and psychological studies necessary for a broad base in eugenics."<sup>72</sup>

Particularly in this country under the leadership of Davenport at Cold Spring Harbor, the relationship between genetics and eugenics was over-stressed, and studies in the mechanism of human heredity were carried forward too rapidly and published as evidence in the cause of eugenics without sufficient experimental support, in regard to their application to man, so that eugenics came into disrepute with such sound men as T. H. Morgan of California, and Jennings of Johns-Hopkins.

Osborn believed that eugenics propaganda was being disseminated that was not in line with the knowledge base of eugenics. "Excellent and carefully considered proposals

---

<sup>71</sup> Osborn to Laughlin, written from Heathcote Farm, Princeton, no date approximately May 1937 (Osborn was attending his son's graduation from Princeton). Harry Laughlin Papers, Kirksville, Missouri.

<sup>72</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Memorandum on the Eugenics Situation in the United States," 24 May 1933, AES Papers, p. 1

were outlined" by the AES advisory council but were not carried out. By 1930 the American Eugenics Society had a large budget without corresponding sources of income and a large number of proposals that lacked adequate scientific basis.

Osborn specifically criticized Davenport for hampering Laughlin and concluded that eugenics in America was "at a low ebb" and "lacked a sense of direction." He also believed that "some of the personalities in the older societies are far less in touch with the movement in eugenical research and the new needs." He was specifically referring to the new work being done in sociology, psychology, and demography. Osborn concluded that the Eugenics Research Association and the American Eugenics Society needed new leadership, and he urged the Rockefeller Foundations to hold off funding eugenics projects until a clearer direction emerged.<sup>73</sup>

Osborn had praise for three men: Henry Perkins, Harry Laughlin, and Henry Pratt Fairchild. Perkins was praised for bringing conservative leadership to the AES. Laughlin was described as "a thoroughly competent man of real ability" and Fairchild as a "moderate" who "works well with others of more technical experience."<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> It is not clear that this memorandum was ever sent or to whom it might have been intended.

<sup>74</sup> Davenport, on the other hand did not think highly of Fairchild and opposed his nomination to the nominating

By 1935 Osborn and his allies were able to take over the Society. Osborn brought Frank Notestein, from the Milbank Memorial Fund, and Warren S. Thompson, president of the Scripps Foundation, into the AES. He personally supervised the revision of the constitution and by-laws of the Society, doing away with its advisory council and revamping its organizational structure. By 1936, Ellsworth Huntington could report that membership was climbing and the financial situation was considerably improved.<sup>75</sup>

In 1940, Osborn published Preface to Eugenics, a college text book, which summed up the ideological changes which have come to be referred to as the "new" eugenics. The essential goal of eugenics remained the same: to control human reproduction to "cast out the worst" and "to continue the normal or superior."<sup>76</sup> Thus, the basic program of positive and negative eugenics remained intact. Psychologists and sociologists were, according to Osborn, "in substantial agreement that differences in environment alone are not sufficient to account for the variations in level of intelligence shown by the deviates at the upper and

---

committee. Fairchild, Davenport wrote Osborn, was more interested in the control "of the number of people in the population" than in "the hereditary difference between peoples." Davenport to Osborn, 6/2/32. Davenport Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

<sup>75</sup> Minutes, 6/7/36.

<sup>76</sup> Frederick Osborn, Preface to Eugenics (New York 1940) p. ix.

lower extremes."<sup>77</sup> While environment might affect the outcome basically, "individuals who are bright progress rapidly through the schools" and "included most of those who enter the professions and assume responsible executive positions in business and public affairs."<sup>78</sup> Condensing eugenic wisdom into a nutshell, Osborn wrote, "The whole range of general intelligence, including feeble-mindedness, average intelligence, and genius is due to beggarly, average, and rich assortments of many gene alternatives."<sup>79</sup>

There has been a general confusion regarding the relationship of the "new" eugenics to sterilization. While it is true that the ideal as stated by Osborn in 1940 was that every adult should be free to choose the size of family they wanted, this did not apply to the those who were clearly hereditary defectives. In other words, the "new" eugenics did not redefine the Society's policy on sterilization. "Geneticists," according to Osborn, were in general agreement that "the inadequacy of a number of genes contributes to feeble-mindedness, and that the inheritance is recessive in at least some clinical types."<sup>80</sup> The

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid. p. 14. Compare this to Laughlin's statement made in 1932 on page 116 that what really counts is the birth differential between "fine stocks and races" and "degenerate races and stocks." The difference is that Osborn does not use terms such as "stocks" and "races" with regard to human populations.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid. p. 10.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid. p. 17.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid. p. 18.

feeble-minded constitute the greatest social and eugenical problem group. "They usually arise in families whose adjustment to society is unsatisfactory, occur often several to a family, and recur in the same family lines."<sup>81</sup>

Osborn explained that the absolute prevention of births among all definitely feeble-minded persons would result in a reduction of between one-tenth and one-third per generation. Even at the lower figure this would be an "enormous" savings in money and social injury. The feeble-minded, morons, idiots, and imbeciles<sup>82</sup> "swell the ranks of unskilled labor, and in times of stress are a direct burden on society."<sup>83</sup> Osborn quoted one government estimate that claimed there were 1.5 million feeble-minded people in the U.S.<sup>84</sup> Of course, the number of carriers of the recessive genes for feeble-mindedness was much greater than the number of actual cases "so that a great number of feeble-minded persons are born of parents of 'borderline' or dull-normal capacity."<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid. p. 15.

<sup>82</sup> A moron is a high grade idiot; an idiot is a high grade imbecile.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid. p. 17.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid. p. 18. National Resources Committee. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938. "Problems of a Changing Population."

<sup>85</sup> Ibid. p. 18.

It should be possible quite rapidly to educate the public to accept the principle that feeble-minded persons not be permitted to have children, for, quite apart from the hereditary consequences, it is a tragic injustice to children to be reared by feeble-minded parents. ... Sterilization on leaving institutional care, or the absolute prevention of marriage, would be a substantial forward step.<sup>86</sup>

There remained the "graver problem" of the idiots and morons for whom there was no easy solution. "We may hope that sometime in the future science may find some way to diagnose carriers of hereditary defect of this sort." Until that time "the only acceptable course" is to discourage "persons of obviously low grade mentality, likely in any event to give their children a poor bringing-up," from having large families. Every effort had to be made to encourage them in the use of contraceptives. The "complete solution to the problem of the feeble-minded was far in the future." But "we can hardly be forgiven if... we fail to reduce this sad burden of our own and future generations."<sup>87</sup>

Another large category of mental defectives that Osborn believed needed to be sterilized were those with hereditary mental disorders such as those suffering from schizophrenia and manic depressive psychosis. As with the feeble-minded "great results can be achieved" even "with the rudimentary and acceptable methods which have been described above, it should be possible to reduce the number of... schizophrenics

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid. p. 19.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

and manic-depressives" by 150,000 per generation for several generations to come.<sup>88</sup>

In 1935, Osborn had estimated between 700,000 and two million people were definitely "carriers of serious hereditary defect" and another two or three million were "probable" carriers of serious hereditary defect. At this extreme "we must work towards a complete elimination of births." While every effort to prevent these people from breeding ought to be made, this would not solve the eugenics problem. Eugenics would only be effective if it could reach the other 95 percent of the population with positive eugenic measures. "It is unlikely that a direct measure of genetic quality will ever be available for the majority of our people." Yet, it is the "differential birth rate among this 95 per cent which will ultimately make or mar our civilization."<sup>89</sup>

Since there was no scientific measure of genetic quality for the large majority of the population who fell between the extremes of feeble-mindedness and genius "we must fall back on the measure of some outward characteristic or group of characteristics, hoping that on average they will be indicative of genetic qualities as well." Osborn

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid. p. 36.

<sup>89</sup> Frederick Osborn, "The Basis of Eugenic Selection," Eugenical News 21:4 (July-August 1936) pp. 69-73.



suggested some evaluation of the quality of the home and the I.Q.<sup>90</sup>

From about 1934 on Osborn began to argue that we "have no real evidence concerning differences in central tendency or in general distribution curves for hereditary mental capacities between whites and Negroes."<sup>91</sup> In a major policy speech in 1937, Osborn said that eugenicists had been too "dogmatic" about the categories of defectives particularly with regard to race and class. It "would be unwise for eugenists to impute superiorities or inferiorities of a biological nature to social classes, to regional groups, or to races as a whole."

Scientists in recent years have made pretty careful studies of this question of superiority and inferiority. They are not at all sure that any races or social classes in this country are above or below others in biological capacity for developing socially valuable qualities. But they are sure that even if there are differences between the average biological qualities for developing socially valuable qualities they are small compared to the much greater differences existing between individuals. Eugenics should therefore operate on the basis of individual selection. ... Fortunately, the selection desirable from the point of view of heredity appears to coincide with the selection desirable from the environmental point of view.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> Frederick Osborn and Frank Lorimer, Dynamics of Population (New York 1934) p. 227.

<sup>92</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Implications of the New Studies in Population and Psychology for the Development of Eugenic Philosophy," Eugenical News 22 #6 (November-December 1937) pp. 104-106, quote is on p. 107.

Osborn's views on this matter became official Society policy in 1939 with the publication of the editorial "The American Concept of Eugenics." The editorial began with the admonition that it is "clearly the responsibility of physicians and public health officials to discourage childbearing among hereditary defectives."

But the gradual diminution of defective genes will not greatly improve the average person's capacity for developing intelligence and socially valuable traits of personality.... Differences in these genetic factors were once attributed to various occupational, regional, or racial groups. Now we know that there is hardly any scientific evidence of innate differences in large groups.... It seems therefore clear that the eugenic program must be directed to influencing births among individuals, rather than among groups or classes, with particular emphasis on increasing births among parents whose socially valuable qualities rise above their neighbors', in whatever environment they may be found.<sup>93</sup>

While the new focus of eugenic selection was squarely on the individual and no racial or social group per se had a monopoly on genetic qualities of value, this did not mean that the differential fertility increase of Indians and Mexicans could be looked upon with favor. According to Osborn Negroes constituted 19.3% of the population in 1790, 14.1% in 1860 and 9.7% in 1940. This was a trend which presented no problems from Osborn's perspective. On the other hand Indians and Mexicans were reproducing at a rate sufficient to double their numbers each generation. "The

---

<sup>93</sup> Osborn, "The American Concept of Eugenics," Eugenical News 24 #1 (March, 1939) p. 2.

Indian no longer needs protection against extinction. The present problem of the Indian is that such a rapidly expanding group cannot much longer continue to grow in the limited space allotted to it."

There were 332,000 Indians in the United States in 1930, and something over 1,400,000 Mexicans. In sixty years if their present rates of reproduction continue, their combined numbers would about equal that of the American Negro. Thus a new racial problem threatens to grow to dangerous proportions before the public becomes aware of it.

These problems are not eugenic, so far as we know at present, but they are a matter of grave social concern, since racial problems are accentuated by any tendency of minority groups to increase at the expense of the majority. An acceptable eugenic program would be of a sort which would tend to equalize any disproportion between the natural increase of whites, blacks, Indians, and Mexicans.<sup>94</sup>

The ideological characteristics of the new eugenics have not been fully appreciated. There was a recognition that genetics alone could not justify or guide a eugenic program. To some extent the changes in the society involved a changing of the guard, particularly, in regard to Charles Davenport. But Harry Laughlin and Henry P. Fairchild, men usually associated with the "old" eugenics were clearly

---

<sup>94</sup> Osborn, Preface to Eugenics (New York 1940) p. 118-19. There was no plea to increase the falling Negro population. Osborn's estimates are not far off the mark. The 1980 census indicates that 11.2 percent of the population are Afro-American. Native Americans (including Eskimos and Aleutians) compose 6 percent of the population. Hispanics are 6.4 percent of the population. Thus, the Native American and Hispanic population actually compose a larger portion of the population than Afro-Americans. See The New York Times summary of the 1980 census, 6 September 1981, p. E5.

leaders of the the so-called "new eugenics." Furthermore, the new approach was clearly rooted in traditional eugenic ideology. The leaders of the 1930s sought to incorporate sociological, psychological, and particularly demographic studies into the eugenics program, and there was a new emphasis on positive eugenics. But the goals of the Society in relation to negative eugenics remained unchanged.

Thus, the new eugenics of the 1930s differs significantly from the portrait of the new eugenics sketched by Mark Haller, Kenneth Ludmerer, and Daniel Kevles. I believe these historians were misled by Frederick Osborn, and more subtly by an unconscious Whiggism that views the development of genetics as progress and assumes that the racism of the early eugenics movement was an aberration.

It is clearly not the case that Osborn came into the eugenics movement "suddenly and unexpectedly," drove out the racists, and reorganized American eugenics. His goals for eugenics between 1937 and 1940 differed very little from those of Harry Laughlin in 1920. In fact, throughout the 1930s, Osborn worked closely with Harry Laughlin. These two men shared a vision of eugenics which was rooted in the 1920s. The changes that occurred in American eugenics between 1920 and 1940 were moderate changes, mostly accommodations to new knowledge, technology, and social conditions.

Osborn was acutely sensitive to the failure of pre-war eugenics. He lived through the frustrations and failures of the 1930s and later the devastating revelations of the post-war period. It was his sensitivity to the vulnerability of eugenics, especially after the Holocaust, that led him to rewrite the history of pre-war eugenics.

## Chapter Four

## The American Eugenics Society: a Prosopography.

This chapter is an examination the leadership of the American Eugenics Society from 1923 to 1935. The purpose of the chapter is twofold: First, to show that for the period in question the leadership of the society remained stable; second, to show the extent of the influence of the movement in various professional and academic fields.

Kenneth Ludmerer has claimed that during this period physicians were losing interest in eugenics.<sup>1</sup> Bently Glass has written that biologist and geneticists were abandoning the eugenics movement in this period.<sup>2</sup> Frederick Osborn has claimed that this was a period of transition for the society during which individuals of "more balanced views"<sup>3</sup> took up leadership positions in the society. My own analysis shows that the leadership of the society did not change significantly during the period 1923 to 1935.

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) pp. 63 & 166.

<sup>2</sup> Bently Glass, "Geneticists Embattled: Their Stand Against Rampant Eugenics and Racism in America During the 1920s and 1930s," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 130 #1 (1986) pp. 130-154.

<sup>3</sup> Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174. Ludmerer cites correspondence between himself and Frederick Osborn, 5 November 1970. He also cites Mark Haller, Eugenics, pp. 174-75. Making the same point, Haller, too, cites correspondence with Frederick Osborn, 26 May 1959.

This is the first prosopographical study in the history of eugenics. Virtually no information exists on the broad membership of the eugenics movement, and very little information exists on the leadership of the movement, either in the United States, or anywhere else. As a result, I believe, we have seriously underestimated the influence of the eugenics movement in the United States.

More than any other pre-war eugenics organization in the United States, the American Eugenics Society represented the broadest range of eugenics supporters. Unlike the Eugenics Record Office, the Galton Society, the Eugenics Research Association, the Race Betterment Foundation, or other national and regional groups, the American Eugenics Society aimed at being the key networking organization within the eugenics movement. The depression resulted in serious financial problems for the society and a decline in membership from 1260 in 1930 to less than five hundred in 1933.<sup>4</sup> But the society remained active throughout the thirties and had substantially recovered from the depression by 1936.<sup>5</sup> Thus, throughout the 1930s the society remained a vigorous eugenic organization with a large and active membership. Serious decline was not really experienced

---

<sup>4</sup> See Minutes of the American Eugenics Society, 4 June 1932; "Memorandum on the Eugenics Situation in the United States," by Frederick Osborn, 24 May 1933, AES Papers. See also, Frederick Osborn, "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (Spring 1974) p. 117.

<sup>5</sup> Minutes, 7 June 1936. AES Papers.

until the first half of the 1940s. Between 1940 and 1945 the society did little more than to publish the Eugenical News. By the beginning of 1946 the society had less than \$900 dollars in available cash and under three hundred members. By 1960 the society had stabilized at about 400 members, mostly specialists in population problems, medical genetics, and demography.<sup>6</sup>

Its aim in the pre-war era was to bring together specialists and non-specialists of all types into an organization whose goal was to disseminate the eugenics ethic throughout American society. As we have seen this goal required political patrons, religious leaders, teachers, social workers, biologists, lawyers, geneticists, writers, and publicists of all kinds.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, all of these groups were well represented among the membership of the AES. Thus, the American Eugenics Society offers a particularly good sample of eugenics supporters.

In his history of the AES Frederick Osborn remarked that the membership was "a veritable blue book of prominent

---

<sup>6</sup> Frederick Osborn, "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (Spring 1974) pp. 117 and 121.

<sup>7</sup> After the war the eugenics society drastically curtailed its ambitions. The society abandoned all attempts at propaganda and became a professional society whose aim was to bring together demographers, population geneticists, and medical geneticists.



and wealthy men and women."<sup>8</sup> Invitations to join the advisory council were made to a highly select group. Over 97% of the advisory council members are included in various standard biographies of prominent Americans. They were prominent in all fields of endeavor including business, academia, and politics. The advisory council of the AES included wealthy bankers, financiers, and manufacturers. Among its politicians were senators, congressmen, and governors. Among its religious leaders were nationally and internationally known figures. Its membership included influential leaders of major philanthropic foundations. And among its professors were the elite of America's social scientists -- men and women who trained large numbers of students and often significantly determined the development of their respective specialties.

This chapter examines the membership of the advisory council of the AES and the board members from 1923 (when the advisory council was first established) until 1935 (when the advisory council was replaced with a simpler structure which

---

<sup>8</sup> Frederick Osborn, "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (Spring 1974) pp. 115-126, p. 117. Osborn also remarked that there were "only a minimum number of professional people in scientific fields actually related to eugenics." He goes on to say that over the next thirty years "a remarkable change" took place. This is not really true. The membership in 1930, as we shall see, contained many of the nation's most outstanding scientists, social scientists, and physicians. It is true that the membership declined dramatically after the war leaving only a core of academics from specialized fields such as demography and population genetics. But this change was not, as Osborn suggests, an evolution beginning in the thirties.

included a president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and a twenty member board of directors). Thus, from 1923 to 1935 the AES Board of Directors and advisory council numbered between 100 and 110 members. The entire database includes 156 individuals for the period 1923 to 1935.<sup>9</sup>

This group represents the core membership of the movement. These people were among the society's -- and the movement's -- most active and committed members.<sup>10</sup> Some thirty percent of the advisory council served on one or more of the organizations committees.<sup>11</sup> Council members were also leaders of other eugenic organizations. For example, E.S. Gosney, a member of the advisory council from 1928 to 1935, was founder of the influential California based Human Betterment Foundation. J.H. Kellogg, council member from 1923 to 1935, was founder and director of the Race Betterment Foundation, and Irving Fisher, a founding member of the AES and active member of the council was also a

---

<sup>9</sup> Those included in the statistical analysis are listed with an asterisk in the appendix.

<sup>10</sup> In a few cases, very elderly members of the advisory council simply lent their names to the organization and the cause of eugenics. Herman Biggs, for example, joined the council in the year of his death and was apparently a member in name only. Charles Eliot was 89 when he joined, and apparently he was not very active in the society. But on the whole the advisory council was quite active. It was literally bombarded with drafts of committee reports and society publications. When the members were asked to comment on the new constitution and by-laws in 1923 they received over forty responses!

<sup>11</sup> Forty-six members of the 156 individuals making up the advisory council data base served on committees.

founder of the Life Extension Institute and a director of the scientific advisory board of the ERO. Of course, people like Charles Davenport, Harry Laughlin, Madison Grant, Henry Fairfield Osborn, Roswell Johnson, and E.G. Conklin were ubiquitous in the eugenics movement.

Other members of the advisory council served in a similar capacity on the boards of related organizations such as the Euthanasia Society of America, the Birth Control League, the Life Extension Institute, or the Population Association of America. Many were also active leaders of related professional organizations such as the American Genetics Association, the National Academy of Sciences, the American Sociological Association, the American Social Hygiene Association, or the Institute of Family Relations in Los Angeles. For example, among the AES Advisory Council there were five presidents of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).<sup>12</sup> Still others were directors of important foundations. Warren Thompson, for example, was Director of the Scripps Foundation; and Frederick Osborn was a member of the Board of the Carnegie Institution of New York, the Milbank Memorial Fund, and later Director of the Rockefeller funded Population Council; Steward Paton was trustee of the Carnegie Institution of

---

<sup>12</sup> William H. Welch (1906); David Starr Jordan (1909); Charles W. Eliot (1914); Henry Fairfield Osborn (1928) and E.G. Conklin (1936).

Washington; and John C. Merriam was president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

The society was also supported by America's financial elite. It was quite common in the eugenics movement to find moderately wealthy members of the upper class taking a personal interest in eugenics. Francis Galton, Jon Alfred Mjoen, and Frederick Osborn are the most prominent examples of wealthy men who dedicated their lives to furthering eugenics. In America eugenics was supported by the financial elite both directly and through major foundations. Both John D. Rockefeller Jr. and George Eastman, although not members of the AES Council, were major donors to the society.<sup>13</sup> Mrs. E.H. Harriman and her daughter Mary Rumsey both served on the advisory council and generously supported the society. Mrs. Harriman was heir to one of America's largest fortunes at the time when her husband Edward H. Harriman died in 1909 leaving her a fortune estimated at between seventy and one hundred million dollars.

The society had other generous and wealthy supporters among the banking and manufacturing community. Three in particular stand out for their dedication to the society and the cause of eugenics. First, there was Frank Babbott, Brooklyn director and trustee of the Long Island Railroad,

---

<sup>13</sup> See Eugenical News 11 #7 (July 1926) p. 98 and #8 (August 1926) p. 125. George Eastman donated \$10,000 in 1925 and a similar amount in 1926. Rockefeller donated \$5,000 in both 1925 and 1926.

several New York elevated railways, and the Brooklyn Savings Bank. Babbott took time from his business commitments to serve both as a member of the AES finance committee and, in 1927, as president of the Eugenics Record Office. The second was Frank Garrett, partner in Robert Garrett and Sons, a banking firm, and director of some half dozen other banks and insurance companies. Garrett too, served on the AES finance committee and took a personal interest in the society's welfare. Finally, there was C.M. Goethe, a major figure in Northern California branch of the AES.<sup>14</sup> Goethe, an admirer of Adolf Hitler, used his platform as president of the Eugenics Research Association between 1936 and 1937 to plead for support of Nazi eugenics.<sup>15</sup>

A number of scholars have contended that the eugenics movement underwent dramatic changes between 1920 and 1940.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Goethe was particularly active in the anti-immigration movement. He founded the Immigration Study Commission which was one of the major organizations campaigning against Mexican immigration in the period 1925-1939. He was active in the American Genetics Association and Population Reference Bureau. He worked closely with E.S. Gosney and Paul Popenoe, serving as a Trustee of the Human Betterment Foundation. Finally, he was active in numerous civic organizations such as the Sacramento Council of Churches, the Sacramento Playground Society, Sacramento Mental Health Association, Sacramento State College and the Save the Redwoods League.

<sup>15</sup> See "Report of the President of the American Eugenics Society," (26 June 1926); Eugenical News 11 #3 (March 1926); for Goethe's defense of Hitler see, "Patriotism and Racial Standards," Eugenical News 21 #4 (July-August 1936) pp. 65-69 and "Eugenics and Geography," Eugenical News 22 #3 (May-June 1937) p. 47.

<sup>16</sup> See, for example, Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174; Mark Haller,

Some have seen the eugenics movement moving from an 'old' eugenics to a 'new' eugenics, the old eugenics referring to the period between 1900 and 1920 when men like Charles Davenport and Harry Laughlin were prominent leaders. The old eugenics movement, according to this interpretation, rested on simplistic notions of genetics and reflected a strong nationalist, conservative and even racist bias. "By the middle of the decade [of the thirties]," Ludmerer writes, "the 'old' eugenics movement collapsed. Undaunted by its failure, a new leadership, genuinely interested in mankind's genetic future, assumed the task of rebuilding it. They rejected the class and race biases of their predecessors, admitted the foolishness of earlier eugenicists' biological pronouncements, and propounded a new eugenics creed which was both scientifically and philosophically attuned to a changed America."<sup>17</sup>

Others have claimed that the change was from eugenics to population control. As Garland Allen has written,

---

Eugenics (New Brunswick 1963) p. 174. Garland Allen, "From Eugenics to Population Control," Science for the People (July/August 1980) pp. 22-28; Daniel Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics (New York 1985) pp. 164-175; Frederick Osborn, "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (Spring 1974) pp. 115-126.

<sup>17</sup> Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174. Kevles makes a similar statement that "reform" eugenics replaced mainline eugenics because "advances in anthropology, psychology, and genetics had utterly destroyed the 'scientific' underpinnings of mainline doctrine." Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics (New York 1986) p. 170.

... the eugenics movement underwent a gradual but significant metamorphosis between 1920 and 1940 - a metamorphosis which, as in insect life cycles, caused the outward structure to appear very different while leaving the inner core largely unchanged. The new eugenic thinking took the form of the population control movement...<sup>18</sup>

Still others have emphasized the development of "reform" eugenics which they have contrasted with "classical" eugenics.<sup>19</sup> Frederick Osborn claimed that there was a significant change in the advisory council after 1930. "The scientists who were officers and members of the board in 1930 were in general heavily involved with large general ideas based on subjective evaluations, and with a strong propagandist bent."<sup>20</sup>

An examination of the collective biographies of the 156 leading members of the AES sheds light on these various interpretations of the changes which took place within the eugenics movement between 1920 and 1935. All the above interpretations have some merit, although an examination of the eugenics leadership indicates a great deal more coherence and continuity than is implied by the various historical interpretations. The AES Advisory Council did

---

<sup>18</sup> Garland Allen, "From Eugenics to Population Control," Science for the People (July/August 1980) pp. 22-28, quote on page 22.

<sup>19</sup> See Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics (New York 1985) pp. 164-176.

<sup>20</sup> Frederick Osborn, "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (Spring 1974) pp. 117-8.

not change dramatically in composition between 1923 and 1935. First of all, nearly 40% of the group were members for the entire period 1923 to 1935.<sup>21</sup> Very few people actually resigned and the overall composition of the society remained quite stable. Within the AES in the thirties there existed a diversity of opinions and political orientations. There was a shift in orientation towards a more sociological view of eugenics and a greater emphasis on positive eugenics. There also developed advocates within the society for population and birth control. But careful reading of the catechisms of the society produced between 1923 and 1935 suggest very little substantial change in major policy and orientation.<sup>22</sup>

The depression caused membership to decrease and sources of money to dry up. Some of the most outspoken leaders of the early eugenics movement, such as Charles Davenport, C.G. Campbell, Madison Grant, Harry Olson, H.J. Banker, and Lucien Howe, either died or resigned in the early and mid-thirties. These resignations coincided with a shift in emphasis to a more sociological view of eugenics.

---

<sup>21</sup> A total of sixty-one individuals. Among this group were many of the leaders of the so-called "new" or "reform" eugenics such as Lewellys Barker, Ellsworth Huntington, and Charles Stockard.

<sup>22</sup> Compare, for example, the very first lengthy statement of purpose prepared by the society, "Report of the Subcommittee on the Ultimate Program to be Developed by the Eugenics Society of the United States." Eugenical News, 8 #8 (August 1923) pp. 73-80, with the last lengthy catechism Ellsworth Huntington's Tomorrow's Children (New York 1935).



But the sociological perspective was there all along as was the reform-minded leadership dominated by politically and socially progressive individuals. While some of the leaders of the AES were politically conservative, the dominant majority were politically progressive.

Of the 156 members of the society composing the database I have obtained biographical information on 151 members (or 96.8%) of this group.<sup>23</sup> This in itself reveals something of the nature of the group. Virtually all members of the council were prominent enough to be included in standard biographical sources.

This group consisted primarily of academics and physicians - particularly public health officials. Some 30% were biologists, zoologists, or geneticists; 20% were physicians, 12% were psychologists and 9% were sociologists. There were also two governors, two senators, and a congressman, nine college presidents, five anthropologists, five writers and editors, and four clergymen. The advisory council does not represent the composition of the Eugenics movement membership at large. A detailed study of the rank

---

<sup>23</sup> I was unable to obtain biographical data on the following members of the group: W. S. Anderson, Professor of Genetics at the University of Kentucky (limited information); Minnie Cumnock Blodgett, wife of John Blodgett, a wealthy lumberman listed in Who Was Who in America; Alexander Coxe (no information at all); Mrs. Wortham James; and Domingo F. Ramos, Professor of Medicine at the University of Havana, Cuba.

and file of the eugenics movement has not been undertaken here.

The advisory council also represents a biased sample of the leadership of the AES. For example, in 1930 the AES published a pamphlet, "What I Think About Eugenics." The pamphlet consisted of statements on eugenics by 144 prominent eugenic supporters and was obviously meant to accompany a pamphlet entitled "Eugenics at Work" which was used to plead for membership and donations. Thus, "What I Think" had a different purpose from the advisory council. Nearly 30% of this group were college presidents. While there were only nine college professors and six physicians, there were nineteen clergymen. Once again there were only four prominent politicians.<sup>24</sup>

Academics and public health officials made ideal advisory council members since they were the most likely to have the time and expertise to respond to the numerous requests for comments on reports and proposals issued by the various committees of the society. The AES Advisory Council was clearly not constituted to serve merely as an impressive letterhead. Members of the council were constantly being called upon to read and comment on society literature, join committees and attend meetings.

---

<sup>24</sup> See "Eugenics At Work," (1931) and "What I Think About Eugenics," (no date, circa 1931) AES Papers.

We must realize therefore that our sample of members of the advisory council represents a very specific sample of eugenicists and we must be careful in whatever generalizations we make. For example, there were many very prominent politicians, Herbert Hoover, Theodore Roosevelt, and Calvin Coolidge among them, who supported eugenics. But politicians may not have been considered the best people for the advisory council. Since eugenics was a controversial movement, the politicians themselves may have wanted to play a less prominent role.

The large number of academics would also tend to give the society a more scholarly coloring. And the large numbers of public health officials reflected the genuine belief that eugenics was an integral part of public health.<sup>25</sup> At a time when one of the foremost problems of the movement was to counter the idea that eugenics was a bizarre fad - scholars in various fields with a scattering of prominent names were probably the best mix the society could aim for.

In a pamphlet aimed at impressing a potential donor or member, college presidents and clergymen were thought to be a better mix. But College presidents are notoriously busy people and though one might get a statement out of them it would be difficult to get them to participate actively in an

---

<sup>25</sup> See, William Allan, "The Relationship of Eugenics to Public Health," Eugenical News 21 #4 (July-August 1936) pp. 73-75.

advisory capacity. Nevertheless, the AES Advisory Council contained the presidents of Harvard, Cornell, Barnard, Antioch, Smith, Wellesley, Stanford, the University of California, and Boston University.

Although information on ancestry is more difficult to obtain than information on employment or family status for the eighty-one individuals for whom family ancestry information was available (52% of the group), it is clear that sixty-one were from "old" American stock (at least three generations). Nearly half this group had families dating back to the 17th century<sup>26</sup> (47%), and over sixty percent had families dating back at least to the 18th century<sup>27</sup> (62%). Of the thirteen foreign born members of the Council seven came from England and Scotland and three from Canada. Only two, the German-educated Aaron Rosanoff (born in Russia) and Ales Hdrdlicka (born in Bohemia), came from central or eastern Europe. In 1935, Milton Winternitz, Dean of the Yale Medical School from 1920 to 1935, joined the newly formed Board of Directors as the sole representative of East European Jewry. It is telling that Winternitz was notorious for ruthlessly restricting Jewish admissions to Yale, avidly seeking admission to restricted

---

<sup>26</sup> A total of thirty-eight individuals.

<sup>27</sup> A total of fifty individuals.

clubs and neighborhoods and identifying himself with  
nativist sentiment.<sup>28</sup>

Thus, the group was very much old American and Western European in origin. It was both a professional and social elite. It was particularly this group that feared the extinction of the old American stock and called for larger families among the "better" classes. They specifically called for at least four children per family from the better stocks. Indeed, among all the evils in America, the worst, according to Theodore Roosevelt, was "the diminishing birth rate among the old native American stock." Roosevelt could scarcely contain himself when it came to "willful sterility." For Roosevelt, "such a creature merits contempt as hearty as any visited upon the soldier who runs away in battle." Celibacy is "more debasing" and "more destructive" than any ordinary vice. It is "not one whit better than polygamy."<sup>29</sup>

The members of the council were in agreement that the better classes had to have families of at least four

---

<sup>28</sup> Dan A. Oren, Joining the Club: A History of Jews at Yale (New Haven 1985) pp 136-150. See review by A.J. Sherman, "Cowardice Versus Democracy," in Times Literary Supplement (8 August 1986).

<sup>29</sup> Letter to Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, 8/11/99. The Letters and Friendships of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, ed. Stephen Gwynn (New York 1929) I, 293; Presidential Addresses (New York 1910), III, 288; "Race Decadence," Outlook, XCVII (4/18/11), 766. Quoted from Thomas F. Gossett, "The Idea of Anglo-Saxon Superiority in American Thought, 1865-1915," PHD Thesis, University of Minnesota, 1953, p.338.

children. "Even the three-child families are not large enough to provide an increase," they noted. Furthermore, there is "no better preparation for life than the rough and tumble of a large family." Studies, the AES claimed in a major policy statement, have shown that single child families "tend toward maladjustment."<sup>30</sup>

The Eugenics Society took pains to point out that among Harvard and Yale graduates "the average number of children decreases with almost perfect regularity from the members accounted most useful and truly successful... to those deemed least successful." This tendency was due to the simple fact that the more successful men earn good incomes at an early age and "feel more certain that they will be able to provide for their families." In the elite social orders where birth control is widely practiced the size of one's family depends upon "socially valuable qualities such as success in one's occupation, love of children, and willingness to make sacrifices for others rather than upon mere animal passions. Of course, there are some "of the highest type" who remain childless due to "health, misfortune or the cumulative effect of our imperfect social system."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> E. Huntington, Tomorrow's Children (New York 1935) pp.12-14.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. p. 49.

The society's literature is filled with such statements. There existed a kind of schizophrenia within the society. On the one hand, the very best types both came from large families and had large families. On the other hand, the extinction of the Mayflower descendants and of the better classes in general was an obsessive theme in AES literature. It is therefore curious to learn that nearly 25% of the group produced no progeny at all and that fully 77.5% of the group had less than four children. The mean number of children per family for the advisory council was 2.29.

Of the 104 members of the advisory council and Board of Directors in 1923, the mean age was 55.4 years with a standard deviation of 10.7 years. The ages ranged from 28 for Arthur Estabrook to 89 for Charles W. Eliot with 65% of the group falling within the 45 to 75 years range. Translated into year of birth, 65% of the group were born between 1848 and 1878. The membership aged slightly by 1930 with the mean age at 58.7 years and the standard deviation at 9.8 years. Thus, for the 1930 group 65% fell within the range 49 and 69 with Estabrook still the youngster of the group at 35 and Charles Gould the eldest at 81. The range of birth dates now spanned 1861 to 1881. In other words more than half the leading eugenicists in this sample could remember America before the great deluge of immigration that began in the 1880's, and none of them were born in the twentieth century.

Religious and political affiliation for the group present a number of problems for the historian. Individuals often change their religious and political affiliation at various points in their lives. It is therefore uncertain that a person listed as a Republican in his or her obituary was a Republican in 1930. Furthermore, many people simply refuse to classify themselves as Republicans or Democrats despite the fact that they may have had a clear tendency to support one party or the other. In some cases, for example, members whose standard biographies make no mention of political affiliation were closely associated with the Hoover, Coolidge, or Roosevelt administrations. Added to these problems, it is not easy to evaluate the significance of party affiliation. Regional differences and local conditions may have determined party affiliation.

I have not attempted to sort through the many problems that this subject raises. I have simply listed the affiliations that I have been able to uncover with the caveat that we must take generalizations from these data as preliminary. It will take a good deal more work to discover the interaction between American political divisions and eugenics. The literature generally indicates that eugenic support was strongest among the politically progressive middle class. But there were many exceptions to this rule



such as Royal Copeland, Senator from New York, "an avowed and sincere conservative."<sup>32</sup>

I was able to identify 38 Republicans and 15 Democrats. There were 103 members of the group for whom no information on political affiliation was available from the standard biographical sources. Four members identified themselves as "independents" and three as "liberal" or "reform" oriented. Religious affiliation was slightly easier to find: There were 16 Episcopalians, 13 Unitarians, 12 Congregationalists, 9 Presbyterians, 8 Methodists, 5 Baptists, and a few Lutherans and Quakers and 69 unknowns. Of the 156 members there was one Jew<sup>33</sup> and one Catholic.<sup>34</sup> Thus, we might at

---

<sup>32</sup> Mark D. Hirsch, Dictionary of American Biography Supplement 2, p. 121.

<sup>33</sup> Here again we run into problems of definition. Rabbi Louis Mann was definitely Jewish. Addie (Mrs. Otto) Kahn was probably of German Jewish heritage but her religious affiliation is not mentioned in the New York Times obituary. Charles Silberman tells the following story in his recent book, A Certain People: American Jews and Their Lives Today (New York 1985): "The elegant and dashing Otto Kahn, a noted investment banker (Kuhn, Loeb & Co.) and stockholder in the Metropolitan Opera Company, was strolling along Fifth Avenue with the humorist Marshall Wilder, who was a hunchback. Kahn pointed out the church to which he belonged and asked, 'Marshall, did you know that I was once a Jew?' 'Yes, Otto,' Wilder replied, 'and I was once a hunchback'" (page 69). Another member of the council who was undoubtedly of Jewish origin was Aaron Joshua Rosanoff, the psychiatrist. Here again, he is never identified as a Jew in his biographies and obituaries.

<sup>34</sup> There was also a miscellaneous assortment of Protestants. There was, for example, one member of the Church of Christ, a few identified simply as "Protestant" or Christian and one identified as "of French Huguenot descent."

least conclude that the majority of the members were liberal denomination Christians with Republicans outnumbering Democrats on something like a scale of two to one.<sup>35</sup>

Educational information is among the most standard sets of data to be found in biographical sources, and we can be confident that in this area our information is fairly complete and accurate. Nearly Forty percent of the group received a degree from either Harvard, Yale, or Columbia. Twenty-seven members of our group received a degree from Harvard (18%), twenty from Columbia, and fourteen from Yale. Twenty-four more received a degree from Princeton, Johns Hopkins, or Cornell. Thus, over half the group received a degree from one of these six schools. At least Thirty-five members of the group did some sort of post-doctoral or independent study in Europe. Typically, such study included work at one or more of the major centers of European science: Liepzig, Munich, Berlin, Göttingen, Freiburg, Jena, Vienna, London, Paris, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Naples. In many cases they studied with or met the leaders of European Eugenics including Galton, Pearson, Ploetz, Lenz, Bauer, Mjoen, etc. Davenport, for example, met and was influenced by both Galton and Pearson.

---

<sup>35</sup> The Republican and Democratic parties of this period were substantially different from their current counterparts. Specifically, the Republican party of this period was closely identified with the progressive movement. It is not a contradiction to say that the eugenicists of this period were both liberal progressive and Republican.

No summary of statistics can adequately convey the importance of the members of the advisory council and board in the various fields that they dominated. Only by examining the individuals in the groups that made up the AES leadership does one begin to appreciate the range of eugenic influence in these years.

One area that has often been ignored in discussions of eugenics is the intimate relationship between the eugenics movement and the public health movement of this period. Robert Wiebe notes in Search for Order (New York 1967) that the period from 1900 to 1930 was a period of tremendous growth for the medical profession, and "the leading area of this new professionalization of medicine was the area of public health." The new medical professionals, he tells us "descended upon the cities like religious missionaries" spreading the gospel of science. They were also spreading the gospel of eugenics. "The prototype of these missionaries," Wiebe tells us, was Dr. Herman Biggs, a charter member of the Eugenics Committee of the United States and a member of its first advisory council.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Robert Wiebe, The Search for Order (New York 1967) pp. 115-116.

Among the AES leadership influential in the field of public health were Herman Biggs, Philip King Brown, Royal S. Copeland, Hugh S. Cumming, Oscar Dowling, Haven Emerson, Livingston Farrand, Irving Fisher, Eugene Lyman Fisk, Homer Folks, Raymond Fosdick, Winfield Scott Hall, Mary Harriman, Woods Hutchinson, John Newell Hurty, John Harvey Kellogg, Robert L. Owen, Watson Smith Rankin, William F. Snow, Victor C. Vaughan, William H. Welch, and Ray Lyman Wilbur.

Kenneth Ludmerer writes that there was a "tentative alliance" between medicine and eugenics but this was short lived, "by the time of the Second International Congress of eugenics in 1921, the movement had abandoned its attempt to woo physicians." At the same time physicians were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the "shallowness of much of the research being conducted in the field" and wary of the political misuse of this work. By the early thirties a "cloud of opprobrium" hung over the field.<sup>37</sup>

In fact, the field of public health in America was dominated by men who were committed to eugenics. Between 1900 and 1940 eugenics was seen as a fundamental aspect of public health and social hygiene. Among the AES leadership

---

The Eugenical News reported an item from the Journal of the American Medical Association stating that "The Société belge de médecine preventive et d'eugénique" had been founded in Brussels. The aim of the society was to integrate preventive medicine and eugenics. see Eugenical News 14 #12 (December 1929) p. 173.

<sup>37</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) pp. 63 & 166. Ludmerer believes this changed in the late thirties as major advances were made in human genetics. This gave human genetics a start in medicine "which is an ideologically neutral field." As human genetics became a part of medicine it too became ideologically neutral. For a look at contradictory evidence see, Dr. William Allen, "The Relationship of Eugenics to Public Health," Eugenical News 21 #4 (July/August 1936) pp. 73-75. Allen was a pioneer in medical genetics. He argued that, as a result of modern medicine, there was a shift in the causes of sickness and death from infectious to hereditary diseases. Thus, modern preventive medicine had to concentrate on morbid inheritance. The lead article in the same issue praised the "stupendous forward movement" taking place in Nazi Germany. See C.M. Goethe, "Patriotism and Racial Standards," Ibid. pp. 65-69.

influential in the field of public health besides Biggs were probably the dozen most influential leaders of American medicine during the period.

Perhaps the most important figure of all was William H. Welch, one of the guiding lights in the establishment of the Johns Hopkins Medical School, founder and president of the board of directors of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in 1901, a member of the International Health Board, and trustee of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. He was one of the organizers of the National Research Council, and served variously as president of the AAAS, AMA, American Social Hygiene Association, and National Tuberculosis Association. Without a doubt Welch was one of the leading figures not only in public health but in American science generally. Welch was one of the founding members, along with Alexander Graham Bell and Charles Davenport, of the Eugenics Record Office. He served on the original committee of scientific advisors of the ERO from 1912 to 1918 and later on the advisory board of the AES from 1923 to 1930.<sup>38</sup>

Of only slightly less stature and an equally avid supporter of eugenics was Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University and secretary of the Interior under Hoover. He was a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation from

---

<sup>38</sup> See Eugenical News 12 #10 (October 1927) pp. 133-34; 14 #8 (August 1929) p. 113; 15 #3 (March 1930) p. 39; #10 (October 1930) p. 142.

1923 to 1940, and president of the American Social Hygiene Association between 1936 and 1948. He was active in both the American Eugenics Society (from 1923 to 1935) and the Eugenics Research Association. Like many leaders in American public health, Wilbur was concerned with the impact of public health measures on the quality of the race. Like many of his colleagues he believed that public health measures tended to diminish the impact of selection on the weak thus exerting a dysgenic effect on the population. While he vigorously supported the public health movement, he believed that public health measures had to take eugenics into account.<sup>39</sup>

Among the other leaders in the field of public health who served on the AES Advisory Council were: Royal S. Copeland, New York City Commissioner of public health (1918), author of a nationally syndicated health column, and Senator from New York between 1923 and 1938 and a member of the important Senate Immigration Committee; Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon-General of the United States and a leading figure in Pan-American health politics; Oscar Dowling, president of the Louisiana State Board of Health (1910, 12, and 16) and one of the South's leading pioneers in public health, vice-president of the Southern Sociological Congress and founder and editor of the Journal of The Southern Medical Association; Haven Emerson, chief of the New York City

---

<sup>39</sup> See "Child Health and Eugenics," Eugenical News 11 #5 (May 1926) p. 74.

Sanitary Commission and chairman of the Committee on Communicable Diseases of the American Public Health Association and later director of what was to become the Columbia School of Public Health.

There was also Livingston Farrand, president of Cornell University (1921-37), executive secretary of the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis and editor of the American Journal of Public Health. Farrand served on the International Health Board and was chairman of the International Red Cross (1919). Eugene Lyman Fisk, founder of the Life Extension Institute, an organization closely associated with the Eugenics Record Office. Homer Folks, a pioneer in public health care for children in New York and Pennsylvania and chairman of the national Conference on Children in a Democracy (1940). Raymond Fosdick, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, a leading figure in both public health and social hygiene. He was directly involved in the funding of eugenic projects through the Rockefeller Foundation. Winfield Scott Hall, author of "Constructive Eugenics" (1915) and medical director of the Rockefeller-funded Bureau of Social Hygiene, an organization with numerous ties to eugenics;<sup>40</sup> and Woods Hutchinson, State Health Officer for Oregon and best selling author of books and articles on public health issues.

---

<sup>40</sup> Mehler, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers," Mendel Newsletter #16 (November 1978) pp. 6-11.

There was John Newell Hurty, a major figure in Indiana Public Health and president of the American Public Health Association. Hurty was instrumental in passing many public health related laws in Indiana including the nation's first eugenic sterilization law. There was Watson Smith Rankin, president of the American Public Health Association in 1920, dean of the School of Medicine at Wake Forest College,<sup>41</sup> and director of the N.C. State Board of Health from 1909 to 1925. William F. Snow, chief executive of the California State Board of Health until he moved to New York to help found the American Social Hygiene Association<sup>42</sup> and edit the Journal of Social Hygiene (1914-17). Victor C. Vaughan, a member of the governing board of the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation and a member of the advisory committee of the U.S. Health Service. He edited Hygeia, a popular health magazine published by the AMA. He was a leading figure in American medicine, serving as president of the AMA, the Association of American Physicians, and National Tuberculosis Association.<sup>43</sup>

Finally, there were two figures who were among the most important leaders in American Eugenics, Irving Fisher and John Harvey Kellogg, who were major figures in the history

---

<sup>41</sup> Later the Bowman Grey School of Medicine. This school later pioneered the field of medical genetics with grants from the AES.

<sup>42</sup> He was chairman of the Board from 1914 to 1950.

<sup>43</sup> 1914-15; 1909-10 and 1919-20 respectively.



of American public health.<sup>44</sup> Fisher was the first president of the AES, serving between 1923 and 1926. He also served as president of the Eugenics Research Association in 1920 and president of the Third International Congress of Eugenics in 1931. He served as chairman of the Board of both the Life Extension Institute and the Eugenics Record Office. Fisher was chairman of the Committee of One Hundred which lobbied for the establishment of a federal department of health, and he was particularly active in the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis. Kellogg, the inventor of flaked cereal, was the founder of the Race Betterment Foundation, one of America's leading eugenic organizations. He also ran the Battle Creek Sanitarium, which was recognized as one of the world's leading institutions of its kind. Over 300,000 people from all over the world visited his sanitarium during his tenure as director.

From this brief review one can see the numerous and close ties of eugenic leaders with the anti-tuberculosis movement in America. AES Advisory Council members were commonly found among the leadership of the National

---

<sup>44</sup> George Rosen, Preventive Medicine in the United States 1900-1975 (Science History Publications, New York 1975) pp. 14-19. Rosen discusses Fisher's activities and the relationship of public health to progressive ideology but makes no mention of eugenics. See also, Mark Aldrich, "Capital Theory and Racism: From Laissez-Faire to the Eugenics Movement in the Career of Irving Fischer," Review of Radical Political Economics 7 #3 (Fall, 1975) pp. 33-42.

Tuberculosis Association (NTA) and National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis (NASPT).

Livingston Farrand was the executive secretary of the NASPT; Homer Folks was a major figure in both organizations as was Watson Rankin. V.C. Vaughan was president of the NTA (1919-20) and W.H. Welch was president of the NASPT (1910).

One finds the AES Council members in high concentrations in public health congresses both national and international. For example, at the end of 1929 the White House sponsored a "Conference on Child Health and Protection." President Herbert Hoover, an avid eugenicist, called for the conference and appointed its leadership. Among his choices were AES Council members Lyman Wilbur as chairman of the conference; C.C. Carstens as chairman of the section on Handicapped Children; C.C. Jones and Rabbi Louis Mann as general members. It is not surprising that the conference should support the AES campaign for eugenic sterilization and segregation. According to the AES's 1935 catechism, "The report of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection states that among the children alone 850,000 are definitely feeble-minded and 150,000 are epileptic." These numbers were given to support the AES contention that approximately two million Americans were in need of institutional segregation. Furthermore, the White House Conference estimated that 5.65 million persons under

21 years of age in the United States "are intellectually subnormal."<sup>45</sup>

Within the confines of their elite groups they helped informally to direct major projects. The monthly meetings of the Galton Society were held in New York during the twenties and thirties either at the home of Madison Grant or at the American Museum of Natural History. The AES Council naturally composed the majority of the regulars at these meetings.<sup>46</sup> Interlocking directorates meant that programs and plans could be worked out informally. For example, during the monthly meetings of the Galton Society, Clark Wissler, Charles Davenport, Charles Stockard, H.F. Osborn, Edwin Embree, J.C. Merriam and others would discuss projects they would like to see carried out. On one occasion they set up a committee consisting of Davenport, Wissler, Hooton, Grant, Laughlin, F. Osborn and W.K. Gregory to look into a broad project to classify hominidae.<sup>47</sup> The committee was to decide how such a project might be organized and where the funding should be sought. Since members of the committee

---

<sup>45</sup> Huntington, Tomorrow's Children (New York 1935) pp. 28, 41, 43.

<sup>46</sup> Members of the Galton Society who were also members of the AES Advisory Council included: C.C. Brigham, C.H. Danforth, C.B. Davenport, Madison Grant, W. K. Gregory (Executive Committee), E.A. Hooton, J.C. Merriam, H.F. Osborn, Frederick Osborn, Charles R. Stockard (Committee on the Reclassification of Hominidae), T. Lothrop Stoddard, H.H. Wilder, Clark Wissler, Frederick Adams Woods, and R.M. Yerkes.

<sup>47</sup> Eugenical News 16 #7 (July 1931) p. 113.

served on the boards of a number of large foundations they could easily decide which foundation ought to fund which project and then recommend that the project be accepted.

For example, a project to study Australian Aborigines began as a suggestion within the Galton Society. Wissler and Embree were put in charge of looking into the matter. In 1925 Embree and Wissler actually traveled to Australia to set up the project for which Embree had obtained funding from the Rockefeller Foundation. Embree was in a perfect position to arrange for Rockefeller funding since he had been secretary of the Foundation since 1917 and by 1925 was in charge of special projects.<sup>48</sup>

At a later meeting of the society a committee consisting of E. L. Thorndike, Clark Wissler, C. B. Davenport, and Dr. W. V. Bingham were set in charge of promoting a comparative study of Negroes, mulattoes, and whites with reference to their social adaptability. The project, which eventually studied race crossing in Jamaica, was put in the hands of Morris Steggerda. The project on race crossing as well as other projects were discussed during meetings of the Galton Society. The Jamaican project was funded by the Carnegie Institution of Washington and was arranged by Davenport.<sup>49</sup> There were also committees on

---

<sup>48</sup> Eugenical News 10 #12 (December 1925) p. 160.

<sup>49</sup> See Eugenical News 11 #12 (December 1926) pp. 188-9; 13 #2 (February 1928) p. 24; 16 #7 (July 1931) p. 113.

eugenics within the NRC, AAAS, NEA, and APA as well as other professional organizations. The NRC, for example, had a Committee on Human Heredity which consisted entirely of AES Council members while the NEA had a Committee on Racial Well-Being which aimed at integrating eugenics into teacher education.<sup>50</sup>

According to Ludmerer, American biologists were abandoning the eugenics movement as early as 1915. Advances in population genetics made by G. H. Hardy and Wilhelm Weinberg as well as work by the American geneticists E. M. East and Rollins A. Emerson "disproved the notion that most, if not all, traits are determined by single genes."<sup>51</sup> Ludmerer concludes that those few who remained enthusiastic about the eugenics movement "never seemed to appreciate fully the significance of either the multiple gene theory or of the importance of environment in development; neither did

---

<sup>50</sup> For discussion of the NEA's Committee on Racial Well-Being see Steven Selden, "Educational Policy and Biological Science: Genetics, Eugenics, and the College Textbook, c. 1908-1931," Teachers College Record 87 #1 (Teachers College Columbia University, Fall 1985) p. 44. The NRC Committee consisted of Davenport, Barker, Cole, Laughlin, Stockard and Wissler. See also Eugenical News 15 #7 (July 1930) p. 108 for eugenic committees of the AAAS and NRC. The NRC also had a committee on Family Records which consisted of Vernon Kellogg, Ellsworth Huntington and H.H. Laughlin. See Eugenical News 14 #6 (June 1929) pp. 80-81.

<sup>51</sup> Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 76.

they recognize the implications that studies in population genetics held for the feasibility of eugenic schemes."<sup>52</sup>

As with his comments about physicians, I categorically reject this part of Ludmerer's characterization of the eugenics movement. It is clear from an examination of the AES leadership that biologists, geneticists, and zoologists composed the largest group of leaders on the AES Advisory Council. Over the period 1923 to 1935 nearly thirty percent of the council was made up of America's foremost biologists. Sewall Wright, for example, America's leading theoretical population geneticist was a member of the AES Council from 1925 to 1935. Sewall Wright worked along with Charles Davenport on the Committee on Research Problems in Eugenics for over a year.<sup>53</sup> In 1926 the Committee issued a report which Wright signed. The report calls for a study of the consequences of race mixing. Wright evidently did not find anything in the newly developing population genetics in the

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. p. 80.

<sup>53</sup> Eugenical News 10 #3 (March 1926). William Provine says that although Wright's name was on the letterhead of the AES he "was never active in the society in any way." This is not true. See "Research Problems in Eugenics," a report of the Committee on Research, March 1926, AES Papers. William Provine claims in Sewall Wright and Evolutionary Biology (Chicago 1986) p. 182, that Sewall Wright, although a member of the advisory council from 1923 to 1935 "was never active in the society in any way." Actually, Wright was a member of the Committee on Research Problems in Eugenics, which was chaired by Charles Davenport. Wright's name appears as a co-author of the final report of this committee. See, "Research Problems in Eugenics: a report of the Committee on Research," 26 March 1926. AES Papers.

mid-thirties to contradict the basic goals of the American eugenics society.<sup>54</sup>

In 1923 there were 32 biologists on the council. Four resigned in 1924, Ross Harrison, H. S. Jennings, Clarence McClung, and Harris Wilder. Of the others, twenty-six remained on the advisory council until it was dissolved in 1935. While there were four resignations in 1924 there were two additions to the council in 1925 and ten in 1927 bringing the total number of biologists to 36 by 1935.<sup>55</sup> Thus, the number of prominent biologists actually increased during the time Ludmerer claimed they were abandoning the movement.

The AES Advisory Council consisted of the most prominent geneticists, zoologists, botanist, and anatomists in the country. Among them was William Castle, professor of Genetics at the Bussey Institute for 28 years. His students, E. M. East and Sewall Wright, were also members of the AES Advisory Council along with David Fairchild, one of America's leading botanists and president of the American Genetics Association. There was also Michael Guyer,

---

<sup>54</sup> As late as 1978 Sewall Wright was quoting approvingly both Arthur Jensen and Cyril Burt on the heritability of I.Q. See Sewall Wright, Evolution and the Genetics of Populations volume 4 (Chicago 1978) pp. 390-91, 395, 410-11; 416, 419 and 437.

<sup>55</sup> Arthur Harris and Sewall Wright joined the Council in 1925. Those added in 1927 were: Howard Banker, William Castle, Wesley Coe, Archibald Huntsman, Francis Lloyd, Robert Nabours, Horatio Newman, Aaron Shull, Francis Sumner and Wilbur Swingle.

zoologist at the University of Wisconsin who specialized in human heredity. There were others who understood the new genetics as well, such as Helen Dean King of the Wistar Institute who specialized in genetic studies of inbred lines of rats; A. F. Shull and Charles Stockard, both students of T. H. Morgan. Shull was vice-president of the American Genetics Association. Stockard made his name in anatomy initially from his work in embryology. He was able to produce cyclops fish by chemically treating sea water in which fish embryos were developing. Jennings used Stockard's results to argue against eugenics but Stockard himself felt that environmental influence did not discredit eugenics.<sup>56</sup> Francis Sumner, of the Scripps Institute joined the AES Advisory Council in 1927. Sumner's work specialized on the inheritance of adaptive variations as a key to evolution. He was convinced that social stratification was dependent upon the inheritance of mental and physical

---

<sup>56</sup> See H. S. Jennings, Prometheus (New York 1925) p. 52. Jennings writes: "we have gotten accustomed to calling inherited those characteristics which are determined before it leaves it's mother's body or the egg, while those determined later are called acquired characters." This is an artificial distinction, Jennings explained, "all the characters depend on the conditions" of the environment outside of the genes even such fundamental characters as the number of eyes and their position in the body. "In fish, for example, two eyes, one at each side of the middle line, form as distinctly an inherited characteristic as in man, yet fish can be subject so early to changed conditions (as Stockard and others show) that the animal has a single median eye instead of two lateral ones." Jennings pressed his point on: "If the fish lived continuously in these conditions they would regularly inherit a single median eye; the two lateral eyes would be looked upon as a rare abnormality, produced by special conditions and not inherited."



differences and supported immigration restriction.<sup>57</sup> There was also Herbert Walter, of Brown University, author of Genetics (1913, 1930, 1938) a popular college textbook which the Eugenical News called, "one of the best of its kind."<sup>58</sup>

Probably the most prominent zoologist of the group was William Morton Wheeler, of Harvard's Bussey Institution. Wheeler was a charter member of the AES Advisory Council and served between 1923 and 1935. Between 1903 and 1908 Wheeler was curator of vertebrate zoology at the American Museum of Natural History, and he remained a research associate of the Museum from 1909 to 1937. The Museum was, of course, a center of eugenic activity in America. Wheeler was considered the world's foremost authority on ants and social insects and the Eugenical News followed his research with considerable interest.<sup>59</sup> Other zoologists on the council included Wilbur Swingle of Princeton, a specialist in endocrinology; Harris Wilder of Smith College, a student of August Weissmann at the University of Freiburg and a specialist in anthropometry,<sup>60</sup> and Herbert Walter of Brown University. Walter taught a popular course on eugenics at

<sup>57</sup> Eugenical News 12 #1 (January 1927) pp. 9-10.

<sup>58</sup> Eugenical News 15 #11 (November 1930) p. 163.

<sup>59</sup> See, for example, Eugenical News 11 #8 (August 1926) p. 116; 12 #5 (May 1927) p. 64 and 14 #1 (January 1929) pp. 3-4.

<sup>60</sup> Wilder was author of A Laboratory Manual of Anthropometry (Philadelphia 1920) and The Pedigree of the Human Race (New York 1926). Wilder was also a fellow of the Galton Society.

Brown throughout the twenties and thirties. Among the lecture topics were "racial poisons," "weeding the human garden," and "survival of the fittest." He also helped supervise a study of "racial fusion" sponsored by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund.<sup>61</sup>

The advisory council and board contained fifteen individuals in the fields of sociology, social work, and criminology. Once again, we find that they were leaders in their fields. As with public health, there existed a close connection between criminology and eugenics.<sup>62</sup> Eugenacists were early and avid supporters of reform and modernization of the penal system. They advocated the indeterminate sentence, testing of both criminals and police recruits, and sterilization of criminals. Eugenacists supported the establishment of institutes of criminology to study criminals and to separate the biological criminals incapable of reform from those with sound heredity in need of rehabilitation. They vigorously debated the relationship

---

<sup>61</sup> See Eugenical News 11 #7 (July 1926) p. 104; Volume 14 #6 (June 1929) p. 87 and Volume 18 #5 (September/October 1935) p. 112.

<sup>62</sup> Mehler, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers," Mendel Newsletter (November 1978) pp. 6-11; Ronald L. Boostrom, "Criminology, Crime Control and the Rise of the Corporate State," Paper presented at the Midwest Sociological Society, 15 April 1977, Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Philip Jenkins, "Eugenics, Crime and Ideology: The Case of Progressive Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania History 51 #1 (January 1984) pp. 64-78.

between crime, race, and I.Q. The eugenics impact on criminology was profound and long lasting.

August Vollmer, for example, a member of the advisory council from 1925 to 1935, is described in his New York Times obituary as "the father of modern police science."<sup>63</sup> Vollmer was chief of police for Berkeley, California, from 1905 to 1932. He helped organize the police departments in numerous cities, including Los Angeles, San Diego, Chicago, and Detroit. In 1932 he retired from the police force to become a professor of criminology at the University of California. Among his innovations were I.Q. tests for police recruits and finger print identification bureaus for police departments. Vollmer was president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. One study of police reform in America refers to the period 1905 to 1932 as "the era of August Vollmer."<sup>64</sup> Adolph Meyer, one of America's foremost psychiatrists and founder and director of the Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic at Johns Hopkins, was also influential in criminological circles as a member of the editorial board of the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology.

---

<sup>63</sup> "August Vollmer Suicide on Coast," New York Times (5 November 1955) p. 40.

<sup>64</sup> Gene and Elaine Carte, Police Reform in the United States: the Era of August Vollmer, 1905-1932 (University of California Press, 1975). See also Alfred E. Parker, Crime Fighter: August Vollmer (New York 1961).

Katherine Bement Davis, superintendent of the Reformatory for Women at Bedford Hills, New York, between 1901 and 1914, and later commissioner of correction for New York City, was a major figure in America penology. With Rockefeller support she established the Laboratory for Social Hygiene at the Bedford Institute to study female offenders. Later she expanded this work into the Institute of Criminology in New York City. Between 1918 and 1928 she served as general secretary of the Bureau of Social Hygiene. Davis was active in New York progressive politics and was largely responsible for the passage of the indeterminate sentence law in that state.<sup>65</sup> It has not been widely appreciated that much of the support for the indeterminate sentence came from the eugenics movement. Eugenic experts argued that the criminal, not the crime, should determine the sentence.<sup>66</sup> Katherine B. Davis was one of the foremost advocates of eugenic reform of penal systems. She was so widely known and respected that in 1915 she was selected one of the three most famous women in America by the Board of the Panama-Pacific Exposition and seven years later she was

---

<sup>65</sup> See the obituary of her in the New York Herald Tribune 11 December 1935 and the biography of her by W. David Lewis in Notable American Women (Cambridge 1971) pp. 439-441.

<sup>66</sup> For an excellent discussion of the connection between the indeterminate sentence and the eugenics movement see, Philip Jenkins, "Eugenics, Crime and Ideology: The Case of Progressive Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania History 51 #1 (January 1984) pp. 64-78.

voted one of the twelve greatest living women in America by a League of Women Voters poll.<sup>67</sup>

Among the most influential of the sociologists on the AES Advisory Council were Henry Pratt Fairchild, Franklin H. Giddings, and E.A. Ross. The careers of these three men help to clarify how eugenics was integrated into academic disciplines, the debate within the eugenics movement over the "sociological" aspect of eugenics and the development of eugenics as a branch of population theory.

All three of these men were dedicated and active eugenicists. Fairchild, who taught sociology at Yale and N.Y.U., was president of the American Sociological Society in 1936 and the Eastern Sociological Conference in 1931. He helped mold the profession with his numerous important text books and his massive Dictionary of Sociology (New York 1944).<sup>68</sup> Fairchild also exemplifies the connections among eugenics, population control, and birth control. Between 1939 and 1948 he served as vice president of the Planned

---

<sup>67</sup> Notable American Women (Cambridge 1971) p. 441.

<sup>68</sup> Henry P. Fairchild, (ed.) Dictionary of Sociology (New York 1944). Among his textbooks were Outline of Applied Sociology (New York 1916), Elements of Social Science; an introduction to the study of life in human society (New York 1924; revised, 1925, 1937) The Foundations of Social Life (London 1927), General Sociology (New York 1934) and Main Street: The American Town, Past and Present (New York 1941). Fairchild's work on immigration includes Immigration, a world movement and its American significance (New York 1913; second edition, 1919), The Melting Pot Mistake (Boston 1919), People: The Quantity and Quality of Population (New York 1939).

Parenthood Federation and between 1931 and 1935 he served as president of the Population Association of America.

Fairchild did not abandoned his eugenics in this later period. He simply incorporated it into his broader concerns. In 1939 he wrote, People: The Quantity and Quality of Population, which integrated his eugenics perspective with the newer birth control and population control movements. It appears to me that many eugenicists became interested in population control in the thirties but few of them actually abandoned eugenics for population control. For the most part they saw the two movements as complementary.

Franklin Giddings held a chair in sociology and history at Columbia University from 1906 to 1928 and specialized in questions of heredity and environment. He was a vice-president and editor of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (1890-94) and of the publications of the American Economic Association. He served as president of the American Sociological Society between 1910 and 1911. He was on the editorial board of the Political Science Quarterly and was a member of the New York City Board of Education. His many textbooks were widely

used in sociology courses around the country.<sup>69</sup> He was a charter member of the AES and a member of the ERA.

Edward Alsworth Ross taught at Cornell and Stanford but spent the bulk of his career (1906-1937) at the University of Wisconsin. In 1892 he was elected secretary of the American Economic Association and in 1914 he was elected president of the American Sociological Society. He was an advisory editor of the American Journal of Sociology and author of numerous popular books and articles. His work reached far beyond academia and he was constantly busy giving popular lectures. Besides his classic works such as Social Control (1901), The Foundations of Sociology (1905), and Sin and Society (1907) he also wrote a number of important eugenic tracks the most important of which was the vitriolic and anti-Semitic, The Old World in the New (1914). In 1927 Ross switched his emphasis from eugenics to population control in Standing Room Only.<sup>70</sup> Like Fairchild, Ross combined a concern for eugenics with a belief in birth

<sup>69</sup> Franklin H. Giddings, The Principles of Sociology 3rd ed. (New York 1896); The Elements of Sociology (London 1898); A Theory of Social Causation (New York 1904); Studies in the Theory of Human Society (New York 1922); The Scientific Study of Human Society (Chapel Hill 1924); Civilization and Society edited by Howard Odum (New York 1932).

<sup>70</sup> Among Ross' major works were: Social Control (New York 1901); Foundations of Sociology (New York & London 1919); Sin and Society (Boston & New York 1907); Principals of Sociology (New York 1920); The Outlines of Sociology (New York & London 1923); The Old World in the New (New York 1914); Standing Room Only (New York 1927). See comments on Ross in Allan Chase, The Legacy of Malthus (New York 1977) pp. 275-6 and 518-9.

control and population control. Unlike Fairchild, Ross clearly believed in the genetic inferiority of "lower" races.

Another sociologist on the advisory council was Ernest R. Groves of the University of North Carolina. Author of over thirty books on marriage, family, and mental hygiene, Groves was considered a pioneer in the field of sex education. Besides his many text books and scholarly articles Groves was corresponding editor of Parents Magazine, associate editor of Social Forces and Education and on the editorial council of the Journal of Educational Sociology. He served as the president of the North Carolina Mental Hygiene Association in the thirties and as president of the National Council on Family Relations in 1941. There was Cheney Jones, a member of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection (1929-30) and the official delegate from Massachusetts to the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy (1939-40). He served as president of the Child Welfare League of America, the National Committee for Mental Hygiene and was on the executive committee of the National Conference of Social Work. Stuart Rice, was a statistician at the University of Pennsylvania and assistant director of the census (1933-36). Rice served as president of the American Statistical Association in 1933 and vice-president of the AAAS in 1937. Florence Sherborn was a child care specialist and chief of child hygiene for the state Board of Health of Kansas. She was also a



professor of Child Care at the University of Kansas. Sherborn wrote a regular column for Eugenics magazine between 1929 and 1931 and served on the AES Committee on Popular Education which arranged the society's exhibits at county fairs. Last, but certainly not least, was the legendary Robert MacIver, sociologist at Columbia University who joined the board of the AES in 1929.<sup>71</sup> MacIver "rose to fame in the 1920s as a humanist in an age of behaviorists" and "became known as a giant in the field of sociology."<sup>72</sup> He served on the board between 1929 and 1932. It is obvious from even this cursory examination of the AES sociologists that they boasted some of the most influential and prominent names in the field.

There was probably no field as dominated by eugenic advocates and eugenic thinking as psychology. Among the ten psychologist on the AES Council, five served as presidents of the American Psychological Association<sup>73</sup> and two served as presidents of related psychological associations.<sup>74</sup> They

---

<sup>71</sup> MacIver was not a member in name only. He attended board meetings at the home of Madison Grant. See Minutes 1 June 1929 and 16 November 1919.

<sup>72</sup> New York Times obituary (29 June 1970).

<sup>73</sup> They were: Knight Dunlap (1922), Carl Seashore (1911), Lewis Terman (1923), Edward Thorndike (1912) and Robert Yerkes (1916).

<sup>74</sup> Henry Goddard served as president of the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-Minded (1914-5) and Truman Kelley served as president of the Psychometric Society (1938-9).

were all important figures who molded the field in these years.<sup>75</sup>

Although all ten were extraordinary leaders, three stand out above the others. They were the three recognized leaders in the field psychology in these years, Lewis Terman, Edward L. Thorndike, and Robert Yerkes. They were all charter members of the society, joining in 1923 to help "stem the tide of racial degeneracy." They served on the council right through to 1935. Terman and Yerkes both served on the Committee on Psychometry, and Thorndike, besides chairing the Committee on Psychometry, served on the Committee on Formal Education.

Thorndike served as the president of the APA in 1912 and of the AAAS in 1934. Besides being a charter member of the AES, he was a fellow of the Galton Society and a member of the Eugenics Research Association. He was active in all

---

<sup>75</sup> For a view of how leading psychologist integrated eugenics into psychology see, Michael Billig, "Psychology, Racism & Fascism," (Searchlight Booklet, Birmingham, 1979); Steven Gelb and Donald T. Mizokawa, "On Not Speaking English, and Other Diseases: A Brief History of the Contribution of Psychology to Racism in Special Education," (Unpublished paper, 30 June 1983); "Mental Testers, Race and the Immigration Act of 1924: The Case of Henry Herbert Goddard," Paper presented at the Mid-America American Studies Conference, Urbana, IL., 14 April 1985; "From Moral Imbecility to Maladaptive Behavior: The Social Construction of Educable Mental Retardation," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA., 18 April 1986. See also "Putting Psychology on the Map: Ideology and Intelligence Testing," by Franz Samelson in Allan Buss (Ed.) Psychology in Social Context (New York 1979) pp. 103-159.

three organizations as well as on a eugenics committee within the National Research Council which was trying to devise means of eugenical family record keeping. He was a part of Galton Society anti-immigration efforts as well as efforts to get the U.S. Census to gather information on "racial descent" of white Americans. In the field of psychology, he was certainly one of the most influential and important figures of the 1930s.

Lewis M. Terman was, if anything, even more avid a eugenics advocate and certainly no less a figure of importance in the history of psychology. He served as president of the APA in 1923 and of the Social Hygiene Association in 1917. He is best known in the field as the author of the Stanford revision of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Test. He actively campaigned for immigration restriction based on eugenical grounds, was a member of Eugenics Research Association, and served on the advisory board of the Human Betterment Foundation in California, which was America's leading organization advocating the use of eugenic sterilization.

Robert Means Yerkes, the third member of this trio, was certainly an equally avid supporter of eugenics and a man of no less stature in his field. He too served as president of the APA (1916). As chief of the Division of Psychology, Office of the Surgeon General, U.S. Army, he supervised the testing of 1.7 million recruits during World War I. He was

the first chairman of the committee on psychology of the National Research Council and chairman of the Committee on Scientific Problems in Human Migration, which he organized in 1922. He also served on the Committee on Research in Problems of Sex from 1921 to 1947. He served as a member of the Eugenics Record Office Committee on the Genetic Basis of Human Behavior. He was a member of the Eugenics Research Association and a fellow of the Galton Society. He was an active supporter of racial immigration quotas. Eugenics was a central concern for all three of these men throughout their long and influential careers.<sup>76</sup>

Thorndike, Terman, and Yerkes were not the only important psychologists on the advisory council. The council also included Carl Brigham, author of A Study of American Intelligence (1923); Knight Dunlap, president of the APA (1922) and author of Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment; Henry Goddard, author of The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness (1912) - a work widely cited in support of eugenic legislation; Truman Lee Kelley, America's leading statistical psychologist of the 20's and close associate of Lewis Terman; Daniel LaRue, co-author with Robert Yerkes of Outline of the Study of the

---

<sup>76</sup> For an evaluation of the controversy over the role of these and other psychologists in the eugenics movement see, Steven A. Gelb, et. al. "Rewriting Mental Testing History: The View from the American Psychologist," Sage Race Relations Abstracts (May 1986) pp. 18-31. For an example of how these issues have been downplayed see Lee Cronbach, "Five Decades of Public Controversy Over Mental Testing," American Psychologist (January 1975) pp. 1-14.

Self (1914) and several important text books; William McDougall, a firm believer in "racial psychology" and author of Is America Safe for Democracy (1921) and Carl Seashore, president of the APA in 1911 and vice-president of the Psychology section of the AAAS (1926-7). These men authored dozens of major textbooks and monographs in the fields they worked in and together edited over ten important journals and monographic series in psychology.<sup>77</sup>

The psychiatrists on the advisory council were not quite as illustrious as the psychologists. Still they included Steward Paton, a trustee of the Carnegie Institution of Washington and president of the Eugenics Research Association in 1919. Paton taught at Johns Hopkins and Yale universities. Walter Fernald, superintendent of the Massachusetts School for the Feeble-Minded and president of the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-Minded (1893). Charles Burr, president of the American Neurological Association (1908) and like Paton a president of the Eugenics Research Association (1925). Burr was editor of the American edition of Curschmann's Textbook on Nervous Diseases. C. Floyd Haviland, president of the

---

<sup>77</sup> Knight Dunlap was managing editor of the Journal of Comparative Psychology; joint editor of Mental Measurement Monographs; editor of Psychology Classics; Comparative Psychology Monographs and Psychobiology of which he was a founder. Seashore was editor of the University of Iowa Studies in Psychology 2-12 and Studies in the Psychology of Music. Terman was editor of The Measurement and Adjustment Series; associate editor of the British J. of Educational Psychology; the J. of Genetic Psychology and the Genetic Psychology Monographs.

American Psychiatric Association (1926) and president of the Connecticut Conference of Social Work (1921). Adolph Meyer, president of the American Neurological Association (1922), the American Psychiatric Association (1927) and twice president of the American Psychopathological Association (1912 & 16). He suggested the term "mental hygiene", helped form the National Committee for Mental Hygiene in 1906 and served as president of the Committee between 1940 and 1943.<sup>78</sup> A.J. Rosanoff, author of the Manual of Psychiatry "the standard medical school textbook" in psychiatry for many years.<sup>79</sup> He also served on the editorial board of the American Journal of Psychiatry. With the exception of Fernald, these men were quite active both in the AES and in the ERA.

I have not been able to go into much detail in this discussion of the biographies of the AES Council. I recommend a careful reading of Appendix I which accompanies this study. What is obvious from this preliminary review is that the influence of eugenic advocates was widespread. The AES Council were leaders in their various fields of endeavor and for the most part they were avid supporters of eugenics. We still need a better understanding of how their support of eugenics was manifested in their respective fields and how

---

<sup>78</sup> He was also on the editorial boards of the J. of Comparative Neurology, J. of Criminal Law, and Criminology and the Archives of Neurology and Psychology.

<sup>79</sup> New York Times obituary (8 Jan. 1943) p. 20. In 1923 he was preparing the sixth edition.

they interacted to further the cause of eugenics in American society.

What is surprising is how few of the names in this prosopography are mentioned in the major monographs on eugenics. I have looked up many of them in the indexes of Haller's Eugenics, Ludmerer's Genetics and American Society, Chase's The Legacy of Malthus, and Kevles' In the Name of Eugenics. Upwards of 70% of the individuals in this prosopography are never mentioned in any of those works. Clearly, we need to go beyond the small circle of individuals studied in the major works thus far. There is no shortcut to this work and this chapter and the accompanying appendix is offered as a first step in a more thorough attempt to understand the American eugenics movement. Our database needs to be expanded to include all of those active in the eugenics movement from 1910 to 1940. Once the database has been compiled we need to look for common features predisposing individuals to eugenics commitments. We also need to examine the regional, religious, and political differences among the group. Were there differences between eugenic activists in the South and West as compared to the Northeast and industrial Midwest? What effect did different political and religious affiliations have on eugenic leaders' positions? We have already seen that the sociological perspective was important in the debates that occurred within the society in the 1930s.

At the moment we cannot fully answer these questions, but I would like to offer the following final observation. It is clear that eugenics was championed by an elite with many connections to all facets of American culture. Within the movement itself there appears to have been an elite core within the Galton Society, Eugenics Research Association, Eugenics Record Office, and American Eugenics Society. These people often arranged for eugenic concerns to be given top priority within other organizations. Since they had connections within government, academia, philanthropy, and business they were able to accomplish a great deal, particularly in infusing eugenic concerns into their various professions. The only way we are going to really understand the dynamics of American and world-wide eugenics will be to understand the details of the interactions of these leaders with the broader society.



Chapter Five

The American Eugenics Society

and

Immigration Restriction

1921 - 1939

It is clear that eugenicists considered immigration restriction one of their most important goals. As we have seen in chapter two, the theme of immigration restriction - the control of "foreign defective germ plasm" - was seen as necessary for the salvation of civilization as a whole. Virtually all of the key speakers at the Second International Congress of Eugenics in 1921 addressed this issue and called for controls. Jon Alfred Mjoen and others expressed the view that eugenics was concerned broadly with world-wide human migration patterns and world population control.<sup>1</sup> This concern for the control of world-wide human population movement remained a central concern of the eugenics movement throughout the inter-war period.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example, "Address of Welcome," by Henry Fairfield Osborn; "Aims and Methods of Eugenical Societies," by Leonard Darwin; "Research in Eugenics," by Charles Davenport and "La race chez les populations mélangées," by D.V. de LaPouge. There were numerous addresses on particular topics not related to immigration. My point is that the opening addresses and those aimed at a wider audience, i.e., those reported widely in the press, focused or stressed the importance of immigration restriction. All of the above addresses are reprinted in the two volumes of scientific papers published by the Congress: Eugenics, Genetics and the Family I and Eugenics in Race and State II (Baltimore 1923).

Furthermore, immigration restriction was not the only goal of the eugenics movement. Another important goal was to lay the foundation for the growth of interdisciplinary fields in the broad areas of social and population biology and demography. In the twenties and thirties eugenic leaders helped establish major research programs in the area of "human migration patterns." The Scripps Foundation, the Milbank Memorial Fund, and National Research Council took leading roles in directing and coordinating numerous studies in this broad area.<sup>2</sup>

The eugenicists' involvement in immigration restriction poses two issues: Understanding the extent to which the eugenicists affected social policy and the extent to which the advent of the new eugenics implied any significant changes in the ideas or campaigns of the eugenics movement. With regard to the former, it must be understood that the immigration restriction laws of the 1920s belong to a hail of anti-foreign statutes that began during the war with passage of the Espionage Act of 1917. Between 1917 and 1920 state laws barred aliens from practicing medicine, surgery, chiropractic, pharmacy, architecture, engineering, and surveying, from operating a motor bus, and from executing

---

<sup>2</sup> Warren Weaver (ed.) U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History, Structure, Management, and Record (New York 1967) pp. 365-375. See also the "Human Migrations" file in the Population Council Papers at the Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, N.Y. particularly the 1926 Report of the Committee on Human Migrations of the National Research Council.

wills. Immigration restriction marked both the climax and the conclusion of an era of nationalistic legislation.<sup>3</sup> While the eugenicists did not create the movement for restriction, they became centrally important to its leadership and played a major role in the passage of the 1924 law. With regard to the second issue, it is clear by following the activities undertaken by the eugenicists after 1924 and comparing them with their pre-1924 efforts, that the the policy and program of the eugenicists remained consistent throughout the period 1921-1940.

Over the past two decades there has been a great deal of debate over the role eugenicists played in the passage of the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act of 1924. Historians of eugenics have tended to emphasize the role of eugenicists while other historians have tended to play down the role of eugenics. The debate has been particularly heated on the question of the role played by the early mental testers.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Peter Heywood Wang, Legislating Normalcy: The Immigration Act of 1924 (Saratoga 1975); John M. Blum, "Nativism, Anti-Radicalism, and the Foreign Scare, 1917-20," Midwest Journal 3 (1950-51), pp. 46-53; Stanley Cohen, "A Study in Nativism: The American Red Scare of 1919-20," Political Science Quarterly 79 (1964) pp. 52-75; Robert K. Murray, Red Scare: A Study in National Hysteria, 1919-20 (Minneapolis 1955).

<sup>4</sup> See for example, J. David Smith, Minds Made Feeble: The Myth and the Legacy of the Kallikaks (Rockville 1985) p. 3, "The Immigration Restriction Act of 1924... was passed largely because of supporting testimony provided by the staff of the Eugenics Record Office..."; a more balanced view is Ludmerer, "Genetics, Eugenics and the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924," Bulletin of the History of Medicine 46 (Jan./Feb. 1972) 59-81, see p. 60; John Higham, Strangers in the land: Patterns of American

In the final analysis, the movement which led up to the reversal of the historic policy of open immigration was a complex mix of anti-Catholicism, anti-Bolshevism, war-inflamed nationalism, and racism. The coalition which led the movement was composed of eugenicists, blue-bloods, academics, progressives, business leaders, and nativists of all shades.<sup>5</sup> In this section I will describe the precise

---

Nativism 1860-1925 (New York 1970) and Barbra Miller Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants: A Changing New England Tradition (Cambridge 1956) make only slight mention of the eugenics movement. On the role of the testers see, Lee J. Cronbach, "Five Decades of Public Controversy Over Mental Testing," American Psychologist (Jan. 1975) pp. 1-14. He asserts that the testers made oversimplified statements to the media but avoided advocacy in their scientific work. For the opposite view, see Leon Kamin, The Science and Politics of IQ (New York 1974). Probably the best treatment of the subject can be found in Franz Samelson's, "Putting Psychology on the Map: Ideology and Intelligence Testing," in Allan Buss (ed.) Psychology in Social Context (New York 1979). Probably the most blatant apology for the testers is Mark Snyderman and R.J. Herrnstein, "Intelligence Tests and the Immigration Act of 1924," American Psychologist (September 1983) pp. 986-994. For a reply to this piece see, Steve Gelb, et. al. "Rewriting Mental Testing History: The View from the American Psychologist," Sage Race Relations Abstracts (May 1986). It is really futile to argue that restriction would have failed without the input of Laughlin or Yerkes. What is clear is that Laughlin and the testers along with progressive academics and popular writers were important participants in the campaign.

<sup>5</sup> The literature on the history of immigration restriction is quite large. The best introduction to the issue is still John Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970). For a monograph devoted exclusively to the 1924 Immigration Act see, Peter Haywood Wang, Legislating Normalcy: The Immigration Act of 1924 (Saratoga 1975). The best single volume devoted to a history of immigration policy beginning in 1924 is Robert A. Divine, American Immigration Policy, 1924-1952 (Princeton 1957). The most recent comprehensive addition to the literature is E.P. Hutchinson, Legislative History of American Immigration Policy: 1798-1965 (Philadelphia 1981). This massive work is primarily a source book. It contains every party platform on immigration and reference to

role of the Eugenics Committee and later the American Eugenics Society in the passage of the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act.

The passage of the 1924 immigration restriction act has generally been acknowledged by historians as one the great successes of the early eugenics movement.<sup>6</sup> Less well appreciated is the fact that eugenics leaders campaigned persistently for the extension of the quota system to the Western Hemisphere in the period 1924 to 1940. The AES was particularly concerned with the immigration of Mexicans into the Southwest. The tactics and arguments against Mexican immigration paralleled those used in the campaign against eastern and southern European immigration. This campaign

---

every major bill on immigration. It does not, however, include any secondary material and very little commentary. More specific is Higham, "Origins of Immigration Restriction, 1882-1897: A Social Analysis," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 39 (1952) pp. 77-88. For an excellent study of the Immigration Restriction League see, Barbara M. Solomon's, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956). Also important are, Morell Heald, "Business Attitudes Towards European Immigration, 1880-1900," J. of Economic History 8 (1953) 291-304. Harry Jerome, Migration and Business Cycles (New York 1926). Roy L. Garis, Immigration Restriction: A Study of the Opposition to the Regulation of Immigration into the United States (New York 1927) records successive legislative provisions and court decisions. John Henry Taylor, "The Restriction of European Immigration 1890-1924" (PHD Thesis, U.C. Berkeley, 1936) is not very interpretive but gives a good account of the Congressional action. A good concise history of restrictive legislation is buried in Charles P. Howland, ed., Survey of American Foreign Relations (New Haven 1929) section 3. Rowland T. Berthoff provides copious information on "Southern Attitudes Toward Immigration, 1865-1914" in J. of Southern History 17 (1951) 328-60.

<sup>6</sup> The other great success being the Supreme Court ruling of 1927 declaring eugenical sterilization constitutional.

was carried on throughout the period of the development of the so-called, "new eugenics."<sup>7</sup>

The Eugenics Committee, however, clearly considered the 1924 immigration restriction law its greatest national victory, and while support for restriction was broadly based, the eugenics movement deserves substantial credit both for coordinating the Congressional campaign between 1922 and 1924 and for the form of the final law. In his presidential report of 1926, Irving Fisher wrote:

We naturally feel pleased when we realize the important part our Committee on Selective Immigration played in the passage of the recent Immigration Act by Congress. We hope this is destined to have a very far reaching effect upon the future character of America.<sup>8</sup>

After the passage of the law, Albert Johnson wrote to the American Eugenics Society:

The members of the American Eugenics Society realized, I am sure, that the investigations made by Dr. Laughlin and the reports made by the Society's Committee on Selective Immigration have been of the greatest value to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the preparation of laws affecting these two important subjects.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, the 1930 report of the Committee on Selective Immigration of the American Eugenics Society in Eugenics 3 (December 1930) p. 471-473. See also, S.J. Holmes, "Perils of the Mexican Invasion," North American Review 227 (May 1929) pp. 613-623; Raymond A. Mohl, The Saturday Evening Post and the "Mexican Invasion" J. of Mexican American History 3 (1973) pp. 131-138.

<sup>8</sup> Report of the President of the American Eugenics Society, Inc. 26 June 1926 (New Haven 1926) p. 6.

<sup>9</sup> "Report of the President," AES Pamphlet (1926) p. 6. See also, "Biological Aspects of Immigration: Testimony

As important as the AES may have been in the final passage of the Immigration Restriction Act, the anti-immigrant movement which led up the passage of the 1924 law predated organized eugenics and drew on sources outside the eugenics movement. The anti-immigrant movement began in the 1880s and gained momentum as immigration from eastern and southern Europe increased. The first institutional expression of this movement came in 1895 when Prescott Hall and Robert DeCourcey Ward founded the Immigration Restriction League. The IRL was an expression of a general dismay at open immigration. As far as Ward was concerned the new immigrants from both eastern and western Europe were, on the whole, ignorant, depraved, and useless.<sup>10</sup>

The IRL had little impact in the 1890s. Until 1896 the old immigration from northern and western Europe surpassed the southern and eastern European current. All in all, at

---

of Harry H. Laughlin, 16-17 April 1920. 66th Cong., 2d. Sess. 26 pp.; "Europe As An Emigrant-Exporting Continent and The United States As An Emigrant Receiving Nation," Testimony of Harry H. Laughlin, 8 March 1924. 68th Cong., 2d. Sess. pp. 1231-1437.

<sup>10</sup> Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956) chapter 5, "Founding the Immigration Restriction League" p. 101. See also her essay "The Intellectual Background of the Immigration Restriction Movement in New England," New England Quarterly 25 (1952) pp. 47-59. An example of the attitude of the IRL can be found in the statement of Francis Kinnicutt before the House Immigration Committee in January 1924. Adolph Sabath compared the statements of the IRL with those of the Know-Nothing Party dating back to 1810. Kinnicutt's reply was that had we "listened a little bit better to some of their warnings" we would be better off today. See, Hearings Before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 68th Cong. 1st. Sess. p. 844.

least 80% of the total European-born population in the U.S. in mid-nineties still derived from Germany, Great Britain, Scandinavia, France, Switzerland, and the Low Countries. Furthermore, concentration of settlement limited the impact of the new groups. Although some New England States and coastal cities had fairly large numbers of new immigrants, the vast majority of the country knew nothing of Italians, Jews, and Slavs.<sup>11</sup>

Unlike anti-Catholicism and racism against blacks, Americans did not have deep-rooted feelings towards southern and eastern Europeans. Thus, the anti-immigrant sentiment that grew rapidly in the 1890s and after was a new phenomenon in the American nativist tradition. Race prejudice had long been common in the United States, but it was confined to non-whites.

Americans in the 19th century harbored the belief that America could easily absorb European immigration. American industrial interests considered immigration of great value. Immigrants were both new consumers and a pool of cheap labor. It was not an easy task to reverse this long held belief. It would be difficult to develop opposition to the new immigration without some means of distinguishing between the new immigrants and the old. The key problem, therefore, was to articulate a theory which distinguished racial

---

<sup>11</sup> Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956) pp. 82-102; Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 88.



differences between western, southern, and eastern Europeans. William Z. Ripley, a young economist at Columbia University provided the answer in The Races of Europe, a massive scholarly volume published in 1899.<sup>12</sup>

Ripley organized into an impressive synthesis the tripartite division of white populations which European ethnologists had been developing over the previous two decades. Europe was divided into three distinct races: a northern race, called Teutonic; a central race, called Alpine; and a southern race, called Mediterranean. John R. Commons, labor historian and progressive activist at the University of Wisconsin, lectured publicly in favor of immigration restriction in the 1890s. He dramatized Ripley's division of European peoples:

A line drawn across the continent of Europe from Northeast to Southwest separating the Scandinavian Peninsula, the British Isles, Germany and France from Russia, Austria-Hungary and Turkey, separates countries of representative institutions and popular government from absolute monarchies; it separates lands where education is universal from lands where illiteracy predominates; it separates manufacturing countries, progressive agricultural and skilled labor from primitive hand industries, backward agriculture and unskilled labor; it separates an educated thrifty peasantry from a peasantry scarcely a single generation removed from serfdom; it separates Teutonic races from Latin, Slav, Semitic and Mongolian races. When the sources of American immigration are shifted from the western countries so nearly allied to our own to eastern countries so remote in the main attributes of civilization, the change is one

---

<sup>12</sup> William Z. Ripley, The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study (New York 1923). First published 1899.

that should challenge the attention of every citizen.<sup>13</sup>

The movement received a powerful stimulus from Francis A. Walker, president of MIT and one of America's outstanding economists. Walker was superintendent of the census for 1870 and 1880. Using the statistics from the census, Walker, in 1891, began arguing that the rate of population growth in America was declining and that this decline coincided with the influx of inferior immigrants. He speculated that native Americans, forced to compete with cheap labor, were reducing the size of their families rather than lowering their standards of living. Thus, Walker argued that natural selection was working in reverse. Steamship companies, advertising campaigns, and cheap transatlantic rates were bringing "beaten men from beaten races; representing the worst failures in the struggle for existence..."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> John R. Commons, "Immigration During the Nineteenth Century," The Chautauquan 12 (1903) p. 326. It should be noted that Commons, like many American academics, accepted the Lamarckian view that acquired characteristics were heritable. Lamarckian theory did not interfere with notions of racial superiority and inferiority. Negroes would improve in native ability under slavery (not, however, in a free state) but this improvement would take many generations. In the meantime the white race would also improve leaving the Negro perpetually inferior. Commons approved of a system of peonage for blacks.

<sup>14</sup> Quoted from Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) pp. 142-3; see also, Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956) pp. 69-70.

In 1901, Edward A. Ross<sup>15</sup> coined the phrase "race suicide" in an address before the American Academy of Political and Social Science. In discussing the dangers of unchecked Asiatic immigration Ross amplified Walker's theory of the survival of the unfittest. When a higher race quietly eliminates itself rather than suffer the competition of a lower one, it is committing suicide. The argument was quickly picked up by other progressives (including Theodore Roosevelt) and applied to the competition between inferior eastern Europeans and native Americans.<sup>16</sup>

Organized eugenic activity in the immigration campaign began between 1910 and 1912 when Charles Davenport organized the committee on immigration of the eugenics section of the American Breeders Association. Davenport was an energetic organizer. He brought the Immigration Restriction League

---

<sup>15</sup> Ross was a member of the AES advisory council from 1925 to 1935. He was quite active in both the eugenics movement and later in the population control movement. His most important work on eugenics and immigration restriction was The Old World in the New (New York 1914) which was a racist attack on the new immigrants. His later work, Standing Room Only (New York 1927) focused on the issue of world population control.

<sup>16</sup> E.A. Ross, "The Causes of Race Superiority," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 18 (1901) pp. 85-88; see also Ross, "The Value Rank of the American People," Independent 57 (1904) pp. 1061-63. John R. Commons extended the argument to the Europeans. "The competition of races is the competition of standards of living." Wages originally set by the greater necessities of more advanced races decline in the face of competition from the Chinaman or the Italian - "competition has no respect for superior races. The race with the lowest necessities displaces others." John R. Commons, "Social and Industrial Problems," The Chautauquan (March 1904) p. 18.

into the eugenic fold by enlisting Prescott Hall<sup>17</sup> and Robert DeCoursey Ward, cofounders of the IRL, into the American Breeders Committee. He also recruited Madison Grant and Franz Boas into the ABA group although Boas quickly withdrew.<sup>18</sup> It was also apparently on the suggestion of Davenport that Henry Goddard went to Ellis Island in 1912 to experiment with the use of the Binet test in detecting mentally defective immigrants.<sup>19</sup>

Between 1907 and 1910 the Department of Commerce and Labor under the direction of Senator William Dillingham held extensive hearings on the immigration issue. While noting that the new immigration was inferior to the old Dillingham's committee nevertheless concluded that immigration legislation should be primarily based on economic and business considerations. Selection of

---

<sup>17</sup> Davenport and Hall had been classmates at Yale.

<sup>18</sup> Samelson, "Putting Psychology on the Map," op. cit. p. 118-119; Garland Allen, "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An Essay in Institutional History," Osiris, 2nd series 2 (1986) pp. 225-264; Barbara Kimmelman, "The American Breeders' Association: Genetics and Eugenics in an Agricultural Context, 1903-1913," Social Studies of Science 13 (London 1983), 163-204.

<sup>19</sup> Samelson, "Putting Psychology on the Map," p. 119; Davenport to H.R. Johnstone, 9/30/10 C.B. Davenport Papers. Henry Goddard, "Feeble-Mindedness and Immigration", Training School Bulletin 9 (1912), and Goddard, "Mental Tests and the Immigrant", Journal of Delinquency 2 (1917).

immigrants should be limited to a literacy test.<sup>20</sup> There was very little input by eugenic leaders in these hearings.

Proposals for immigration restriction legislation had been introduced into Congress as far back as the 1880's. What held restriction back was a formidable coalition of business interests, progressives, and first generation Americans. This coalition began to disintegrate in the teens and collapsed completely in the face of war-inflamed nationalism. Progressives were among the first to see a danger in the new immigration. They often encountered immigrants as a stumbling block to urban reform.<sup>21</sup> Business leaders were slower in yielding to the restrictionist trend but they succumbed to the fear of anarchism and communism.<sup>22</sup>

Thus defenders of open immigration were steadily decreasing during the first two decades of the twentieth century. A few progressives, such as Edward Everett Hale and William James, continued to defend the immigrant. Bourke Cochran, the Irish representative of the House, and

---

<sup>20</sup> Ludmerer, "Genetics, Eugenics, and the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924," Bulletin of the History of Medicine 46 (Jan./Feb. 1972) p. 63; Reports of the Immigration Commission 1, Senate Document No. 747, 61st Congress, 2nd sess. (Wash, GPO 1911) p. 45.

<sup>21</sup> New Republic 6 (1916) p. 254, quoted from Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 302. See also, Walter Weyl, Tired Radicals and Other Papers (New York 1921) pp. 221-23. New Republic 27 (1921) pp. 314-15, and 38 (1924) p. 30; Nation 112 (1921) p. 331, and 115 (1922) p. 404.

<sup>22</sup> Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 303.

Adolph Sabath, the representative of the Jewish 'greenhorn sections,' still called for open immigration on the House floor. Immigrant writers such as Franz Boas, Ludwig Lewison, Mary Antin, and Horace Kallen still defended open immigration but they were increasingly isolated voices.<sup>23</sup>

Anti-Catholicism was also making spectacular gains. In 1911, Wilbur Franklin Phelps, a small country editor from the Ozark highlands, founded The Menace, a rabidly anti-Catholic newspaper. In one year circulation rose to over one hundred thousand and in five years circulation topped a million! Other anti-Catholic organizations, including the American Protective Association and Ku Klux Klan also gained membership in these years. At the same time Catholics themselves, caught up in fear of anarchism and communism, turned against open immigration.<sup>24</sup>

The eugenics movement was developing an identity in America at the same time that this diverse movement for immigration restriction was gaining momentum. What the

---

<sup>23</sup> Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956) ch. 9, "The minority with faith" pp. 176-194. See Boas, "What is Race" Nation 120 (1925) p. 91; New York Times, 4/26/24, p. 17. see Lewison's autobiography, Up Steam (New York 1922); Mary Antin, They Who Knock At Our Gates (Boston 1914).

<sup>24</sup> Donald Kinzer, An Episode in Anti-Catholicism (Seattle 1964); Richard Linkh, American Catholicism and European Immigrants (Staten Island 1975) chapter XII. Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 180; The paper ceased publication during the war and started up again under the title, The New Menace to campaign for immigration restriction. See The New Menace, 1921-1929, Missouri State Historical Society.

eugenics movement did was weave these threads into a whole cloth, developing a coherent theory and popularizing it throughout the country.<sup>25</sup> According to immigration historian Robert Divine, "the man who played the key role in synthesizing these racist concepts and applying them to immigration restriction was Madison Grant," author of The Passing of the Great Race (1916). Grant "wedded the racist ideas developing in the United States to the more virulent European race theories" of de Gobineau and Chamberlain.<sup>26</sup> Grant was not alone, however, in calling the attention of the nation to the racialist perspective. Between 1916 and 1920 a cascade of books and articles flowed from the eugenicists pens.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> John Higham estimates that between 1910 and 1914 popular magazines carried more articles on eugenics than on the three questions of slums, tenements and living standards combined. (Higham, 149). Garland Allen notes that by 1915 the Readers Guide lists over fifty articles a year under the subject eugenics. This is a substantial underestimate. Dozens of eugenics related articles are also to be found under the headings of "intelligence tests", "genetics", "immigration" and "heredity."

<sup>26</sup> Divine, American Immigration, pp. 11-12.

<sup>27</sup> Among the best known of the period were, Madison Grants, The Passing of the Great Race (New York 1916); Charles Gould's, America: A Family Matter (New York 1921), and Lothrop Stoddard's, The Rising Tide of Color Against White Supremacy, (New York 1920). There were also numerous other books and articles. See, for example: Clinton S. Burr, America's Race Heritage (New York 1922); Edwin G. Conklin, "Some Biological Aspects of Immigration," Scribner's Magazine 69 (1921) pp. 352-59; George Creel, "Close the Gates!" Collier's 67 (1921), pp. 9-26.

The eugenics movement also brought restrictionists together under the banner of science. Supporting such popular works were the statements of America's leading academics. Among them were the leading psychologists of the day, who were rising to national prominence and prestige in these years.<sup>28</sup> Yerkes, Terman, and Brigham joined the restrictionist campaign after World War I, using the Army intelligence test data to argue that the new immigrants were racially inferior. Terman boasted after the passage of the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act that, because of the mental tests, psychology "has become the beacon light of the eugenics movement;... [and] is appealed to by Congressmen in the reshaping of national policy on immigration."<sup>29</sup>

The eugenicists managed to instill the belief that eastern and southern Europeans were biologically inferior to northern European whites. Furthermore, most restrictionists

---

<sup>28</sup> Lewis M. Terman, "Feeble-minded Children in the Public Schools of California," School and Society 5 (1917) p. 161, quoted from "Rewriting Mental-Testing History" p. 14. The second quote is taken from Terman, The Measurement of Intelligence (New York 1916), p. 91.

<sup>29</sup> Lewis Terman, "The Mental Test as a Psychological Method," Psychological Review 31 (1924) p. 206. See also Samelson, "Putting Psychology on the Map: Ideology and Intelligence Testing," in Buss (ed.) Psychology in Social Context (New York 1979). In February 1921, Yerkes wrote to Johnson calling his attention to the army tests and pointing out the "important bearing upon the immigration Bill... before Congress." Samelson, p. 124. In his introduction to Carl Brigham's, A Study of American Intelligence (New York 1923), Yerkes pointed out that "no one of us as a citizen can afford to ignore the menace of race deterioration or the evident relations of immigration to national progress and welfare." (p. vii).



jumped on the eugenics bandwagon and either joined eugenic organizations or coordinated their work with the eugenic leadership.

Frenzied agitation for restriction began during the third session of the 65th Congress.<sup>30</sup> A number of bills were introduced to deny citizenship to "alien slackers," deport "alien enemies," and aliens who attempted to escape military service. Playing on the fear of Bolshevism,<sup>31</sup> both the Senate and the House introduced bills to suspend immigration entirely. These demands showed the extent the war had altered the temper of American nationalism.<sup>32</sup>

The turning point in terms of the involvement of the eugenicists in the actual formulation of restrictionist legislation came in 1919 with the appointment of Albert Johnson as chair of the House Immigration Committee.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Between 2 December 1918 and 4 March 1919.

<sup>31</sup> The fear of Bolshevism, at least for some restrictionists, was more a ploy than a sincerely felt threat. Madison Grant was more contemptuous of communism than frightened of it. He had another consideration in mind. "When the Bolsheviks in Russia are overthrown, which is only a matter of time, there will be a great massacre of Jews and I suppose we will get the overflow unless we can stop it." Madison Grant to Prescott Hall, 10/21/18 IRL papers, Harvard University quoted from Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 306.

<sup>32</sup> Hutchinson, Legislative History of American Immigration, pp. 169-170.

<sup>33</sup> The IRL was instrumental in getting Johnson appointed to this committee. It maintained a full time lobbyist in Washington. See Chase, Legacy, p. 289. For a biography of Johnson see, "One who must be shown," Saturday Evening Post, 195 (19 May 1923) pp. 92, 97. The foreign danger

Quickly becoming the leader of the restrictionist movement, he brought the eugenics leadership to Washington to join him in an informal cabinet which planned the legislative battle for restriction.

It was probably Madison Grant who introduced Johnson to eugenic circles in New York. Johnson and Grant were old allies and Grant was in a unique position to introduce Johnson to New York restrictionist circles. Grant had been treasurer of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, a charter member of the Eugenics Committee, chairman of its subcommittee on Selective Immigration, founder of the Galton Society, member of the Eugenics Research Association, and a leader in the American Defense Society.<sup>34</sup>

Before long Johnson was made a member of the Eugenics Research Association, the Eugenics Committee of the United States, and the Galton Society. Lothrop Stoddard, Kenneth Roberts,<sup>35</sup> Charles Gould, and Harry Laughlin were meeting

---

was the governing passion of his entire Congressional career. He was first elected to Congress in 1912 on a restrictionist platform. He embraced the two bitterest aversions of his timber-rich constituency in southwestern Washington. -- hatred of the wobblies and hatred of the Japanese.

<sup>34</sup> John Higham is the source of the speculation that Grant was Johnson's initial contact with New York restrictionist circles. Johnson was impressed with Grants 1916 book (The Passing of the Great Race) and had been corresponding with him since that time. Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 313-315.

<sup>35</sup> Roberts was particularly active and important in the immigration restriction campaign throughout the twenties and thirties. He traveled to Europe in 1919, 1920 and 1921 as a reporter for the Saturday Evening Post sending

regularly with Johnson to plan strategy. Johnson was especially pleased to enlist the cooperation of Harry Laughlin. Laughlin gave the House Committee and through it the American people an extensive education in the importance of basing immigration policy on scientifically racial rather than economic considerations. After Laughlin's first appearance before the committee in 1920, Johnson appointed him its "expert eugenics agent."<sup>36</sup>

The Eugenical News was used to inform the troops of the progress of Immigration bills and call on its readership for support. Kenneth Roberts, whose editor at the Saturday Evening Post was a member of the Eugenics Society's advisory council,<sup>37</sup> was ordered to Washington to do a series on

---

back alarmist reports on the numbers and nature of the immigrants waiting to come to America. He kept in close touch with Albert Johnson during these trips and later testified before Johnson's Committee on December 14, 1921. See Hearings, 67th Cong. 2d. Sess. pp.97-106. During the 1930s he used the same arguments developed in the campaign against the Jews to campaign against the Mexican immigrants. See Robert A. Mohl, "The Saturday Evening Post and the 'Mexican Invasion,'" Journal of Mexican American History 3 (1973) pp. 131-38.

<sup>36</sup> Laughlin's activities for the Congressional Committee are most extensively documented in Francis Hassenschal, Harry H. Laughlin, Expert Eugenics Agent for the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization 1921 to 1931 (Cleveland, Ohio, Ph.D. Dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1969). See also, Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society, Chapter 5; Randy Bird and Garland Allen, "The Papers of Harry Hamilton Laughlin," Journal of the History of Biology 14 #2 (Fall 1981) pp. 339-353.

<sup>37</sup> Frederick S. Bigelow, was associate editor of the Saturday Evening Post and a member of the AES advisory. The editor, George Horace Lorimer, while not a member of the advisory council was clearly in sympathy with their aims (see his editorial "The Great American Myth" 5/7/21 in which he recommends reading Grant and Stoddard to

immigration and the House debate. He "practically camped in the committee's office," according to Peter Snyder, Johnson's personal secretary. Lothrop Stoddard and Harry Laughlin came to Washington to testify before Johnson's committee.<sup>38</sup>

Early in 1920 Johnson invited Harry Laughlin to testify before his committee. Laughlin presented a report entitled "Biological Aspects of Immigration."<sup>39</sup> Laughlin told the committee that "the character of a nation is determined primarily by its racial qualities; that is, by the hereditary physical, mental, and moral or temperamental traits of its people." Laughlin summarized the data on the Jukes, Ishmaels, and Kallikaks,<sup>40</sup> telling the committee that they had been deported from England because even then "it was found that they were the kind who would steal the bishop's silver if they got a chance." Even in Australia eugenics workers had found slums populated by the descendants of the original Botany Bayers deported from

---

anyone who "wishes to understand the full gravity of our present immigration problem." quoted from Chase, p. 173); Roberts original series on the Immigrants began in October 1919. He later published a book, Why Europe Leaves Home based on the series in 1922.

<sup>38</sup> Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 313 and note 37 on p. 394.

<sup>39</sup> "Biological Aspects of Immigration: Testimony of Harry H. Laughlin, April 16-17, 1920. 66th Cong., 2d. Sess. 26 pages. See also, Chase, Legacy, p. 291.

<sup>40</sup> The Jukes, Ishmaels, and Kallikaks are examples of studies of family groups allegedly proving genetic propensities for crimes, pauperism, and feeble-mindedness.

England. To prevent any further "deterioration of the American people" immigration of "degenerate 'blood'" must be prevented.<sup>41</sup>

By the summer of 1920 the tide of anti-immigration was clearly turning. The war over, transportation lines were once again fully operative. New immigrants were arriving in the latter half of 1920 at the rate of over fifty-thousand a month. The new immigrants came in the face of the Red scare, depression, and rising unemployment. A wave of persecution in Europe brought 119,000 Jews to America between 1920 and 1921.<sup>42</sup> Johnson made as much of this as he could. He reintroduced his suspension bill (H.R. 14461), which called for a two year suspension of immigration. Johnson's arguments for the bill played on anti-Semitism. The bill passed the House 296 to 42.

Testifying before the Senate Immigration Committee on behalf of this bill, Johnson presented a report from the State Department to the effect that the "dregs of Europe" were crowding French, German, and Austrian cities waiting to inundate America. Prefacing his remarks by saying that these reports "have been assailed as somewhat offensive," he

---

<sup>41</sup> Quoted from Chase, Legacy, p. 292.

<sup>42</sup> The actual numbers were not very large. According to Senate testimony between one hundred and sixty and three hundred thousand immigrants arrived between January and October 1920. Prior to 1914 the country was receiving an inflow of over one million annually. Hearings before the Committee on Immigration, United States Senate 66th Congress, 3d. Sess. p. 89; 144.

urged his colleagues to remember "that they are from our own State Department, from the consular agents." The State Department report referred to the immigrants as "wasted by disease," "mentally deficient," "abnormally twisted" and mostly of the "Jewish race" whose "unassimilability" cannot "bear any argument."<sup>43</sup> The report referred to "great masses" of Polish Jews "of the usual ghetto type" who were waiting to come to America. "They are filthy, un-American, and often dangerous in their habits." The State Department Report went on for eleven pages and returned over and over again to the Jews. Johnson's campaign was simple and direct.<sup>44</sup> America faced an emergency which called for the immediate suspension of all immigration. The alternative would be inundation by "filthy, un-American" Jews.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> "Statement of Hon. Albert Johnson," before the Senate Committee on Immigration 66 Congress 3d. Sess. (Monday, 3 January 1921) pp. 7-40. The quotes are taken from pages 9-11.

<sup>44</sup> Kenneth Roberts supplied similar testimony before the House Committee. He described a situation in which a "venerable Jew" who was serving as his guide "tore" into a crowd of immigrants, "beat them, and apparently cursed them... That was the only thing that would make them get back. Apparently they won't allow themselves to be handled in any other way." Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 67th Cong. 2d. Sess. 13 Dec. 1921, pp. 97-106.

<sup>45</sup> On the origin of the State Department report see Louis Marshall to Charles Evans Hughes, April 27, 1921, in Marshall Papers, Box C Archives of the American Jewish Committee; New York Times 11/13/20, p.11; Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 309. Johnson also presented eyewitness testimony and news stories supplied by Frederick Bigelow and Kenneth Roberts. They had gone to Europe to generate stories and gather material in support of Johnson's efforts. See Johnson's testimony before the Senate Committee on Immigration 66

The Senate committee did not buy Johnson's arguments. It was obvious that no emergency existed. The reports of millions of Jews waiting to come to America were clearly false. The actual numbers of immigrants coming per month was light to moderate by pre-war standards and as Louis Marshall and others pointed out many of those coming were the close relatives of immigrants already here. Nevertheless, the sentiment for restriction was strong. The Senate Committee recommended substitution of a fifteen-month quota system for aliens based on 5% of the number of foreign born persons of such nationality based on the 1910 census. This bill would limit immigration to around 350,000 per year. The House Conference committee accepted the plan and the compromise was sent to President Wilson in February 1921. It received a pocket veto from the President.<sup>46</sup> In the next session of Congress both the House and Senate tightened up the original quota bill, cut the quota from five to three percent, and sent it on to Harding who signed it into law on 19 May 1921.<sup>47</sup>

---

Cong. 3d. Sess. on H.R. 14461, pp. 7-40. See also the compelling and rational reply of Morris Rothenberg, of the American Jewish Congress, on pp. 143-47 and the detailed point by point rebuttal by Judge Leon Sanders, representing the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, pp. 89-96. There was simply no foundation in the State Department reports. Most of the Jews who wished to immigrate to America had family here already. They were the wives and children of families who arrived before the war.

<sup>46</sup> Hutchinson, Legislative History of American Immigration, pp. 174-176.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid. pp. 179-80; New York Times, 2/20/21, p. 1, 4/7/21, p. 29; 3/29/21, p. 19; Cong. Rec., 67 Cong., 1 Sess., 589,968.

Although adopted as a temporary measure, the law was a turning point in American immigration policy. It imposed the first sharp limit on European immigration and it established the national origins test as a means to restrict immigrants.<sup>48</sup> The eugenicists had wanted an army of testers and eugenic field workers to screen the immigrants both in Europe and at Castle Garden. This idea was politically unrealistic and the eugenicists compromised on the national origins system, although they never gave up the dream of eugenic field workers selecting seed stock from Europe.<sup>49</sup>

With the quota system in place Johnson began an extended campaign to tighten up the immigration quotas. At this point the Eugenics Committee and the eugenics movement as a whole began to play a leading role. The temporary law still allowed 150,000 immigrants from eastern and southern Europe to enter America each year. Between 1922 and 1924 Johnson and his allies in the eugenics movement planned a

---

<sup>48</sup> The national origins test was not abandoned until the Cellar Act of 1965. See, Time "Special Immigrants Issue: The Changing Face of America" 7/8/85 for a popular look at the contemporary immigration issue.

<sup>49</sup> They never entirely gave up the hope of a system run by eugenic field workers who could cull Europe of its best seed stock. Even within the national origins system the eugenicist pushed for testing. See for example, the 1930 Report of the Committee on Selective Immigration of the AES, 11 November 1930 reproduced in Eugenics 8 #12 (December 1930) pp. 470-73. The Nazi Lebensborn program was based on a similiar idea. SS troops kidnapped "Aryan" children from across occupied Eastern Europe, and brought them back to Germany to infuse the seed stock stock of the Fatherland.



well coordinated campaign to close the door even further.<sup>50</sup> With the help of his "Kitchen Cabinet" in New York, Johnson and his Committee developed the strategy for the Congressional campaign. They would aim at reducing the quota to 2% and changing the census base from 1910 to 1890.<sup>51</sup>

Although the Committee on Selective Immigration of the Eugenics Committee of the United States was not officially constituted until 28 April 1923, the AES leadership began organizing academic support for tightening immigration control in 1922 when Robert Yerkes and Charles Davenport helped create the Committee on Scientific Problems of Human Migration<sup>52</sup> as part of the the National Research Council's Division of Anthropology and Psychology.<sup>53</sup> The Committee

---

<sup>50</sup> Eugenical News 6 #1 (January 1921) p. 3, 6 #2 (Feb. 1921) p. 15, 6#9-10 (Sep./Oct. 1921) p. 58, 6# 11-12 (Nov./Dec. 1921) p. 67; 7 (1922) pp. 47, 71, 119; 8 (1923) pp. 39, 69; Minutes of the Eugenics Committee of the U.S. 6/16/23. Saturday Evening Post 196 (2/11/22); N.Y. Times 7/10/21, sec 6, p. 8.

<sup>51</sup> Laughlin comments that Grant was "instrumental in the framing of the Johnson Restriction Bill of 1924." See Laughlin "Notes on Madison Grant" Laughlin Papers, Kirkville in Laughlin/Grant file. The New York Times obituary of Grant 5/31/37 makes the same point claiming that Grant helped "frame the Johnson Restriction Act of 1924."

<sup>52</sup> The Committee was organized in August 1922. For a full report on its diverse activities see, "Report and Recommendations of the Committee on Scientific Problems of Human Migration." Presented to the Division of Anthropology and Psychology, National Research Council, April 5, 1926.

<sup>53</sup> "Report of the Biological Conference Group" of the Committee on Scientific Problems of Human Migration

believed that it was "urgent" to study the biological consequences of racial intermixture. This work bears "directly upon the immigration question."<sup>54</sup> Yerkes obtained five thousand dollars to begin a scientific study of the problem from the Scripps Foundation. On 25 January he, Wissler, and Lillie met with Commissioner General of Immigration, W.W. Husband to explore ways in which the committee might encouraged and guide academic work in support of immigration restriction. The committee was composed almost entirely of the inner-core of the AES leadership.<sup>55</sup>

The AES Committee on Selective Immigration consisted of Grant as chairman; Laughlin, secretary; and Robert deCoursey Ward as vice-chairman. In the Fall of 1923, the following

---

submitted by Frank R. Lillie, March 8, 1923. Population Council Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York. The Committee consisted of Yerkes, Chairman, Dr. Dodge, Sec. of the National Research Council, Kellogg, chairman of the NRC Division of Biology and Agriculture, Davenport, Holmes, Pearl, and Wissler.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid. See, Appendix to the Report titled, "Recommendations as to Problems in Race Intermixture," see also p. 5 of the Report itself. The Committee believed that adequate funding had to be found for research on the effects of race-crossing. They decided that this would be a priority of their work. The Committee also specifically recommended eight thousand dollars for the National Bureau of Economic Research in New York to undertake a study of the projected need for labor in relation to Immigration. See Exhibit 12.

<sup>55</sup> The Eugenics Committee was actively organizing on behalf of immigration restriction even before the establishment of the Committee on Selective Immigration. See, "Eugenics Committee of the United States," a type written report circa January 1924, AES Papers." in Minutes of the Eugenics Committee, AES Papers .

members were added to the Committee: Lucien Howe, Charles W. Gould, Albert Johnson, and Francis Kinnicutt.<sup>56</sup> Thus, the Committee on Selective Immigration was represented by the Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, the leaders of the Immigration Restriction Leagues of Boston and New York, the American Defense Society, and the Eugenics movement. This group coordinated the campaign, which included releasing special reports to the press at crucial points in the House proceedings.<sup>57</sup>

Using Congressional franking privileges and Congressional stationery, Laughlin surveyed all major public institutions for the mentally and physically handicapped and prepared a new report documenting his earlier assertions regarding the inferiority of the new immigrants. Laughlin's massive new report containing detailed statistical analysis of the number of immigrants and children of immigrants in jails and other institutions for the socially inadequate.

Laughlin testified on the result of the survey of state and federal institutions for social inadequates. He studied ten classes: feeble-minded, insane, criminal, epileptic, inebriate, tuberculous, blind, deaf, deformed, and dependent. "It shows that certain individuals are

---

<sup>56</sup> Kinnicutt was a founder of the 20,000-member New York Immigration Restriction League which was separate from the Boston IRL headed by Ward.

<sup>57</sup> See Report titled, "Eugenics Committee of the United States" circa January 1924 pp. 3-4. AES Papers.

contributing unduly to an institutional population; it reveals clear evidence that some countries are 'dumping' their defectives upon 'Our America.'" the report recommended the following: 1) examination of the individual immigrant, not only as such but as a potential parent; 2) the measurement of immigrants by modern mental tests; 3) the consideration of the personal standing of each immigrant at his home; 4) a consideration of the family history of the immigrant; 5) the establishment of immigration officials to secure adequate personal and family data. Davenport commented in reporting on Laughlin's testimony that it was "really thrilling to observe the attention Congress is paying to precise facts concerning immigration and its consequences."<sup>58</sup>

In December Laughlin prepared yet another report both for the Eugenics Committee and for Johnson. The Eugenics Committee's Committee on Selective Immigration distributed the report to the advisory council and to Congress. They also distributed 2360 copies to newspapers, magazines, and journals across the country for release on 7 January 1924.

---

<sup>58</sup> "Analysis of the Metal and Dross in America's Modern Melting Pot." Statement of H. H. Laughlin before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Serial 7-C, pp. 723-831. Washington. Government Printing Office, 1923. See the summary of the report in the Eugenical News 8 #4 (April 1923) p. 32.

Another five hundred copies were distributed by Committee members to individuals and organizations.<sup>59</sup>

Laughlin's report was sent to all the members of the advisory council with the request that they read the report carefully and give any comments or advice on the report. When H. S. Jennings received a copy of the report he was extremely disturbed over its conclusions. Jennings believed the report was methodologically flawed. Laughlin surveyed 445 state and federal custodial institutions. He calculated the proportion of various categories of defectives such as insane, feeble-minded, criminal, etc. He then calculated a sort of quota system. A group that furnished inmates to these custodial institutions in the same proportion as it furnishes inhabitants to the population was said to fill 100 percent of its quota. Jennings pointed out that Laughlin's entire edifice was fraught with methodological problems.

Jennings was particularly disturbed by the conclusions drawn from Laughlin's data. He pointed out that by Laughlin's own standards Negroes had to be considered among the best biological stock in the nation since they furnished

---

<sup>59</sup> The details of the Committee's activities on behalf of the 1924 Immigration Restriction Act can be found in a report on the accomplishment of the Eugenics Committee of the United States, a five-page typescript titled: "Eugenics Committee of the United States of America." It was written sometime early in 1924 and is part of the AES collection (Bk I). Harry Laughlin, "Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot," Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 67th Cong. 3d. Sess. Serial 7-C, 1923, pp. 725-831.

only 16% of their quota for the feeble-minded while native whites filled 125% of their quota. Furthermore, Jennings's pointed out:

if we examine the facts for the nationalities or regions that have contributed very large blocks of immigrants, so that there were in 1910 as many as 1,000,000 foreign born Americans from each, we find that Ireland contributed a much greater proportion of defectives than any of the other large groups.... Ireland was first in the proportion of insane, of pauperism or dependency; and of total defectives. The next to the worst record is that of Russia; then follows the Balkans; ... Italy, Scandinavia; Great Britain; Germany; with Austria-Hungary last.<sup>60</sup>

"Thus," Jennings concluded, based on Laughlin's own data, "the worst record is given by a country in Northwest Europe; the best by one in Southeast Europe [i.e. Austria-Hungary].

Now, does this situation call for going back to the census of 1890 as a basis [for the immigration quotas]? If it does ... It would discriminate against what on the face of Laughlin's own data is the best stock among the large groups. I am not certain that I should be able to subscribe, in view of Laughlin's statistics, to what is said on Page 8 of the Committee report as to the aliens from Northwest Europe being the 'good types, able bodied, physically fit, independent,' etc, ..."<sup>61</sup>

The Eugenics Committee ignored Jennings criticism and went ahead with a massive propaganda campaign based on

---

<sup>60</sup> Jennings to Fisher, 11/21/23, see, also Irving Fisher to H.S. Jennings, 11/19/23; Jennings Papers, American Philosophical Library, Philadelphia, Pa.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

Laughlin's worthless data. The results of Laughlin's report were published extensively in newspapers throughout the country. During the hearings of the House Committee two professional statisticians declared Laughlin's report "unworthy of consideration."<sup>62</sup> Jennings, too, was called to refute Laughlin's arguments. He summarized his critique of Laughlin's report with devastating simplicity. Laughlin's data, he argued, presented a powerful argument against changing the quota basis. According to Laughlin's data changing the quota basis from 1910 to 1890 would increase the number of defectives.<sup>63</sup>

Jennings also published his objections in The Survey, Science, and later in a short book entitled Prometheus or Biology and the Advancement of Man. Jennings wrote:

---

<sup>62</sup> Testimony of R. R. Luntz, a statistician for the Washington Office of the National Industrial Conference Board before the House Immigration Committee, 68th Cong. 1st Sess. December 1923, pp. 250-283. See also the critique of Professor John M. Gillman of the University of Pittsburgh, pp. 540-550.

<sup>63</sup> Statement of Professor H.S. Jennings, Hearings Before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 66th Cong. 1st. Sess. Friday 4 January 1924, pp. 510-518. Jennings was not the only one to question Laughlin's report.

the current fallacy that what is hereditary is certain, fixed, unchangeable ... reappears in discussions of racial problems .... There is no warrant in the science of genetics for such a statement; under new conditions they may not appear. It is particularly in connection with racial questions in man that there has been a great throwing about of false biology. Heredity is stressed as all-powerful; environment as almost powerless; a vicious fallacy, not supported by the results of investigation. We are warned not to admit to America certain people now differing from ourselves, on the basis of the resounding assertion that biology informs us that the environment can bring out nothing whatsoever but the hereditary characters. Such an assertion is perfectly empty and idle ...<sup>64</sup>

Shortly after passage of the immigration restriction bill Jennings sent Irving Fisher his resignation from the Eugenics Society. "My main difficulty with the methods of the Eugenics Society" he wrote, "lies in its use of Dr. Laughlin's 'Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot' in support of the provisions of the immigration bill basing admission of immigrants on the census of 1890 in place of 1910." That provision "may be a wise one, on other grounds, but the arguments for it drawn from Laughlin's studies seem to me clearly illegitimate. His data do not in my opinion justify the statements made in the Report"<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> H. S. Jennings, "'Undesirable Aliens': A biologist's Examination of the Evidence before Congress," The Survey 51 #6 (15 December 1923) pp. 309-312; "Proportions of Defectives from the Northwest and from the Southeast of Europe," Science (14 March 1924); Promethius or Biology and the Advancement of Man (New York 1925) p. 55-8. See also, Fisher to Jennings, 2/22/24.

<sup>65</sup> Jennings to Fisher, 9/27/24; Jennings Papers, APS, Phil. PA.



Jennings took pains to review the entire history of the Laughlin affair. Noting that all through the proceedings he communicated his objections to the Board and to the Congressional Committee.

When your letter of Nov. 19, 1923 enclosing that report came, I wrote you, under the date of Nov. 21, calling attention to the shakiness of the evidence on which the assertions were made. I trust that I am not 'sore' because no attention was paid to the point I made but here was a question of fact, one susceptible to test by some simple computations. The Committee did not think it worth while to make these computations ... Yet this was a matter of enormous importance on which the statements of the Committee were mistaken.<sup>66</sup>

Not only were Jennings' objections ignored, the Committee was clearly rounding up all arguments in favor of restriction without regard to merit. The overriding concern seemed to be to find the cluster of arguments that would support the bill. For example, John B. Trevor, a close friend of Madison Grant and a fellow trustee of the American Museum of Natural History, and eventually an unofficial advisor to Johnson, recommended that the new bill be argued on the grounds that the 1910 census unfairly favored the southern and eastern European immigrants! The argument was simple. A quota should maintain the racial balance in the country. Since the new immigrants only constituted some 12 per cent of the population they should not constitute more than 12 per cent of the quota. By the 1910 census they were allotted 44% of the quota. By the 1890 census they were

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

allotted 15%. Thus the 1890 census was fair - even liberal.<sup>67</sup>

While such a tactic was deemed necessary for the floor of the House, no such ruse was necessary among the eugenicists themselves. In their campaign for restriction they had repeatedly referred to the racial inferiority of the new immigrants. In its call for support of the bill the Committee on Selective Immigration of the Eugenics Committee of the United States of America wrote to its members:

Our immigration policy in the past has been too much a matter of temporary economic or political expediency. One of the most encouraging recent developments is the rapidly growing conviction on the part of our people that, as Dr. H. H. Laughlin has stated it, 'immigration is a long-time investment in family stocks rather than a short-time investment in productive labor.'...

A percentage limitation based on the census of 1890 would therefore not only reduce (1) the inflow of unskilled 'cheap' labor, but would also greatly reduce (2) the number of immigrants of the lower grades of intelligence and (3) of immigrants who are making excessive contributions to our feeble-minded, insane, criminal, and other socially inadequate classes." The initial argument in favor of the restriction law was economic. "The fundamental reason for its continuance is biological."<sup>68</sup>

In its campaign for the bill, the Eugenics Committee also stressed the importance of the results of the Army

---

<sup>67</sup> Trevor was a New York lawyer, graduate of Harvard and Columbia Law School. See Chase, Legacy, p. 290; Higham, Strangers, p. 320.

<sup>68</sup> Report of the Committee on selective Immigration of the Eugenics Committee of the United States of America, Eugenical News V9#24 (Feb. 1924) pp. 21-24.

intelligence tests. The Committee believed that the country at large had been greatly impressed by the results of these tests.

Experts have told us that had mental tests been in operation, and had the 'inferior' and 'very inferior' immigrants been refused admission to the United States, over 6,000,000 aliens now living in this country, free to vote, and to become the fathers and mothers of future Americans, would never have been admitted. The facts are known. It is high time for the American people to stop such a degradation of American citizenship, and such a wrecking of the future American race."<sup>69</sup>

The Johnson Immigration Restriction Bill passed the House and Senate with only minor modifications. It was signed by President Coolidge on 26 May 1924.<sup>70</sup> The eugenicists rejoiced at what they considered their greatest national victory. They believed this victory would be only the beginning of a eugenics campaign that would permeate every aspect of American social and legal life. In the end immigration restriction took the wind out of the eugenics sail. The eugenicists had been able to lead a large coalition of nativists in the campaign. Once won, however, the coalition disintegrated.

---

<sup>69</sup> "Report of the Committee on Selective Immigration of the Eugenics Committee of the United States," Eugenical News 9 #2 (February 1924) pp. 21-24.

<sup>70</sup> Calvin Coolidge had already lent his name to the Nordic theory when he published, "Whose Country is this? In his address to Congress he called for some action to keep America American. Good Housekeeping 72 (February 1921) p. 14.

While the country lost interest in immigration restriction, the American Eugenics Society did not. The Committee on Selective Immigration continued to be active well into the thirties. In 1928 the Committee issued its fourth report. It called for three additional standards to the legislation then in effect.

(a) That in the future there shall be admitted as immigrants only white persons, all of whose ancestors are of Caucasian descent.

(b) That the standard of natural intelligence be at least equal to the mean of the population and that no immigrant who rates below a "C" in the Army intelligence scale should be admitted.

(c) That it be required that the majority of the near kin of each particular immigrant indicate a high probability from the standpoint of family stock, that the particular immigrant will become an asset to American citizenry.

Society literature stressed the continued danger of non-Aryan immigration. Among those the society mentioned as of particular danger were Negroes from the West Indies, coolies from Philippines, and peons from Mexico. The Society advocated extension of the quota system to all countries of North and South America. The Society also advocated strengthened border patrols, an effective deportation system, and consular examination of potential immigrants. The AES was also interested in bringing a test case before the Supreme Court to determine whether Mexicans

could be excluded on racial grounds since they were neither white nor of African descent.<sup>71</sup>

While the Society was interested in all aspects of immigration control, including such things as registration and deportation of aliens, its focus turned more and more to the danger of Mexican immigration. In testimony before the House Immigration Committee in March 1928, Harry Laughlin called attention to the entrance of Mexican and colored races into the southwest since 1920.<sup>72</sup>

In a talk he presented before the Galton Society, Laughlin pointed out that the 1924 Restriction Act had resulted in larger numbers of Mexicans pouring into California, Arizona, and Texas. According to Laughlin the Mexicans were threatening to reconquer these areas. Francis Kinnicutt reported that the question of Mexican immigration was one of the major problems before Congress and that bills

---

<sup>71</sup> The Immigration Act of 1924 restricted immigration to white persons or persons of African descent. The courts had already ruled that this excluded Hindus and Mongolians. "Fourth Report of the Committee on Selective Immigration," Eugenical News 13 #10 (October, 1928) pp. 134-5; see also, "Memorial on Immigration Quotas," Eugenical News 12 #3 (March 1927) p. 27. See also footnote 4 above.

<sup>72</sup> "American History in Terms of Human Migration," review of statements by Harry Laughlin before the House Immigration Committee March 7, 1928. Eugenical News 13 #8 (August, 1928) p. 112.

drawn up on the issue were being effectively opposed by the railroads, farmers, and the sugar industry.<sup>73</sup>

The Galton Society responded by calling upon Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin to prepare a statement which the Society could endorse. The "Statement on Immigration Control in Relation to National Character" was issued in May 1929. The statement emphasized that "the essential character of every nation depends primarily upon the inborn racial and family endowments of its citizens."<sup>74</sup>

The campaign for continued restriction in the period 1924 to 1935 followed the same methods of the earlier campaign. The AES Committee on Immigration coordinated the efforts of restrictions, worked closely with Albert Johnson and the House Immigration Committee, produced many books and articles on the danger of immigration, and influenced organizations such as the NRC, AAAS, and foundations to take an interest in the issue. Furthermore, throughout this period the Committee on Selective Immigration was led by Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin. The transformation of the

---

<sup>73</sup> "Present Aspects of Immigration," a talk before the 74th meeting of the Galton Society. Eugenical News 14 #4 (April 1929) pp. 58-61.

<sup>74</sup> "Statement of the Galton Society on Immigration in Relation to National Character," Eugenical News 14 #5 (May 1929) p. 71. Voting members at the meeting were Carl Brigham, Charles Davenport, W.K. Gregory, J.C. Merriam, N.C. Nelson, E.L. Thorndike and Clark Wissler. Frederick Osborn was a regular guest of the Society in 1929. He became a member of the Galton Society in November 1929 as well as director of the Galton Society Publishing Company.

Society in these years from the so-called "old" eugenics to the "new" eugenics made very little difference in this campaign.

In 1934, for example, Frederick Osborn, acting as director of the Galton Publishing Company, supervised the production of The Alien in Our Midst, a collection of essays edited by Madison Grant and C.S. Davison. Among the authors included in the volume besides Grant were Albert Johnson were E.M. East, Lothrop Stoddard, and H.F. Osborn.<sup>75</sup>

Frederick Osborn expressed his views on these questions directly in Dynamics of Population, a book he wrote with Frank Lorimer in 1934.<sup>76</sup> Osborn was agnostic on the question of the hereditary nature of race and class differences. While the I.Q. tests scores clearly showed race and class differences, those groups with lower average scores also suffered from economic and cultural deprivation which might account for the differences. Osborn assumed that some of these differences were genetic but there simply wasn't enough evidence available to justify "invidious

---

<sup>75</sup> Madison Grant and C.S. Davison, The Alien in Our Midst or "Selling Our Birthright for a Mess of Pottage (New York 1934). See "The Quality of Immigrants Determine the Character of the Nation," in Eugenical News 19 (January/February 1934) p. 30.

<sup>76</sup> Frank Lorimer and Frederick Osborn, Dynamics of Population: Social and Biological Significance of Changing Birth Rates in the United States (New York 1934). See, Haller, Eugenics, p. 174-5 for comments on this book.

racial distinctions."<sup>77</sup> While Osborn rejected the certainties of past eugenic pronouncements on race, he maintained all of the Society's anti-immigrant policies. On the question of immigration restriction he wrote:

There has been a great influx of persons of diverse racial origins, with low standards of living and with unknown intellectual capacities during recent years... These groups have also been characterized, at least during the first generation, by rapid natural increase. Combining immigration and natural increase, there was accession to the United States during the last decade of nearly a million persons of Mexican or West Indian origin, including a large proportion of Indian and Negro stock. There seems to be no valid reason, except the private gain of some parties interested in exploiting cheap labor, for a continuance of this policy. The time would seem to be ripe for legislative action on this matter.<sup>78</sup>

Osborn explained that immigration restriction should ideally be based on a close examination of the individual and his or her near kin, though politically "it is frequently necessary to deal with groups." Intelligence tests have shown "that there are significant differences in the distribution of intellectual development among immigrants" On the basis of this evidence

There would seem to be every reason in favor of extension of the quota principle of immigration control to North America (especially south of the Rio Grande), South America, and the Atlantic and Pacific Islands.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid. p. 337.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid. p. 336.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.



Osborn also was troubled by the migration of Negroes to the northern industrial centers. While the science of genetics had not proven miscegenation harmful, unions of persons "of very different capacities, always involves hazards from the eugenic standpoint." Furthermore, interracial unions also carry a "social stigma." The discouragement of miscegenation "is a eugenic objective which intelligent leaders of racial minorities will readily share with other thoughtful persons."<sup>80</sup>

Osborn and Lorimer even expressed concern over the Northern migration of Negroes for the future of the Negro race. They felt that it was unfortunate that the most "intellectual Negroes" were moving into the "relatively sterile environment of urban life" leaving behind the "most retarded Negro families" in the high birth regions. Osborn and Lorimer recommended a policy that would encourage "superior Negro families" to remain in rural communities.<sup>81</sup>

Osborn expanded and revised these views in his book Preface to Eugenics published in 1940. By 1940, Osborn was confident that "stocks which do not differ in color from the majority of natives" would rapidly assimilate into the nation. They intermarry with the native stocks and "tend toward occupational and individual levels" in accordance

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid p. 338.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid pp. 337-8.

with their individual abilities.<sup>82</sup> As we noted in chapter three, this was not true of Negroes, Indians, and Mexicans.

Of all the racial groups in this country, the Negroes, the Indians, and the Mexicans present the most serious cultural problems. There is as yet no scientific evidence as to whether these races differ from the white stocks in genetic capacity to develop qualities of social value. But their present cultural qualities and standards of education and sanitation are such as to complicate and retard the development of adjoining white groups.... These problems are not eugenic, so far as we know at present, but they are a matter of grave social concern, since racial problems are accentuated by any tendency of minority groups to increase at the expense of the majority.<sup>83</sup>

Osborn speculated that these races might be improved "by a process of increasing births among their best stocks and decreasing births among their poorer stocks," but the eugenic aspect of this problem was overshadowed by the inability of these groups to assimilate culturally and economically into America.<sup>84</sup> The only acceptable policy, Osborn concluded, would be "to equalize any disproportion now existing between the natural increase of white, blacks, Indians, and Mexicans."<sup>85</sup>

Thus, the AES maintained all of its positions relating to immigration throughout the decade of the thirties. The certainty of racial inferiority was replaced with the

---

<sup>82</sup> Osborn, Preface to Eugenics (New York 1940) p. 75.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid. p. 119.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid p. 78.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid. p. 119.

suspicion of such inferiority. In 1934 the Society maintained the conviction that it was best to keep the eastern and southern Europeans out. I.Q. test scores, after all, showed them to be, on the whole, of inferior intellect. By 1940 with absolutely no danger of further European immigration, Osborn grew sanguine about the prospects for the complete assimilation of white immigrants. The problem became the Indians, Mexicans, and Negroes. Osborn reiterated earlier positions on miscegenation, opposition to Negro migration from Southern rural areas, and opposition to any differential birth rate which favored these racial groups. In the end, "invidious racial distinctions" were replaced with "a reasonable" eugenic policy.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> It should also be noted that while Osborn was more cautious in his statements regarding race, Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin were still spearheading the Society's campaign and their position on race had not changed.

Chapter Six  
A Comparison of American and Nazi  
Sterilization Programs.

In February 1937 the American Eugenics Society sponsored a conference on Eugenics in relation to Nursing at the Hotel Delmonico in New York. One of the featured speakers was Dr. Marie Kopp, (1888-1943)<sup>1</sup> who had toured Germany in 1935 for the Oberlander Foundation studying the administration of the Nazi eugenic sterilization laws. In his summary of Dr. Kopp's paper, Frederick Osborn, then Secretary of the Society, had occasion to remark that "the German sterilization program is apparently an excellent one" and that "taken altogether, recent developments in Germany constitute perhaps the most important social experiment which has ever been tried."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Very little information is available on Dr. Kopp. A New York Times obituary states that she was affiliated with the Rockefeller Foundation and a founder of the Pestalozzi Foundation. She was born in Lucerne, Switzerland. See, New York Times 12/16/43, p. 27.

I have not been able to locate any biographical information on Dr. Kopp. She apparently held a Ph.D. in sociology.

<sup>2</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Summary of the Proceedings" of the Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Nursing, 2/24/37 AES Papers. The "Summary of the Proceedings" was also mailed to the AES membership in slightly revised form as a circular letter dated 2/24/37. See Mehler and Allen, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #1," Mendel Newsletter (June 1977) note 6 on page 15. See also Dr. Kopp's presentation to the "Symposium on Sterilization" held at the New York Academy of Medicine in November 1936 entitled: "Eugenic Sterilization Laws in Europe," and published in the Am. Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology 34 (Sept. 1937) pp. 499-504, and her article, "Legal and

In 1977, Garland Allen and I used Osborn's obviously enthusiastic approval of the Nazi eugenics programs to question the notion propagated by Mark Haller and Kenneth Ludmerer, that the American Eugenics movement had undergone drastic changes by the 1930s. According to Haller and Ludmerer, the eugenics movement in the United States had been shaped by naive and simplistic notions of human genetics as well as class and race bias. By the 1930's a new leadership was supposed to have taken over the movement. This new leadership was "genuinely interested in mankind's genetic future." They "propounded a new eugenic creed which was scientifically and philosophically attuned to a changed America." The eugenic measures espoused by the Nazis, according to Ludmerer, "were obviously a perversion of the true eugenic ideal as seen by well-meaning men deeply concerned about mankind's genetic future."<sup>3</sup>

---

Medical Aspects of Eugenic Sterilization in Germany," published in the American Sociological Review 1 #5 (Oct. 1936) pp. 761-770.

- <sup>3</sup> Barry Mehler and G. Allen, "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #1: The American Eugenics Society Papers, Mendel Newsletter #14 (June 1977) pp. 11-13; Mark H. Haller, Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought (Rutgers 1963) pp. 117, 174; Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society: A Historical Appraisal (Baltimore 1972) p. 174. Both Ludmerer and Haller based their notion of a "new eugenics" on conversations and correspondence with Frederick Osborn. (Ludmerer, p. 174 note 27 and Haller, p. 174 note 39 on page 239). Ludmerer distinguishes between eugenicists who favored the Nazi program and "American geneticists of standing" who criticized it. As will be seen from this chapter such a distinction will not stand scrutiny.

The effort to exonerate eugenics of guilt for the Holocaust continues. In May 1985, Lloyd Humphreys, professor emeritus at the University of Illinois, called

In the same year that Allen and I challenged this thesis (1977), Loren Graham published an influential comparative study of Weimar and Russian eugenics. He suggested that Nazi eugenic policies represented a major departure from Weimar eugenics of the 1920s in which "humane socialist principles predominated." Thus, the impression given by Ludmerer and Graham was of two eugenic movements changing in opposite directions with apparently no interaction. American eugenics was becoming more humane and scientific while German eugenics was abandoning the "humane socialist principles" of the 1920s. Both agreed that Nazi eugenics was somehow a major perversion of eugenics.<sup>4</sup>

---

for a new eugenic policy to stem the dysgenic trend in the American population. Recognizing the problem of advocating eugenics in the post-Holocaust era, he said, "Anger and horror at the practices of Nazi Germany are understandable and justified, but we should not allow those emotions to determine our own policies. A group of insane evil men established practices that were antithetical to every aspect of Galton's definition of eugenics." Humphreys, "Intelligence and Public Policy," paper presented at the symposium: Intelligence, Measurement and Public Policy. Held at the University of Illinois, April 30-May 2, 1985.

<sup>4</sup> Graham, "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movements in Germany and Russia," American Historical Review 82 #5 (1977), 1113-64 (pp. 1136-37); quoted from Paul Weindling, "Weimar Eugenics: The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics in Social Context," Annals of Science 42 (1985), 303-318 (p. 305). Philip Reilly in an otherwise excellent study of involuntary sterilization in America also misinterprets Weimar eugenics. See Reilly, "Involuntary Sterilization of Institutionalized Persons in the United States: 1899-1942," Ph.D. Thesis (Yale, 1981) pp. 75-81. Horace Judson claims that there is very little connection between Anglo-American eugenics and Nazi eugenics in his review of Daniel Kevles' In the Name of Eugenics. See H. Judson, "Gene Genie," The New Republic, 8/5/85, p. 30. Carl Bajema, in the introduction to his Benchmark collection, Eugenics: Then and Now (Stroudsburg 1976),

This study stresses the continuity and coherence of eugenics both nationally and internationally. It does not mean to imply that there were no differences between American and Nazi eugenics or between Weimar and Nazi eugenics but It does challenge the notion that Nazi eugenics was a "perversion" of eugenics. Eugenicists from all over the world met at international conferences, participated in international eugenic organizations, toured and lectured in each other's countries, translated and reported on each other's research, and carefully examined legislative initiatives in each other's countries. This is not to say that national differences did not exist, but that continuity

---

confronts the problem head on. "Does eugenics include brutal racist evolutionary practices such as those of Nazi Germany?" Bajema's answer is an emphatic no. See the discussion of Bajema in the introduction to this study (page 14, footnote 20). He claims that Francis Galton employed two criteria for a true eugenics program: The policy must be humane and it must be effective. It was clear to Bajema that "the inhuman racist practices of Nazi Germany fail both criteria and cannot be called eugenic." Bajema, Eugenics: Then and Now (Stroudsburg 1976) p. 5. The attempt to separate eugenics from the negative associations of the Nazi regime began in the mid-forties. See Henry Sigerest, Civilization and Disease (Chicago 1943) pp. 106-107. Sigerest writes, "I think it would be a great mistake to identify eugenic sterilization solely with the Nazi ideology and to dismiss the problem simply because we dislike the present German regime and its methods... The [eugenic] problem is serious and acute, and we shall be forced to pay attention to it sooner or later." Quoted from Ludmerer, Genetics, p. 117. For an article entirely free of this misperception see Jeremy Noakes, "Nazism and Eugenics: The Background to the Nazi Sterilization Law of 14 July 1933," in R.J. Bullen et. al. (eds.) Ideas into Politics: Aspects of European History 1880-1950 (London and New Jersey 1984) pp. 75-95.

and interaction were more pronounced than differences.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the American and German eugenicist were particularly close in ideology in the thirties.

With regard to eugenic sterilization, Marie Kopp remarked, America "served as an example to the rest of the world." The first sterilization law was passed in Indiana in 1907. Between 1907 and 1928, when the first European sterilization law was passed in the Swiss Canton de Vaud, Americans had enacted nearly thirty state sterilization laws. Between 1928 and 1936 a number of European states also passed sterilization laws including Denmark (1929), Germany (1933), Sweden and Norway (1934), Finland and Danzig (1935), and Estonia (1936). All of these laws, according to Dr. Kopp, were modeled on and inspired by American efforts.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, the many papers presented at the three international conferences of eugenics in 1912, 1921, and 1933. The sharpest international differences in eugenics were between the Catholic and Protestant nations. Many Catholic nations had thriving eugenics movements. But in these countries sterilization was generally disapproved of as a means of eugenical control. The eugenics movements in Germany, America, and England were quite close ideologically.

<sup>6</sup> Kopp, "Eugenic Sterilization Laws in Europe," New York Academy of Medicine 34 (September 1937) p. 499. See also, J. Blasbalg, "Ausländische und deutsche Gesetze und Gesetzentwürfe über Unfructbarmachung," Zeitschrift Für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft 52 (1932) pp. 477-496. G. Bock has an excellent essay, "'Zum Wohle des Volkesköpers....' Abtreibung und Sterilisation im Nationalsozialismus" in Journal für Geschichte 2 (1980) Heft 6 pp. 58-65. The Eugenical News reported the full texts of a number of these foreign laws and published numerous reports on the progress of eugenics world wide. See, for example, the text of the Danish eugenical sterilization law in Eugenical News 21 #1 (January 1936) pp. 10-13. See also the full text of the German



Furthermore, the American and German eugenicists were particularly close in ideology.<sup>7</sup> The German and American movements each regularly translated the literature of the other, and the German movement was closely followed in the American eugenic press. In June 1936, Heidelberg University planned a celebration in honor of its 550th anniversary. Harry Laughlin, the author of Eugenical Sterilization in the United States (Chicago 1922), was offered an honorary degree in recognition of his services to eugenics. Laughlin wrote that he would be glad to accept "not only as a personal honor, but as evidence of the common understanding of German and American scientists of the nature of eugenics as research in and the practical application of those

---

sterilization law and the full text of the Norwegian sterilization bill in Vol. 28 #5 (September 1933) pp. 89-95. Eugenic sterilization was legal in all Swiss Cantons under the Medical Practices Act and could be performed at the discretion of the physician with the permission of the individual or guardian. See Marie Kopp's review of S. Zurukzoglu, Verhütung Erbkranken Nachwuchses (Basel 1938) in Eugenical News 24 #1 (March 1939) pp. 7-8.

The German law was much more comprehensive than all other similar laws and bills and incorporates more safeguards than any other bill.

<sup>7</sup> The Germans had been following the American sterilization legislation closely. Geza von Hoffman, the Austro-Hungarian Vice-Consul, took a keen interest in eugenics. After being transferred to Berlin he became an active member of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene and published extensively on the American sterilization programs. For more on this see Noakes, "Nazism and Eugenics," in R.J. Bullen et. al. (eds.) Ideas into Politics: Aspects of European History 1880-1950 (London and New Jersey 1984) pp. 75-95 and K. Novak, Euthanasie und Sterilisierung im "Dritten Reich." Die Konfrontation der evangelischen und Katholischen Kirchen mit dem "Gesetze zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses" und der "Euthanasie" - Aktion (Göttingen 1977).

fundamental biological and social principles which determine racial endowments and the racial health... of future generations."<sup>8</sup>

The Nazi takeover enabled German eugenicists to achieve long sought goals, but at least until the outbreak of the war the movement did not substantially alter its goals. Some American eugenicists did not approve of Nazi totalitarianism (though some did), but they did not see the German eugenics legislation as corrupted by the Nazi regime. As Osborn remarked, "Germany's rapidity of change with respect to eugenics was possible only under a dictator." But, as doctor Kopp pointed out in her paper, the eugenic legislation enacted by the Nazis had "been on the docket for many years."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Randy Bird and Garland Allen, "Archival Sources in the History of Eugenics," J. of the History of Biology 14 #2 (Fall 1981) p. 351. The most popular German eugenics text, Menschliche Erblchkeitslehre (Munich 1927) was translated into English and widely read in the United States. See Human Heredity (New York 1931) translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. Many American eugenics texts, including Madison Grant's classic, The Passing of the Great Race (New York 1916), were translated into German. The Eugenical News is filled with news from Germany and reviews of German texts.

<sup>9</sup> Marie E. Kopp, "A Eugenic Program in Operation," Paper presented at the Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Nursing, 2/24/37. AES Papers. There was a sterilization bill before the Prussian Legislature as early as 1903 and one before the Saxon Legislature in 1923. Bills were introduced to the Reichstag in 1907 and 1925. See Kopp, "Eugenical Sterilization Laws in Europe," New York Academy of Medicine 34 (September 1937) p. 499. Marie Kopp is also quoted in M. Olden, History of the Development of the First National Organization for Sterilization (Gwynedd 1974). See J. David Smith, Minds Made Feeble (Rockeville 1985) p. 160. See also, Samuel J.

Recent work on the German eugenics program supports this view. Gisela Bock, in a landmark essay entitled, "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany," writes that by the end of World War I "sterilization was widely and passionately recommended as a solution to urgent social problems."<sup>10</sup>

---

Holmes, Human Genetics and its Social Import (New York 1936) and Leon Whitney, The Case for Sterilization (New York 1934). In England the Nazi eugenics law "was much discussed in the English press." C.P. Blacker, who was no fan of the Nazis, felt constrained in his book, Voluntary Sterilization (London 1934), to defend the German eugenic law against claims that it would be used as an instrument of persecution. While he admitted that such a possibility existed, he pointed out that the law itself did not allow for such abuse. Blacker quoted the law and informed his English readers that he did not believe the law was designed for the improper sterilization of political prisoners or for racial persecution. Blacker, pp. 87-90. The German Reichstag did not favor eugenic legislation before 1933. In response to bills advocating eugenic sterilization, bills were introduced into the Reichstag in 1914 and 1918 which plainly stated that sterilization and abortion could only be performed if there was a threat to the life or limb of the mother. War and revolution prevented the Reichstag from taking action on these bills. After the war, particularly after 1927, the eugenics movement in Germany made great gains. Eugenic sterilization would probably have become law without a Nazi takeover. See Noakes, "Nazism and Eugenics," in R.J. Bullen et. al. (eds.) Ideas into Politics: Aspects of European History 1880-1950 (London and New Jersey 1984) p. 81.

- <sup>10</sup> Gisela Bock, "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 8 #3 (Spring 1983) quoted from a slightly revised version reprinted in Renate Bridenthal et. al. When Biology Became Destiny: Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany (New York 1984) p. 274. Bock comments in her footnote (#15 on page 291) that there had been extensive writing on this subject in the 1920s. She notes that even Chase "seems to underestimate the German roots of the movement." For a more thorough examination of these issues by Bock see Zwangsterilization im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik (Opladen 1986). See also "Frauen und ihre Arbeit im Nationalsozialismus" in A. Kuhn and G. Schneider, eds. Frauen in der Geschichte (Düsseldorf 1979) pp. 113-149.

Paul Weindling, who has written on Weimar eugenics, notes that the emphasis on negative eugenics "pre-dated the Third Reich." He quotes the geneticist Richard Goldschmidt, who complained that the Nazis "took over our entire plan of eugenic measures." The legislation which the Nazis promulgated in July 1933 had been developed and lobbied for during the Weimar years. Weindling concludes that "authoritarian politics provided favorable circumstances for eugenicists to exert influence on social policy in the planning of sterilization legislation."<sup>11</sup>

Despite all the revisionary work which has been done, no one has actually compared the American and German eugenicists' views on these issues or the legislation that emerged in the two countries. Several historians have suggested that the Nazi eugenic sterilization laws were modeled after the American laws, but no detailed examination has been carried out to see just how much ideological affinity existed in regard to these issues.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Paul Weindling, "Race Blood and Politics," Times Higher Ed. 19 July 1985; "Weimar Eugenics," Annals of Science, 42 (1985), 304, 318. See also Eugenical News 19 (July-August 1934) p. 107. A news article reports on the eleventh meeting of the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations held in Zurich, 18-21 July 1934. The report states that eugenics was being tackled in Germany with "characteristic thoroughness and efficiency. The main direction is in the hands of scientific men who have long been leaders of this field, and it seems to be going on sound and truly eugenic lines."

<sup>12</sup> See, for example, Allan Chase, Legacy of Malthus (New York 1980) p. 349; Randy Bird and Garland Allen, "Archival Sources in the History of Eugenics #3: The Papers of Harry Hamilton Laughlin," The J. of the History

The German and American views on eugenic sterilization were fundamentally the same throughout most of the 1930s. This is not to say that individual eugenicists did not disagree with some aspects of the program or that some American geneticists did not criticize the program as a whole, but the many efforts that have been made to distinguish Nazi eugenics from "humane socialist eugenics," "new eugenics," or "reform eugenics" obscures the fundamental coherence of eugenic ideology in the United States and Germany in the thirties.

The Nazi sterilization law was promulgated on 26 July 1933.<sup>13</sup> Within two months the Eugenical News printed a major evaluation of the law including its complete text in translation. The Eugenical News praised the Nazi government for being the "first of the world's major nations to enact a modern sterilization law." The German law "reads almost

---

of Biology Archive Report 14 #2 (Fall 1981) pp. 339-353; J. David Smith, Minds Made Feeble (Rockville 1985) chapter nine, "Eugenics, Sterilization and the Final Solution" pp. 135-168. Smith's chapter is a good summary of the secondary sources, but it does not add anything to what we already know about the sterilization issue.

<sup>13</sup> For an excellent article on the background to the German law see Jeremy Noakes, "Nazism and Eugenics," in R.J. Bullen et. al. (eds.) Ideas into Politics: Aspects of European History 1880-1950 (London and New Jersey 1984) pp. 75-95. Bock notes that the law was actually ready by 14 July but not promulgated until the 26th. The reason she gives is that the Nazi did not want the law to interfere with the signing of the Concordat with Rome which took place on the 20th. See Bock, Zwangsterilization (Opladen 1986) pp. 86-7.

like" Harry Laughlin's "American model sterilization law"<sup>14</sup> and along with the American statutes will "constitute a mile stone" (sic) in the advance in controlling human reproduction.

The new law is clean-cut, direct and "model." Its standards are social and genetical. Its application is entrusted to specialized courts and procedure. From a legal point of view nothing more could be desired.

Indeed, the Eugenical News editorialized, "it is difficult to see how the German sterilization law could be deflected from its purely eugenical purpose, and be made an 'instrument of tyranny' for the sterilization of non-Nordic races."<sup>15</sup>

Paul Popenoe, director of the Human Betterment Foundation and member of the Board of Directors of the American Eugenics Society, published an alternate translation of the full text of the German sterilization law

---

<sup>14</sup> There is no hard evidence that the Nazi sterilization law was actually "based" on Laughlin's model law. Laughlin himself is probably the source of this observation since he was editor of the Eugenical News in 1937 and wrote most of the unsigned articles. My point here and in the following paragraphs is simply to show the enthusiasm and pride American eugenicists expressed in regard to the German law. Rightly or wrongly, the Americans took credit for the German law.

<sup>15</sup> The law was titled, "Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses." Eugenical News 18 #5 (September/October 1933) pp. 89-95. In the same issue the Eugenical News printed the text of the Norwegian sterilization bill which was much less rigorous than the German law. It allowed for the sterilization of anyone who was not self-supporting and for the castration of anyone who has sex with children under the age of 14 years. It contained none of the safeguards of the Nazi law.

in the Journal of Heredity in July 1934. He too maintained that the law was clearly based on American models and stated his belief that the majority of American eugenics experts recognized it as "better than the sterilization laws of most American states." The safeguards against abuse were the best to be found anywhere in the world.<sup>16</sup>

While the law itself was considered excellent, Popenoe commented, "the success of any such measure naturally depends on conservative, sympathetic and intelligent administration." The Nazis were doing their best to prevent criticism by gathering "about it the recognized leaders of the eugenics movement, and to depend largely on their council in framing a policy which will direct the destinies of the German people, as Hitler remarks in Mein Kampf, 'for the next thousand years.'"<sup>17</sup>

The German law resembled Laughlin's model in allowing for the sterilization of eight classes of "hereditary"

---

<sup>16</sup> Popenoe, "The German Sterilization Law," Journal of Heredity 25 #7 (July 1934) pp. 257-260. Popenoe not only praised the sterilization law, he also praised Hitler who "bases his hopes of national regeneration solidly on the application of biological principles to human society." He went on to quote extensively from Mein Kampf. Popenoe also defended the Nazis privately. See Popenoe to L.C. Dunn, 22 January 1934. LCD Papers, quoted in Ludmerer, p. 117.

<sup>17</sup> Praise for the Nazi law can also be found in C.P. Blacker's Voluntary Sterilization (London 1934) pp. 90-94. See also Leon Whitney The Case for Sterilization (New York 1934); Gosney and Popenoe, Sterilization for Human Betterment (New York 1929) and J.H. Landman, Human Sterilization (New York 1932).

diseases including feeble-mindedness, schizophrenia, manic-depressive insanity, epilepsy, Huntington's chorea, hereditary blindness, deafness and malformation. It also allowed for the sterilization of alcoholics under a separate category. There was a good deal of debate as to whether alcoholism was hereditary, and the law apparently therefore allowed the sterilization of alcoholics under a category separate from "hereditary diseases."<sup>18</sup>

Even when a family member of an incompetent person requested sterilization, permission had to be obtained from the Court of the Wards. If the individual were a minor, incompetent, or mentally deficient, a ward could apply to the court. In all cases of legal incompetency a legal guardian was necessary. A licensed physician had to append a certificate to all voluntary sterilization orders stating that the person has "had the purpose and consequences of sterilization explained to him."

Sterilizations could also be requested by public health officials for inmates of hospitals, custodial institutions, or penitentiaries. The petition had to be submitted in writing to the District Eugenical Court (Erbsgesundheitsgericht) and supported by a medical certificate. The decision rested with the Eugenical Court. Attached to the

---

<sup>18</sup> My summary of the German sterilization law is based on a comparison of the two English translations of the law. See Eugenical News 28 #5 (Sep/Oct. 1933) pp. 91-93 and Paul Popenoe, "The German Sterilization Law," J. of Heredity 25 #7 (July 1934) pp. 257-60.



Magistrates Court, the Eugenical Court consisted of three members: a judge, (as chairman), a public health physician, and a physician "particularly versed in eugenics." None of these three could either initiate a petition for sterilization or perform the operation, nor could a physician who initiated a petition perform the operation. Legal council had to be provided for the defendant and all costs both legal and medical were to be borne by the state. A special court of appeals was set up and any challenge to the lower court decision automatically suspended the ruling until it could be reviewed.

The Eugenical Court had all of the authority of a regular court. Witnesses could be called and were obliged to testify. The court decision was based upon a majority vote and had to be delivered in writing and signed by the members of the tribunal. The reason for ordering or suspending a sterilization had to be stated in the order, and the decision had to be delivered to the applicant as well as the person whose sterilization had been ordered or to that person's legal counsel.

The decision of the court could be appealed within one month and an appeal automatically postponed the procedure until the Supreme Eugenical Court could review the case and pass judgment. The Supreme Eugenical Court was composed of a judge from the District Superior Court, a public health physician, and another physician especially versed in

eugenics. The decision of the Supreme Court was final. If approved, the sterilization was to be performed only at a hospital and by a licensed physician. Finally, all persons involved in the procedure were "pledged to secrecy." Violation of this confidence was punishable with imprisonment of up to one year or a fine.<sup>19</sup>

Daniel Kevles remarks that the German sterilization law "went far beyond American statutes" in that it applied to all persons "institutionalized or not, who suffered from allegedly hereditary disabilities."<sup>20</sup> In practice, this was an important distinction. Some two-thirds of the victims of the Nazi sterilization program were not institutionalized. However, in principle, the American and German sterilization programs sought to sterilize the same population.

The most famous American sterilization law, the Virginia law, was challenged on the grounds that it violated the principle of equal protection since it applied only to institutionalized persons. Oliver Wendell Holmes spoke directly to this concern in *Buck v. Bell* (1927). Holmes pointed out that the Virginia compulsory sterilization law sought to sterilize all persons with hereditary defects, not just those institutionalized. It did not violate the equal protection clause because "the law does all that is needed when it does all that it can." The law, he said clearly

---

<sup>19</sup> The law went into effect 1 January 1934.

<sup>20</sup> Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics, p. 116.

sought to bring all "similarly situated so far and so fast as its means allow" under its jurisdiction.

so far as the operations enable those who otherwise must be kept confined to be returned to the world, and thus open the asylum to others, the equality aimed at will be more nearly reached.<sup>21</sup>

Doctor J. H. Bell, Superintendent of the State Colony for Epileptics and Feeble-minded of Virginia, made this point explicit in a talk before the American Psychiatric Association at Atlanta, Georgia, in May 1929. Bell stated:

There is, of course, no object in sterilizing an institutional inmate who is not still within the reproductive period or who will not be returned to the population at large.... We believe that a widespread operation of eugenical sterilization under institutional control ... will, in the course of time, greatly reduce the number of defective and dependent people within our population.<sup>22</sup>

The Commonwealth of Virginia aimed to sterilize only those who could "be safely discharged or paroled and become self-supporting with benefit to themselves and to society." Carrie Buck was institutionalized only after she became pregnant. She was released immediately after she was sterilized. Her sister Doris Buck was brought to the State Colony specifically to be sterilized and was released immediately after her sterilization. It was clear that the

---

<sup>21</sup> Kevles, In The Name of Eugenics, p. 116. Buck v. Bell, Supreme Court Reporter 47 (St. Paul 1928) pp. 585.

<sup>22</sup> J. H. Bell, "Eugenical Sterilization," Paper presented before the American Psychiatric Association at Atlanta, Georgia, May 1929. Quota from the Eugenical News 14 #10 (October 1929) p. 151-2.

provision in the law to sterilize institutionalized persons was not meant to restrict the population of those to be sterilized. The Virginia law and the Nazi law actually aimed to sterilize the same people. It was only a technical mechanism of the Virginia law that differed. If the law really did single out an institutionalized population for special treatment it would have violated the equal protection clause and would have been unconstitutional. Thus, the difference was not as significant as it has sometimes been seen to be.<sup>23</sup>

In actual operation there were a number of factors which made it easier to perform a sterilization under the

---

<sup>23</sup> See "An Act to provide for the sexual sterilization of inmates of State institutions in certain cases," Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Virginia (Richmond 1924) pp. 569-571.

Carrie Buck had lived with the Dobbs family in Charlottesville, Virginia, until she was seventeen years old. She had completed the sixth grade in school and had a congenial relationship with the family. The Dobbs family sought her commitment on 23 January 1924, after they discovered that Carrie was pregnant. During the hearings to establish Carrie's eligibility for sterilization, Arthur Estabrook, the eugenics expert from the Eugenics Record Office sent to testify in the case, was asked if Carrie was incapable of self support. He was specifically asked, "would she land in the poorhouse." He answered, no, "she would probably land in the lower-class area in the neighborhood in which she lives." Estabrook went on to explain that she "is incapable of taking care of herself in the manner in which society expects her to." Quoted from Dudziak, "Oliver Wendell Holmes as a Eugenic Reformer," Iowa Law Review 71 #3 (March 1980) p. 850. See Gary Robertson "I Wanted Babies Bad," Richmond Times Dispatch 2/23/80. See also Smith, Minds Made Feeble pp. 144-7. For a detailed review of *Buck v. Bell* see R. J. Cynkar, "Buck vs. Bell: Felt Necessities vs. Fundamental Values?" Columbia Law Review 81 (1981) pp. 1418-61.

Virginia law than under the Nazi law. The Virginia law states that "whenever the superintendent" of any of the five state hospitals "shall be of the opinion that it is for the best interests of the patient and of society that any inmate of the institution under his care should be sexually sterilized, such superintendent is hereby authorized to perform, or cause to be performed... the operation." The Virginia law differed somewhat as to the categories subject to sterilization, stressing "hereditary forms" of idiocy, insanity, imbecility, feeble-mindedness, or epilepsy and leaving out alcoholism, Huntington's chorea, hereditary blindness, deafness and malformation. It should be noted however that these categories were included in Laughlin's model law and were included in other state laws.

The superintendent had first to present a petition for sterilization to a special board of his hospital which he was charged to establish to deal with such cases. He would then state the facts of the case and the grounds for his recommendation. A copy of the petition was then to be served to the "inmate together with a notice in writing designating the time and place" of sterilization and giving the inmate at least thirty days notice. "A copy of the said petition shall also be served upon the legal guardian." If no guardian existed the superintendent applied to the Circuit Court to appoint one. The guardian was paid a fee not to exceed twenty-five dollars. If the inmate to be

sterilized was an infant and the parents were known they too were to be served the papers.

After receiving the petition the "special board" proceeded to hear and consider the petition and the evidence offered in its support. "Any member of the special board shall have the power to administer oaths to any witness at such hearings." All testimony had to be transcribed and all records of the proceedings had to be preserved. The inmate or his/her guardian could attend these hearings if they wished.

If the special board determined that the inmate was a "probable potential parent of socially inadequate offspring" and that said inmate may be sterilized without detriment to his or her general health "and that the welfare of the inmate and society will be promoted by such sterilization, the said special board may order" the sterilization by a "competent physician." Thus, the director of the institution could controlled the entire proceeding. He established the review board, initiated the sterilization proceeding, and carried out the operation.

Within thirty days of the order the inmate or his or her guardian could appeal to the Circuit Court. All papers regarding the proceedings were then to be handed over to the Circuit Court. The decision of the Circuit Court could be appealed to the Supreme Court of appeals within ninety days of the Circuit Court order.

Reading the two laws one is struck by the problems with the American version. The Virginia law allowed the institution much greater control over the sterilization mechanism than the German law. In the German law the proceedings were clearly divided between the petitioner for sterilization, the Eugenical Court, and the physician who carried out the operation. Furthermore, in the German procedure the hearings were carried out in a special court attached to the regular court system. In the Virginia law the initial hearing was carried out in the institution.

In the Virginia law the superintendent himself creates a "special board" which is undefined. The superintendent then petitions his own board and is charged by the board with the sterilization. This is an in-house proceeding open to all sorts of abuse by a zealous eugenics advocate. And indeed the historical record indicates much abuse. Furthermore, where the German law paid all legal expenses for defense and appeal, the Virginia law allowed only twenty-five dollars. This was hardly enough to cover the cost of carrying a case to the Circuit Court of appeals.

Despite these apparent problems Oliver Wendell Holmes commented that there "can be no doubt that so far as procedure is concerned the rights of the patient are most carefully considered." That the rights of the patient were not carefully considered is obvious from a review of the record. Doris Buck and others sterilized in Virginia were

not even told the nature of the operation. According to Doris Buck, "When the welfare people found out who my mother was, they said I had to go to Lynchburg." At the hospital she was told she needed surgery to "correct medical problems." Carrie Buck, herself, testified in 1980, "All they [the doctors] told me was that I had to get an operation on me. I never knew what it was for. Later on, a couple of the other girls told me what it was. They said they had it done on them."<sup>24</sup>

In reality, the carefully drawn legal procedures were politically motivated. Eugenic legislation was difficult to pass and the courts often challenged eugenic laws on a variety of grounds. In order to make eugenic bills more palatable to legislatures and courts, eugenicists drafted careful legal procedures to protect the rights of the "degenerate classes." But when it came down to the actual day to day operation of eugenic programs, we find all sorts of abuses.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Holmes, *Buck v. Bell*, Supreme Court Reporter 47 (Oct. 1926) p. 585. *Richmond Times-Dispatch* 2/23/80 p. 6 and 2/27/80 p. 2. See also *Richmond Times-Dispatch* 2/24/80, page one, "Nazi Sterilizations had their roots in U.S. Eugenics." Dr. K. Ray Nelson, Director of the Lynchburg Hospital, stated that many of the women sterilized between 1920 and 1940 were used as a source of household help. "Most ... would not be considered retarded by today's standards, he said."

<sup>25</sup> See Chase, *Legacy of Malthus* (New York 1980) p. 16-18. Chase cites a 1974 case court case in which Federal District Judge Gerhardt Gesell ruled that Federal family planning programs were being used to coerce poor women into accepting sterilization. There is a large body of documentation on sterilization abuse in the United



Support for the Nazi eugenics program was widespread within the American Eugenics Society leadership. The idea that in the 1930s support for Nazi eugenics was limited to a fringe element discredited in the legitimate world of science is patently false. The American Eugenics Society officially endorsed the Nazi program in its 1937 conference on "Eugenics in Relation to Nursing" and praised the program in its official publications throughout the thirties.<sup>26</sup>

Charles R. Stockard, president of the Board of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research (1935-1939) and a leading eugenicist, sounded the alarm for sterilization with as great an urgency as any Nazi. At a round table discussion at the New York Academy of Medicine organized by the American Eugenics Society in 1937, Stockard said that the human species faced "ultimate extermination" unless propagation of "low grade and defective stocks" could be "absolutely prevented."<sup>27</sup>

---

States. For more details on this see Thomas M. Shapiro, Population Control Politics: Women, Sterilization, and Reproductive Choice (Philadelphia 1985). We know that numerous eugenic sterilizations were in fact carried out in the United States without any legal authority and we will never know how many illegal eugenic sterilizations have been or continue to be performed.

<sup>26</sup> Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Nursing: Summary of the Proceedings, by Frederick Osborn. AES Papers, 2/24/37. See also Eugenical News 18 #5 (September-October 1933); 19 #2 (March-April 1934); 19 #4 (July-August 1934); 19 #6 (November-December 1934); 20 #1 (January-February 1935); 21 #6 (November-December 1936); 21 #4 (July-August 1936); 22 #4 (July-August 1937); 23 #6 (November-December 1938).

<sup>27</sup> Charles R. Stockard, remarks made during the "General Discussion" at the "Round Table Conference on Eugenics in

Furthermore, support for Nazi eugenics was not confined to the AES. A recent survey of high school biology texts from 1914 to 1949 reveals that over 90 per cent included a discussion of eugenics.<sup>28</sup> In the mid-thirties many of these texts commented explicitly and favorably on the German eugenics program.<sup>29</sup> During this same period, in 1937, Frederick Osborn and Harry Laughlin founded the Pioneer Fund, a eugenic fund whose first project was to bring a Nazi eugenic propaganda film to America which was distributed to high schools and churches.<sup>30</sup>

---

Relation to Medicine" at the New York Academy of Medicine 4/21/37, AES Papers.

- <sup>28</sup> Steven Selden, "Confronting Tacit Social Values and Explicit Political Ideology in the Science Curriculum: The Response and Responsibility of Today's Educator," to be published in Alex Molnar (ed.), The Social Responsibility of Educators (Alexandria, in press). See also the author's review of college texts, "Education Policy and Biological Science: Genetics, Eugenics, and the College Textbook, c. 1908-1931," Teachers College Record (Teachers College, Columbia University) 87 #1 (Fall 1985) pp. 35-51.
- <sup>29</sup> As late as 1948 Michael Guyer's popular text, Animal Biology (New York 1931; revised edition 1948; 5th edition, New York 1964) was still advocating a vigorous program of positive and negative eugenics. "In many family strains," Guyer warns, "the seeds of derangement and disability have become so firmly established that they menace the remainder of the population." Guyer (1948) p. 555. Quoted from Selden, "Confronting Tacit Social Values," to be published in Alex Molnar (ed.), The Social Responsibility of Educators, p. 26.
- <sup>30</sup> Two films were received by the Pioneer Fund in 1937. The English title for the films was "Applied Eugenics in Germany." See "Outline proposed for the first year's work of the Foundation" in the Laughlin Papers, Folder marked "Pioneer Fund," North East Missouri State University, Kirksville, Mo.

More to the point, however, is the fact that the underlying ideology, for both the American and the Nazi sterilization programs, was quite similar. The American Eugenics Society catechism of 1935 saw eugenics as "racial preventive medicine" and degenerates as "an insidious disease" affecting the body of society in the same way as cancer affects the human body.

Just as opiates lessen the pain of cancer, so religion, philanthropy, and education, at great expense to society, restrain some of the hereditary weaklings from doing harm. Nevertheless, crime and dependency keep on increasing because new defectives are born, just as new cancer cells remorselessly penetrate into sound tissue.<sup>31</sup>

In modern times, the catechism went on, "we treat cancer by means of the surgeon's knife." Our present methods of treating defectives leaves "great numbers of them to produce new offspring and create new cancers in the body politic." One might think of the American Eugenics Society as "a Society for the Control of Social Cancer," the catechism concluded. Sterilization, therefore, had to be seen as an integral part of preventive medicine. Since religion, philanthropy and modern medicine would not permit the weak to die of hunger and pestilence "sterilization seems to be the best protective."<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Ellsworth Huntington Tomorrow's Children: The Goal of Eugenics (New York 1935) p. 45.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., pp. 45, 46, 51.

Compare that with the view expressed by Konrad Lorenz in the Zeitschrift für angewandete Psychologie und

Characterkunde:

There is a close analogy between a human body invaded by a cancer and a nation afflicted with subpopulations whose inborn defects cause them to become social liabilities. Just as in cancer the best treatment is to eradicate the parasitic growth as quickly as possible, the eugenic defense against the dysgenic social effects of afflicted subpopulations is of necessity limited to equally drastic measures.... When these inferior elements are not effectively eliminated from a [healthy] population, then -- just as when the cells of a malignant tumor are allowed to proliferate throughout a human body -- they destroy the host body as well as themselves.<sup>33</sup>

This ethic was expressed quite clearly by Wilhelm Frick, Nazi minister of interior who was hanged at Nuremberg for crimes against humanity, in a talk he gave on German population policy in 1933. In the talk, which was favorably reported in the Eugenical News, Frick outlined the dangers of the social welfare system which had increased the numbers of the "diseased, weak and inferior." It is "urgent," he said, "to reform the entire public health system, as well as the attitude of physicians." The main object of state and

---

<sup>33</sup> Quoted from Chase, Legacy (New York 1980) p. 349. For a thorough discussion of Lorenz's ideas in relation to eugenics see Theodora J. Kalikow, "Konrad Lorenz's Ethological Theory: Explanation and Ideology, 1938-1943," J. of the History of Biology 16 #1 (Spring 1983), pp. 39-73.

public health services must be "to provide for the unborn generation."<sup>34</sup>

Harry Laughlin expressed the same sentiments in his defense of sterilization. The "germ-plasm," he contended belonged to "society and not solely to the individual who carries it." Furthermore the interests of society clearly outweigh the interests of the individual. "If America is to escape the doom of nations generally, it must breed good Americans." Historically, Laughlin declared, the chief cause of national decline "has been the decline of the national stock."<sup>35</sup>

That these ideas could be used to justify euthanasia as well as sterilization was made explicitly clear by Foster Kennedy, an influential New York psychiatrist and eugenics advocate, in 1942. In an article in the American Journal of Psychiatry, Kennedy stated that he was "in favor of euthanasia for those hopeless ones who should never have been born -- Nature's mistakes." Kennedy recommended a medical board be established to review cases of defective

---

<sup>34</sup> Eugenical News 19 #2 (March 1934) p. 35. While I am quoting here from Wilhelm Frick rather than a leader of the German eugenics movement, it is clear that Frick was expressing their views.

<sup>35</sup> Laughlin, "Report of the Committee to Study and Report on the Best Practical Means of Cutting Off the Defective German-Plasm in the American Population: I The Scope of the Committee's Work," 10 (Eugenics Record Office Bull. No 10A, 1914) pp. 16, 58-59. Quoted from Mary Dudziak, "Oliver Wendell Holmes as a Eugenic Reformer: Rhetoric in the Writing of Constitutional Law," Iowa Law Review 71 #3 (March 1986) p. 846.

children who had reached the age of five or more. If in the opinion of medical experts, "that defective has no future or hope of one then I believe it is a merciful and kindly thing to relieve that defective -- often tortured and convulsed, grotesque and absurd, useless and foolish, and entirely undesirable -- of the agony of living."<sup>36</sup>

In 1982 Yale Psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton published an important article entitled, "Medicalized Killing in Auschwitz," in which he examined the imagery of killing as a medical procedure. Lifton was interested in just how German physicians were able to rationalize their participation in mass murder.<sup>37</sup> He discovered to his surprise that many of

---

<sup>36</sup> Foster Kennedy, The American J. of Psychiatry 99 (July 1942) pp. 13-16. Time magazine (23 Jan. 1939) referred to Kennedy as "Manhattan's famed neurologist." For a sympathetic review of the euthanasia movement see Derek Humphry, The Right to Die: Understanding Euthanasia (New York 1986). Kennedy also participated in the "Symposium on Sterilization" at the New York Academy of Medicine in 1936. His paper was entitled, "Sterilization and Eugenics," and can be found in the Am. J. of Obstetrics and Gynecology 34 (Sept. 1937) pp. 519-20.

<sup>37</sup> Robert J. Lifton, "Medicalized Killing in Auschwitz," Psychiatry 45 (November 1982) pp. 282, 285. See also Lifton's recent full length study, The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide (New York 1986); "Doctors of Death," Time (25 June 1979) p. 68. Leo Alexander, an investigator at the War Crimes Trials wrote in "Medical Science Under Dictatorship," New England J. of Medicine (14 July 1949) that doctors served as executioners for the Third Reich in numerous capacities. "It all started," he argued, "with the acceptance of the attitude, basic in the euthanasia movement, that there is such a thing as life not worthy to be lived" (42). For an extraordinary article on the contemporary use of these same psychological mechanisms see Richard Goldstein and Patrick Breslin, "Technicians of Torture: How Physicians Become Agents of State Terror," in The Sciences a publication of the New York

the former Nazi physicians whom he interviewed in the late seventies were almost totally unreconstructed. While they condemned the "excesses" of the Nazi era they often expressed "a nostalgia for the excitement, power, and sense of purpose of the Nazi days."<sup>38</sup> This led Lifton to focus on "the motivational principles around ideology, and the various psychological mechanisms that contributed to the killing."

Lifton emphasized the importance of the belief that killing was a therapeutic imperative. German physicians propounded an ethic which placed the doctor's loyalty to the nation as "cultivator of the genes" above his responsibility to the individual patient. As one SS doctor, Fritz Klein, explained it, he participated in Auschwitz exterminations "out of respect for human life." Just as the physician "would remove a purulent appendix from a diseased body" so he was removing degenerates from the "body of Europe." The comparison of degenerate humans with cancer cells and disease is recurrent throughout the European and American eugenic literature. It was not unique to Germany.

---

Academy of Medicine, (March/April 1986). The article examines torture in South and Central America in the 1980s.

<sup>38</sup> Quoted from interview with Lifton, "Doctors of Death," Time (25 June 1979) p. 68.

Those who participated in the eugenic sterilization programs could also express nostalgia. Hans Harmsen,<sup>39</sup> Director of the School of Public Health in Hamburg, pointed out in the English Eugenics Review in 1955 that the German eugenic sterilization law under which some 400,000 people were sterilized<sup>40</sup> was not a result of Nazi excess. In fact, the law was not even rescinded by the Control Commission of Germany after the war. It remained on the books although sterilization could not be performed without the reconstitution of the Erbgesundheitsgerichte (sterilization review courts) which were disbanded after the war.<sup>41</sup>

Harmsen, who was active during the entire Nazi period as a Hamburg health official, could write a decade after the

---

<sup>39</sup> Harmsen was a eugenicist from the mid-twenties on. For comments on his activism see Bock, Zwangsterilization (Opladen 1986) pp. 27, 37, 45-47, 49, 51 and 53.

<sup>40</sup> It is estimated that the Nazis sterilized two million people, but only 400,000 were sterilized under the eugenic sterilization law. Many people, for example, "voluntarily" submitted to sterilization and did not come under the purview of the law or were sterilized without legal authority.

<sup>41</sup> Harmsen, "The German Sterilization Act of 1933: Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses," Eugenics Review 46 #4 (London 1955) pp. 227-232. Marion S. Olden of the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, who was active in the eugenic sterilization campaign of the 1930s, also favorably recalled in 1974 the Nazi sterilization program. She wrote that she "read everything on the subject and had a well founded conviction that it was administered scientifically and rationally, not emotionally and racially." The post war revelations did not shake her conviction. Quoted from J. David Smith, Minds Made Feeble (Rockville 1984) p. 159.



war that "there was no evidence that any reason other than eugenic ones influenced the handling of the proceedings." In fact the sterilization proceedings continued after the war. Four hundred and fifty-eight orders for eugenic sterilizations issued under the Nazi regime were reviewed between 1947 and 1952 in Hamburg alone. One-third of the original orders were upheld upon retrial. Harmsen commented with obvious regret that

At the present time, lack of uniformity in the sterilization laws, coupled with the non-existence of a superior court to which decisions could be referred, has resulted in no operations being performed, not even in cases where sterilization is eugenically desirable.<sup>42</sup>

In reviewing the German sterilization experience between 1933 and 1945 Harmsen wondered if the "danger of passing on hereditary traits" had not been overemphasized. But he expressed no awareness that involuntary sterilization might be seen as a great injustice by the victim. Still finding it necessary to defend eugenic sterilization against the claim that it led to an increase in promiscuity Harmsen cited a 1938 study which showed that only 4.8% of women sterilized "continued their immoral lives" and 7.6% "seemed to be endangered by extraordinary sensual desires." Fully

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., pp. 228-231. Harmsen admitted that the sterilization of those with "a slight or medium degree of imbecility" (i.e. people who were perfectly capable of self-support) might have been a mistake. In such cases he wrote "the value of sterilization... appears to be doubtful." He further concluded that "because of recent research in schizophrenia" some of the sterilizations of mental patients may also have been in error.

82% of the women led "normally moral lives" after their sterilization. The study concluded that sterilization did not "further a slide off into prostitution."<sup>43</sup>

While castration was not an important part of either the German or American eugenics programs, even in this regard there were similarities. Castration of boys was introduced by the Nazis in a separate law that was part of the eugenic legislation of 1933. Between 1933 and 1940 they castrated about 2000 "habitual delinquents." But castration as a part of a eugenic program was not unique to Nazi Germany. Norway, Finland, and Denmark also had provisions for castration of sexual delinquents or persons of marked sexual abnormality. The debate over the benefits of castration had been going on in America for decades with many prominent and enthusiastic supporters.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 230. In the United States Popenoe published a number of studies through the Human Betterment Foundation to alleviate this same fear. The thrust of the studies was to show that sterilization had a positive effect on the victim. Some of the early claims were that sterilization cured masturbation and prostitution. See E.S. Gosney, ed. Collected Papers on Eugenical Sterilization in California: a critical study of 6000 cases (Pasadena 1930).

<sup>44</sup> See Bock, "Racism and Sexism," in When Biology Became Destiny, (New York 1984) p. 277. See Kopp, "Eugenic Sterilization in Europe" New York Academy of Medicine 34 (September 1937) pp. 501-02. For the castration debate in America see Philip Reilly, "Involuntary Sterilization of Institutionalized Persons in the United States: 1899-1942," (Ph.D. Thesis, Yale University 1981) pp. 17-49.

My point here is not that castration was widely recommended either by the Nazis or anyone else. The Nazis performed two thousand castrations in the same period of time that they performed two million

Foster Kennedy led a symposium on sterilization for the American Eugenics Society in 1937. He told his fellow American eugenicists that "there is something to be said" not just for sterilization "but of castration" as well. Castration he argued would be an excellent treatment for the criminally insane. While he criticized the German eugenic program for sterilizing manic depressives, whom he believed often carried genes for great genius, he agreed that "sterilization of the feeble-minded, if done largely and thoroughly" would "aid our civilization."<sup>45</sup>

Castration of women began in Germany in 1936 with the introduction of X-ray and radium therapy as a means of sterilization. This was hailed at the time as the safest and most modern method of sterilization. It had been enthusiastically recommended in the United States as the most humane method of female sterilization since 1922 but it was not until 1936 that the procedure was perfected.<sup>46</sup> In that year the prestigious American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology recommended "sterilization by irradiation" as the preferred method of sterilization in an article by Ira

---

sterilizations. Nevertheless, castration was considered a legitimate procedure in certain cases. This view was not overwhelmingly embraced in either the United States or Germany but was considered legitimate in both countries.

<sup>45</sup> Foster Kennedy, "Symposium on Sterilization" presented at the Conference on Eugenics (The doctors conference) held at the New York Academy of Medicine, 21 April 1937. AES Papers.

<sup>46</sup> See "The Eugenic Aspect of Irradiation," Eugenical News 12 #11 (November 1927) p. 154.

Kaplan, an American specialist in radiation therapy at Bellevue Hospital in New York.<sup>47</sup>

Kaplan, recommended irradiation by means of x-ray or radium as "the procedure of choice" for female sterilization. X-ray therapy did not require hospitalization or surgery and was safe and comparatively simple. The great draw-back to x-ray treatment, especially for patients between twelve and eighteen years old, however, was that the effects often wore off. For more permanent results Kaplan recommended packing the uterus with radium and leaving it there for a few days. While errors in the technique "may cause some distressing or even fatal conditions" when "properly administered by an experienced and trained therapist, sterilization by irradiation is effective and at the same time produces no untoward effects." He did note that radiation sickness - "nausea, vomiting and malaise" sometimes occurs. "Its cause is not

---

<sup>47</sup> Albers-Schoenberg was the first to produce aspermia in males by x-ray in 1904. See Ira I. Kaplan, "Sterilization by Irradiation," Paper read before the Section on Gynecology and Obstetrics, New York Academy of Medicine, 24 November 1936. It is reprinted in the Am. J. of Obstetrics and Gynecology 34 (September 1937) pp. 507-512. In 1922 Harry Laughlin wrote that of all the methods for sterilization, radiation therapy "holds out the greatest promise." Laughlin looked forward to the time when "with very little trouble or expense to the state and very little inconvenience to the cacogenic individual... sexual sterility can be effected" by means of radiation therapy. This was especially important for women since salpingectomy necessitated opening the abdominal cavity. Harry Laughlin, Eugenical Sterilization in the United States (Chicago 1922) p. 421-22.

yet understood" but it could be easily treated with fruit juices and nembutal (a powerful barbiturate). In a few cases rapid onset of menopause occurred but this could be relieved by irradiation of the pituitary.<sup>48</sup>

Gisela Bock makes an important point worth emphasizing. Unlike Haller, Ludmerer, and so many others, Bock simply refers to eugenics as "a form of racism." Her rationale is that the theory of genetic "inferiority" is essentially racist. The central tenant of eugenics is that the human species can be divided into three groups: inferior, normal, and superior. This is a generic racism. The genetically inferior are composed of the lower ten or twenty percent of the society roughly measured by socioeconomic status. In societies in which racial and ethnic minorities are present they are usually included within this definition, even if they are not specifically singled out. In any case, historically, Jews, Gypsies, Negroes, Mexicans, and other ethnic minorities have been the victims of negative eugenics campaigns.

The evidence of this chapter suggests that the American and German eugenics movements were one in "the identification of human beings as valuable, worthless, or of inferior value in supposedly hereditary terms." As Bock notes this "was the common denominator of all forms of Nazi

---

<sup>48</sup> Ira I. Kaplan, "Sterilization by Irradiation," Am. J. of Obstetrics and Gynecology 34 (September 1937) pp. 507-512. pp. 510-11.

racism." Even in America eugenics was synonymous with "race hygiene" and its most fundamental program was to purify the "race" of "low grade" and "degenerate" groups. Thus, American and European eugenicists created a generic racism -- the "genetically inferior". Not surprisingly the victims always turned out to be the traditional victims of racism -- Jews, Blacks, and the poor.<sup>49</sup>

Eugenic ideology within the American Eugenics Society was slowly hammered out in discussions and publications of the society over the years. The sterilization issue was discussed on numerous occasions and was the subject of many articles, books, and conference round table discussions. The integral role of eugenic sterilization in any thorough eugenics program was stressed in at least a dozen pamphlets that were published between 1923 and 1940. The most extensive exploration of the Society's self-identity in these years, however, was Ellsworth Huntington's Tomorrow's Children (1935), a 137 page catechism which was an effort to synthesize the various position papers of the past decade.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Bock, "Racism and Sexism," in When Biology Became Destiny (New York 1984) p. 276.

<sup>50</sup> Ellsworth Huntington, Tomorrow's Children: The Goal of Eugenics (New York 1935). The first formal act of the Society at its first annual meeting was the issuance of the President's Report which re-examined and refined the "Eugenics Catechism" of 1923. The next year the Society published "The American Eugenics Society," a sixteen page pamphlet which again examined the broad purpose of the Society and its program. "Organized Eugenics" appeared a few years later followed by "American Eugenics" in 1936 which represented a roundtable discussion of issues. In 1938 "Practical Eugenics" was published and "The

Although Ellsworth Huntington was credited as the author "in conjunction with the Directors of the American Eugenics Society," Tomorrow's Children may be seen to represent the collective view of eugenics worked out by the Board of Directors and the Advisory Council of the American Eugenics Society over a period of more than a decade of debate and discussion.

"This book," Huntington wrote in the preface, "...is an outgrowth of the original report of the Committee on Program prepared under the direction of Professor Irving Fisher when the American Eugenics Society was founded." It was arranged as a catechism because it was written to replace A Eugenics Catechism prepared by Leon Whitney in 1923. "The authorship of Tomorrow's Children is composite." The final version of the manuscript went through seven drafts and the galley proofs were distributed to all the members of the Advisory Council "so far as they could be reached." The final catechism represented the consensus of the group: "the author has done his best to represent the general sentiment of the group as a whole." To make it entirely clear the verso of the copyright page lists the entire one hundred and ten members of the Board and Advisory Council of the Society. Virtually all these members had belonged to the

---

Development of Eugenic Policies" was published in 1939 along with "A Eugenics Program for the United States." These are only examples of pamphlets produced by the Society. Committees of the Society also produced pamphlets and all of the pamphlets were distributed to the advisory council members for comment.

Society for five years or more. Sixty-three of them had belonged to the group since at least 1923 and thus had participated in the many discussions that had taken place in the process of hammering out this final collective catechism of American Eugenics.<sup>51</sup>

The catechism defines eugenics as "an applied science like engineering or medicine." It rests on the two-fold basis of genetics, the science of heredity; and sociology, the science of society. Eugenics seeks to improve the inherited physical, mental, and temperamental qualities of the human family by controlling human evolution. Just as the medical profession guards the community against ill health, so eugenics guards the community against the propagation of poor biological inheritance. The germ plasm is the nation's most precious natural resource. Eugenics is

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., pp. vii-viii. The Board consisted of Guy Irving Burch, Population Reference Bureau; Henry P. Fairchild, New York University; Irving Fisher, Yale University; Willystine Goodsell, Columbia University; C.C. Little, American Society for the Control of Cancer; Frederick Osborn, Secretary of the AES; H.F. Perkins, University of Vermont; Paul Popenoe, Human Betterment Foundation and Milton Winternitz, Yale University. Among the advisory council were some of America's most liberal and highly respected religious, political, medical and academic names. They included Robert L. Dickinson, probably the most highly respected gynecologist in America at the time. The Reverend Harry Fosdick whose Riverside Church in New York had over 3000 members and his brother Raymond Fosdick, at the time the newly appointed President of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board. Among the biologists were E.M. East, William Wheeler and Sewall Wright. Among the psychologists were E.L. Thorndike, Lewis Terman and Robert Yerkes. The list includes an all-star cast from other fields as well, the majority of whom were quite active in the Society.



thus an integral part of public health as a form of preventive medicine and an integral component in the conservation of our natural resources.<sup>52</sup>

The catechism stressed again and again that sterilization need not be limited to those for whom a definite genetic etiology could be established. By 1935, the Society had decided that sociological factors were just as important as genetic factors in determining eugenic policy. It was quite clear to eugenicists in the mid-thirties that in most cases there was no way of knowing whether a particular family's qualities were due to heredity or environment, "but heredity and cultural status are closely associated." Therefore the eugenicist can feel sure that both biologically and socially "we will get more high grade individuals from those who fulfill certain eugenic criteria than from those who do not."<sup>53</sup>

The Nazis too believed that social worth and progeny tests should be the major means for determining sterilization. In fact, after the passage of their

---

<sup>52</sup> Huntington, Tomorrow's Children, p. 9.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 36. See also Osborn, "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2, (1974) p. 119. Osborn quotes Barbara Burks at a meeting held in 1937 to discuss the catechism. Burks "spoke hopefully about the possibility of negative eugenics." Pointing out the difficulty "of measuring specific traits in individuals" she concluded that despite that problem "we can say within a group of families that fulfill certain criteria we will get more eugenically desirable children than we will out of another group that fail to meet these criteria."

sterilization law, the Nazis engaged in a long debate in 1936-37 over the criteria of inferiority. Race and ethnicity were not the chief criteria. "The individual's proof of social worth (Lebensbewährung) was now officially established as the decisive criterion." Members of the working class "who show no inclination to change or become more efficient, and also seem unintelligent, will be close to a diagnosis of 'feeble-mindedness.'" And, of course, those "who are unable to earn a steady livelihood or otherwise unable to adapt socially" should be included among those to be sterilized. Such people are "morally underdeveloped and unable to correctly understand the order of human society." The majority of those actually sterilized in Germany were unskilled workers, particularly agricultural workers, servants, and unskilled factory workers. Among the women prostitutes and unmarried mothers were included among the inferior.<sup>54</sup>

The stress on negative eugenics that was common to American and German eugenics of the thirties aimed at the sterilization of two large groups. As defined by the American eugenics "catechism" they were: First, emotional and mental defectives, "or in the broader sense persons who by reason of inborn temperamental or intellectual deficiencies are a menace or an undue burden to society."

---

<sup>54</sup> Bock, "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany," in Bridenthal et. al. When Biology Became Destiny (New York 1984) pp. 281-282.

The second group was composed of "borderline persons not obviously defective, but of such low intelligence and unstable temperament that they are undesirable." Such people were considered "of little direct value to society" and "according to both Mendelian principles and historical experience" were likely to produce defective children.<sup>55</sup>

The AES criteria for restriction of procreation were chronic dependency, feeble-mindedness, insanity, and criminal behavior. "Any of these may be of environmental origin" but when two or more of these traits occur together, "the chances that hereditary defects are present become fairly large." Crime, for example, is often the result of "temperamental instability." While "almost anyone may become a criminal" under stress "excessive emotional instability, or lack of will power" seems to run in certain families. "No matter whether such a condition is the result of heredity or environment" or both "it is not advisable for such families to have children." They should be treated with "the utmost kindness" but "their disabilities should die with them." The situation was the same for "chronic dependency" except that "the part played by environment is apparently less, and the part played by inherited lack of intelligence, will power, and the capacity for coordination is greater."<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Huntington, Tomorrow's Children, p. 39.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., p. 40.

What kind of numbers did the American eugenicists consider dysgenic? The catechism cited the report of the 1929 White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, according to which 850,000 children were definitely feeble-minded and 150,000 were epileptic. It was estimated that there were about two million persons who were so feeble-minded they need institutional care (90,000 were actually institutionalized). Another 320,000 persons were institutionalized for insanity. Once again it was clearly recognized that such defects are sometimes "purely environmental in origin." Nevertheless, such people are always in danger of producing defective children. After all, "what kind of home influence can one expect where either parent is epileptic, feeble-minded, or insane?" No matter what the cause of such defects may be "even if all the criminals, epileptics and similar people were biologically desirable, their homes are rarely desirable places in which to bring up children." Common prudence "makes it advisable that even the doubtful cases should have no children."<sup>57</sup>

Furthermore, about five million adults and six million children are "subnormal in education" and suffer from "lack of innate ability." Another twenty million others fail to finish grammar school. Some of these, of course, could have finished with better health care, school programs designed

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., pp. 41-42.

to their needs, etc. Nevertheless, there "seems no escape from the conclusion that many of them inherit such a poor mental endowment that even this moderate degree of success is beyond their ability." Not all of these people should be sterilized, of course, "it would be absurd to think of sterilizing or segregating a quarter of our population." A thorough eugenics program would combine sterilization, segregation, and the vigorous promotion of birth control among the lower classes. Nevertheless, it is clear that the eugenicists were advocating the sterilization of millions of Americans right up to 1940.<sup>58</sup>

Such a policy would "in a few generations" greatly reduce the numbers of criminals, paupers and insane individuals. The billions now spent combating crime and dependency would gradually become available for more constructive purposes, such as promoting the birth and education of high-grade children to replace the defectives.<sup>59</sup>

Fully one fifth of the population is "comparatively unintelligent" although not "actually defective." An army of educators, clergymen, philanthropists, social workers, and physicians was attempting to uplift them. "It is time for the eugenicists to persuade the country to replace the innately deficient" with those who "unquestionably possess

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., pp. 44, 56.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

an innate endowment." A far-reaching eugenic program was needed. Harry Laughlin, the Society's leading expert on eugenical sterilization, hoped that "the most worthless one-tenth of our population" might be sterilized in two generations.<sup>60</sup>

It is quite clear from the Eugenics Catechism that American eugenicists were aware that advances in genetics were weakening the biological arguments they had been making since the turn of the century. Geneticists such as J.B.S. Haldane, H.S. Jennings, H.J. Muller, and the Morgan group at Columbia University were undermining the certainties of early eugenic pronouncements. Some historians have argued that this advance in the science led many geneticists away from eugenics in the thirties, but as our examination of the AES Advisory Council has shown this was not really the case. American eugenicists simply took a step back from the biological arguments, admitted the uncertainties of genetic inheritance, and rested their case for sterilization on a combination of sociological and genetic arguments.

---

<sup>60</sup> In 1914 when Laughlin made that statement the population of the United States was something over one hundred million. Thus, Laughlin suggested the sterilization of ten million over the next sixty years. It is apparent from the catechism that this estimate had not really been modified to any great extent. See Laughlin, "Report of the Committee to Study and Report on the Best Practical Means of Cutting Off the Defective Germ-Plasm in the American Population. II. The Legal, Legislative and Administrative Aspects of Sterilization" (Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.; Eugenics Record Office Bulletin No. 10B, 1914) pp. 132-50.

If it made sense to "discourage large groups" from having children the question remained, was it fair to the individual? To answer this question the catechism turned to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes "speaking from the bench of the United States Supreme Court."

We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if we could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the state for these lighter sacrifices, often not felt to be such to those concerned, in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetents. It is better for all the world if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime, or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. The principle that sustained compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover the cutting of the Fallopian tubes.<sup>61</sup>

No one who has written on the eugenics movement in America has made it clear that the American Eugenics Society, which represented the collective views of the most prominent American eugenicists, actually envisioned the sterilization of millions of Americans.

How does this compare with the goals of the Nazi eugenics program? In June 1933 Dr. Wilhelm Frick, the Nazi minister of interior, outlined the goals of the Nazi eugenics program. He estimated there were about 500,000 carriers of "serious physical and mental hereditary diseases" who need to be sterilized as quickly as possible.

---

<sup>61</sup> Huntington, Tomorrow's Children, pp. 43.

Then there was a much larger number whose "progeny is undesirable." He estimated this larger group at approximately a fifth of the German population.<sup>62</sup>

The Nazis actually sterilized about 400,000 people under their eugenic sterilization law between 1934 and 1945 (0.5 percent of the population).<sup>63</sup> In America perhaps 30,000 people had been sterilized in the period 1907-1937. By the standards of the American Eugenics Society the German program was still conservative. It is not at all surprising then that the American Eugenics Society praised the Nazi program in 1937. After carefully studying its goals and operation it was clear to American eugenicists that it reflected the goals and orientation of the American plan. That is precisely what Frederick Osborn meant when he said that "a brief history of the origin and development of eugenic sterilization showed the originality of the United States where all the first laws were initiated, and indicated a lack of thoroughness of our people in their failure to follow through."<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> An Address by Dr. Frick, Reichminister for the Interior, before the First Meeting of the Expert Council for Population and Race-Politics held in Berlin, 28 June 1933. Eugenical News 19 #2 (March/April 1934). p. 34.

This larger group was not necessarily to be sterilized. Various programs of education, segregation, marriage restrictions and coercion could be used. This was the American view as well.

<sup>63</sup> Bock, Zwangsterilization, p. 8.

<sup>64</sup> Osborn, Circular Letter, 2/24/37, Scrapbook, AES Papers. For the German sterilization statistics see Bock, "Racism



To have "followed through" on the plan of the American Eugenics Society in 1937 would have meant a mass program of eugenic sterilizations in every state in the Union. The difference between America and Germany with regard to eugenic sterilization was simply that in Germany a eugenic sterilization plan was fully supported by the state. In America essentially the same eugenic sterilization program met stiff resistance. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that in both countries human beings were judged to be biologically inferior and their right to bear children and raise families was denied.

---

and Sexism" in When Biology Became Destiny p. 279. Bock notes that in the U.S. only 11,000 persons were sterilized between 1907 and 1930. She also notes that 80 men and 400 women died as a result of the surgery. More detailed statistics can also be found in Harmsen.

Chapter Seven  
The Eugenic Hypothesis  
1938-1940

There is good reason to question the notion of a "new eugenics" as presented by Mark Haller and Kenneth Ludmerer. The idea that the old eugenics "collapsed" and a new leadership had "rebuilt" American eugenics is too simplistic and far too extreme. I have traced the development of particular policies with regard to immigration and sterilization within the American Eugenics Society from its earliest days to 1940. Focusing on those two important issues I have shown that there was a good deal more continuity in policy between 1921 and 1940 than is usually supposed in the literature. I have also looked at the society's leadership from 1923 to 1935. It is quite clear that at least up to 1935 there was very little change in the ideology, philosophy, and leadership of the society.

The idea of a "new" eugenics appearing between 1930 and 1940 was not created by Haller and Ludmerer. In the late thirties the AES leadership began to articulate an ideology which they themselves described as new. As we shall see, however, the essentials of the "new" eugenics had clear

roots in the older philosophy and the differences have not yet been clearly articulated.<sup>1</sup>

The notion of a "new" eugenics is not entirely without merit. Important changes occurred between 1930 and 1940. In 1934 Charles Davenport retired as Director of the Carnegie Institution's Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor.<sup>2</sup> Institutional changes as well took place within the AES beginning in the early thirties with the resignations of Davenport, Howe, Campbell, and others. In 1935 major changes in the institutional structure of the Society were inaugurated with the elimination of the advisory council and the reframing of the constitutional structure of the society. At the end of 1938 control of the Eugenical News was transferred from the ERO to the AES.<sup>3</sup> By

<sup>1</sup> What has been referred to in the literature as the "new eugenics" was not articulated until the late 1930s. A self-conscious expression of this newer philosophy of eugenics is not found in the AES papers or its publications until after 1935.

<sup>2</sup> For a full examination of the closing of the Eugenics Record Office see Garland Allen, "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An Essay in Institutional History," Osiris 2nd series, 2: pp. 250-253.

<sup>3</sup> Minutes, 2/9/39. In February 1939 the Board of the American Eugenics Society met to consider policy regarding the Eugenical News. It was agreed "that a severe editorial policy be adopted in publishing Eugenical News and that definite methods of editorial control be adopted." All future material submitted to the Eugenical News was to be subject to review by at least one of the directors of the society, the editorial committee and an outside authority. Scientific material would be stressed, all book reviews would be signed, biographical statements on the contributors be included, and as soon as possible, the society would begin paying for solicited materials.

the end of 1939 Harry Laughlin was retired by the Carnegie Institution from the Eugenics Record Office which was subsequently closed down.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, by 1939 Frederick Osborn's position of leadership within the East Coast eugenics establishment had been consolidated and the center of eugenics activity had clearly transferred from the ERO at Cold Spring Harbor to the AES in New York. Osborn served as one of the Directors of the Society, generally presided at the meetings, and either wrote or supervised the composition of the society's most important platform statements. His 1940 monograph, A Preface to Eugenics, was considered the most important statement on eugenics of the period and still stands as the foundation of the "new" eugenics.

Between 1937 and 1939, the AES was intensely active. Membership nearly doubled during these years and finances were stable.<sup>5</sup> The AES organized eight conferences on eugenics in relationship to recreation, nursing, education, medicine, publicity, birth control, housing, and the church. AES leaders also participated in fourteen other conferences in which eugenics was included as part of the program.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In January 1940 Laughlin returned to Kirksville, Missouri.

<sup>5</sup> Membership was approaching five hundred by 1939. The gross income for 1937-38 was \$7,156. The Society maintained two employees.

<sup>6</sup> Minutes 14th Annual Meeting (16 May 1940) p. 2. Recreation held January 37; Nursing, February 1937;

Thus, the Society was assiduously engaged in defining its goals in relation to other social issues. A close examination of presentations given by the leadership of the AES during this period will illuminate the essentials of the so-called "new" eugenics.<sup>7</sup>

"We are at a major turning point in human biology," Frederick Osborn told his colleagues at the New York Academy of Medicine in April 1939. Speaking at a lecture in honor of Herman Biggs, Osborn told his audience that "European peoples appear headed for a serious decline." Between 1650 and 1930 Europeans achieved a "seven-fold increase" from one hundred million to seven hundred million at a time when the world population increased only four-fold. However, Osborn explained, for the past one hundred years the trend in the west had been towards a decrease in the number of births per married woman. This trend was most marked in Europe. By 1935 England had a net rate of reproduction which was 24 per cent short of replacement; Germany, France, and Sweden had similar rates.<sup>8</sup> By 1932, "for the first time in our history, the women of childbearing age in the United States

---

Education, March 1937; Medicine, April 1937; Publicity, December 1937; Birth Control, January 1938; Housing, April, 1938; The Church, May, 1938.

<sup>7</sup> The material that follows has been taken either from AES pamphlets of the period or from statements by representatives of the Society at AES or other conferences.

<sup>8</sup> Frederick Osborn, "The Significance to Medicine of Present Population Trends," Address before the New York Academy of Medicine, 6 April 1939. p. 5.

were failing to replace their own numbers in the next generation."<sup>9</sup> The problem was even more serious than the gross numbers indicated. While the western world as a whole was losing ground to non-European populations, reproduction within the the U.S. and Europe was from the worst stocks.

More than one-third of the births annually in the U.S. were occurring in families on relief, or with total incomes of less than \$750 per year.<sup>10</sup> Over half of the natural increase was contributed by that third of the population living in the poorest rural areas. In 1930, cities with populations of 25,000 or more inhabitants had an average fertility only 85 per cent of the amount required for replacement. Within each city fertility was highest among the poor, uneducated, and unskilled. "The Nation's new born citizens are somewhat fewer than the number required to maintain a stationary population," said Frank Notestein, a Princeton University demographer, at the AES Conference on Birth Control, "and they are being recruited heavily from

---

<sup>9</sup> Frederick Osborn, "The Significance to Medicine of Present Population Trends," Address before the New York Academy of Medicine, 6 April 1939. See also, P.K. Whelpton, "An Empirical Method of Calculating Future Population," Journal of the American Statistical Association (September 1936) 31 #196, pp. 457-473; Frank Notestein, "Some Implication of Current Demographic Trends for Birth Control and Eugenics," Paper presented at the Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control of the American Eugenics Society (28 January 1938) AES Papers.

<sup>10</sup> Eric M. Matsner, Medical Director of the American Birth Control League "Birth Control: Future Policies as Evidenced by Present Day Trends," Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control (28 January 1938).

... the most impoverished rural areas of the South and West."<sup>11</sup>

Warren Thompson, Director of Scripps Foundation and a member of the AES Board, summed up the problem at the AES Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Housing:

The inverse relation between economic and social status and size of family has been found in practically all studies on this point in the United States of which this writer has knowledge. Unskilled laborers have larger families than skilled workers, and skilled workers have more children than professional and business men.... Since there is good reason to believe that a large part of those who are on the borderline between hereditary normality and abnormality, as well as most of the hereditarily defective, are to be found in the lower income classes... it seems fair to assume that the groups whose reproduction is of least benefit to the community have larger families on the average than those who are of sound stock....<sup>12</sup>

Thompson pointed to Swedish studies which indicated that people adjust the size of their families to the size of available housing. He noted therefore, that public housing can have either a eugenic or dysgenic effect on the population. If, for example, we wish to encourage the professional classes to have larger families the society must insure that adequate housing is available within the

---

<sup>11</sup> Frank W. Notestein, "Some Implications of Current Demographic Trends for Birth Control and Eugenics," Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control of the American Eugenics Society (28 January 1938) p. 2. AES Papers.

<sup>12</sup> Warren Thompson, "Housing and Population" Paper presented at the AES Conference on the Eugenic Aspects of Housing. Town Hall Club, 1 April 1938. AES Papers.

range of the professional classes. Thompson also concluded that housing policy might help reduce the birth rate among certain groups by maintaining high rents. Thompson hinted at a housing policy which would subsidize the middle class and maintain housing pressures on the unemployed and lower working class.<sup>13</sup>

The perceived dysgenic trend presented a clear challenge which the Eugenics Society felt had to be addressed on a number of fronts. Birth control, of course, was desperately needed in the rural South and generally in the lower class neighborhoods so that "genetically inferior persons" would be able to "limit their own fertility."<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, sterilization was "especially important" in connection with groups such as the Jukes, Kallikaks, and

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. Thompson was quite circumspect in his advocacy of this tactic! "I am not saying that it may not be a good thing, under certain circumstances, to seek to reduce the birth rate below maintenance level and that high rents may not be a perfectly proper agency to use to depress the birth rate, but I do maintain that we should know what we are doing and that we should not inadvertently allow a housing program to set up a train of consequences as regards population growth of which we are unaware." After untangling all the negatives and placing the quotation in context, it is clear that Thompson, who was specifically addressing administrators of federal housing projects for the poor, was saying that public housing should not be used to encourage large families among the poor, whom he specifically associates with "hereditary defectives." Rather, public housing ought to be used to encourage large families among the professional classes.

<sup>14</sup> Frank W. Notestein, "Some Implications of Current Demographic Trends for Birth Control and Eugenics," Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control of the American Eugenics Society (January 28, 1938). p. 2. AES Papers.



Nams. These "scattered groups of defective families in rural areas present a special and difficult problem."<sup>15</sup>

There were marked differences in approach to sterilization in this period. Society literature in the 1920s assumed that feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, mental illness, and criminal tendencies were genetic in origin. Eugenic sterilization was seen as a direct method of reducing these genetic disabilities. By 1935 this position was no longer tenable. Advances in the mechanisms of heredity made by T.H. Morgan at Columbia, H.S. Jennings at Johns Hopkins, and others were discrediting the simplistic notions of human heredity propagated by Davenport.

The Society leadership now freely admitted that if these problems did have a genetic element it was probably recessive, and sterilization could not eliminate recessive hereditary defects from a population within any reasonable period of time. Nevertheless, the leadership of the Society still insisted that sterilization could "substantially reduce the proportion of defectives from generation to generation."<sup>16</sup> This reduction would not come about as a result of the decrease of defective genomes; it would result

---

<sup>15</sup> "Practical Eugenics: Aims and Methods of the American Eugenics Society" (New York 1938) p. 19. AES Pamphlet, AES Papers.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 13. In other words, the "new" approach was to freely admit that there was little certainty with regard to the genetic transmission of human character traits. Sterilization was defended despite these uncertainties.

from a decrease of families incapable of providing an environment suitable for the nurture of normal children. Osborn noted in 1933 that "the relation between genetics and eugenics" had been "over-stressed".<sup>17</sup> Eugenic sterilization could be justified without recourse to genetics.

The AES recommended that sterilization be applied even in cases where "there is no certainty that the traits of the parents will be passed on to their children through heredity." Sterilization was recommended on social rather than specifically eugenic grounds since "mentally deficient or defective parents cannot provide a home environment suitable for rearing children."<sup>18</sup>

The emphasis was placed on the humanitarian character of sterilization. Individuals were "afflicted" with hereditary disorders and sterilization was a medical treatment which people "deserved." Thus, it was stressed that sterilization ought to be "available" to "afflicted" groups just as medical care generally ought to be available to all citizens in need of such care. It should be voluntary as much as possible and should not be imposed on those who oppose it from a religious or ethical standpoint

---

<sup>17</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Memorandum on the Eugenics Situation in the United States," 24 May 1933. AES Papers.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

provided the friends or co-religionists of such people furnish the means of effective segregation at their own expense...<sup>19</sup>

Nevertheless, among those afflicted with defects some were a "menace to society." This group could not be trusted to refrain voluntarily from having children. For them, sterilization was preferable to segregation since most of those sterilized could still lead "normal, useful, self-supporting" lives.

While, the Society praised laws in Nebraska and South Dakota which provided for the registration of the feeble-minded and prohibited the issuance of a marriage license "to any defective" except on proof of previous sterilization.<sup>20</sup> The emphasis in these years was on the legalization of "voluntary sterilization" which was "a natural consequence of the fact that sterilization is not a punishment but a protection." Handicapped people "eagerly sought" sterilization, and most of those in need of sterilization "could not or should not be committed to State institutions for the feeble-minded." Restriction of legal sterilization to such institutions deprives a class of citizens of appropriate health care. "Every State should adopt the necessary legislation, authorizing hospitals supported by taxpayers to accept patients who request to be sterilized." Widespread legalized voluntary sterilization

---

<sup>19</sup> "Practical Eugenics" (New York 1938) p. 14. AES Papers.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

is a "highly valuable protection for people who for any reason ought not to have children."<sup>21</sup>

Throughout the literature of this period one finds sterilization described as a right which should not be denied to those at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder simply because they could not afford it. With proper education and incentive the dysgenic elements of the population would flock to sterilization centers. Thus, what distinguished the old eugenics from the new with regard to sterilization was not so much orientation as emphasis. In the twenties the Society was pushing for the initial passage of eugenic sterilization laws. By the thirties many states already had such laws although few sterilizations were actually being performed. By the late thirties the society still supported eugenic sterilization but also began to stress the benefits of sterilization for the individual sterilized rather than the necessity of sterilization for the society at large. The only thing really new in this position was the emphasis on voluntary sterilization. Studies in the early twenties touted the benefits of sterilization as a cure for masturbation and prostitution.<sup>22</sup> In the twenties, the benefits were mentioned as an

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>22</sup> See, for example, the work of Harry Sharp and Hoyt Pilcher. They claimed that sterilization was of great benefit to the individual. For a review of this literature see Phillip Reilly, "Involuntary Sterilization of Institutionalized Persons in the United States: 1899-1942," M.D., Thesis (Yale 1981).

afterthought. In the thirties, they were given a more prominent position in sterilization advocacy.

It is quite extraordinary that throughout the eugenic literature of the twenties and thirties, one finds almost no recognition that sterilization might be perceived by those sterilized as a violation and a punishment. In fact, until Carrie Buck was interviewed by Gary Robertson, a reporter for the Richmond Times-Dispatch, in February 1980, no one had ever asked the question, "what ever became of the victims of involuntary sterilization?" Carey Buck told Robertson of her life-long desire to have have children. At the age of 76 she still suffered from the injustice done to her. Regarding the sterilization she said, "they done me wrong. They done us all wrong." Another victim described the dissolution of his marriage. His wife "could never accept the fact we couldn't have children."

After 13 years, I'd lost everything I'd worked for. She could just never bring herself to talk to me about her feelings. It was terrible. ... they took alot of my life away from me. Having children is supposed to be a part of the Human race. Sometimes I feel there's a part of me that I'm missing.<sup>23</sup>

It is quite telling about the ethics, not only of the eugenics movement, but more generally of the academic

---

<sup>23</sup> Gary Robertson, "Test Case Figure Back in Public Eye," (27 Feb. 1980) p. 1; Bill Mckelway, "Patient 'Assembly Line' Recalled by Sterilized Man," (24 Feb. 1980) Richmond Times Dispatch. In 1982 CBS aired "Marian Rose White," a T.V. movie based on the true story of a sterilization victim.

establishment, that so little thought has been given to the perspective of the victims of eugenic sterilization.

Osborn believed that Americans would shortly awaken to the reality of population decline. The new eugenics was devised to deal with this "new" reality. In the 1920s there was really no solid evidence of overall population decline in the west. The sophisticated demographic analysis did not come until the early thirties. Nevertheless, as is clear from the pronouncements at the Second International Congress of Eugenics, the leaders of the twenties held very pessimistic views about the future of western civilization. Statements were specifically made with regard to the eventual extinction of the Mayflower stock and the "rising tide of color." The difference between the statements of the twenties and those of the thirties and forties is not in substance. It is rather in tone, language, and emphasis.

Osborn was confident that Americans would awaken to the problem of population decline just as the Europeans had. In fact, in France, Germany, England, and Scandinavia population decline was a major issue and governments all over Europe were taking steps to increase their birth rates in the thirties. Osborn was particularly fearful that Americans might simply demand "large families indiscriminately in order to stem the decline in population."

Before this stage is reached public opinion must be educated to demand that the large families be born to couples with a desirable biological inheritance.<sup>24</sup>

This then was the basic outline of the eugenics situation in the latter half of the 1930s. The perception of an "unparalleled" situation in which the European peoples were in decline, combined with a dysgenic trend in birth ratios, was hardly different from the gloomy fears of Henry Fairfield Osborn and George Vacher de LaPouge nearly two decades earlier. While references to "race suicide" and the "complete destruction of the white race" no longer appeared, the basic elements were substantially the same. The tone of the forties, however, was much more subdued. There was little in the way of hyperbolic pronouncements. Underlying the eugenics of the forties was a faith that, despite gloomy appearances, western civilization would muddle through. In this respect, eugenics of the forties was somewhat more sober than the eugenics of the earlier period. Osborn realized by 1940 that eugenics was not going to sweep the world as a new religion and save civilization. Eugenics might have an influence on housing, medical education, and population policies, but it was not going to play the kind of central role that his uncle Henry Fairfield Osborn had hoped it would.

---

<sup>24</sup> "Practical Eugenics" p. 6.

As early as 1935 and certainly by 1940, Osborn and other leaders of the eugenics movement in America had faced enough defeats and frustrations to realize that eugenics faced powerful and deeply entrenched opposition in American society. In 1926 the AES leadership believed that eugenics would become an integral part of American education, law, health care, and politics. After working closely with Congress on the passage of a eugenically oriented immigration bill the AES leadership believed further advances would be forthcoming, including extension of the immigration quotas to the western hemisphere. The AES legislative program called for numerous legislative initiatives on both the state and federal levels. For example, the society wanted the U.S. census to carefully record peoples ancestry more carefully so that a eugenical record of the entire population could be kept.<sup>25</sup> They failed in this endeavor as they did in numerous other initiatives during the period 1924 to 1935.

Eugenics simply was not an idea that caught people's imaginations. Instead there was stiff resistance to eugenics. Intellectuals and social prophets might see eugenics as the ultimate reform but among the mass of the literate and voting population it simply was too radical.

---

<sup>25</sup> They lobbied for the inclusion on a) the name and racial descent of the father, b) maiden name and racial descent of the mother, and as far as possible, the racial descent of each parent by listing the predominating race of each grandparent. See Minutes, 6/1/29. AES Papers.



It is for this reason that the society was trying to avoid controversy during this period. Osborn believed that eugenics went against an ingrained American individualism. The idea that people are born with innate limitations went against fundamental American beliefs as expressed in the Horatio Alger myth. In America, it was thought, anyone could succeed with a little luck and pluck. It was for this reason that eugenics in the late thirties avoided the issue of race and class and stressed the individual. The society was groping for a eugenic ideology which would be more acceptable to the American people.

The society was particularly interested in expanding its efforts to bring the clergy into the fold. In May 1939 the AES held a conference on eugenics in relation to the church. The conference was attended by over 135 religious leaders as well as numerous leaders of eugenics, birth control, and philanthropy. It was clearly recognized that one of the staunchest bastions of opposition to eugenics was from conservative religious leaders of all stripes. Eugenics clearly did not go over well among rural Baptists and urban Catholics. A particular effort was made to bring leaders of these groups into the society and thus reduce the tensions between eugenics and the church.

On numerous occasions in these years society literature disavowed the overt racism of a few years earlier. The official position of the society was that all racial and

social groups were of value and that genetic differences between such groups were small compared to difference within each group. Therefore the society believed that a eugenic policy must aim at all sectors of American society, not at one group. The emphasis was constantly placed on the fact that talent was distributed throughout the population. It was a serious mistake of the earlier eugenicists to label whole groups as inferior. While the literature still refers to "inferior stocks" these were identified only as a generic category. This was somewhat ingenuous since the degenerates referred to were still within the usual groups. Thus, for example, the society still fought vigorously against Mexican immigration and still regarded degeneracy as being more frequent among the poor.

In fact, the racism of the eugenicists was only thinly veiled beneath the surface. Nowhere in the literature was there a concern for the declining Negro population, nowhere was concern expressed over the three centuries of differential fertility in which the European populations were growing at a rate nearly twice that of non-white peoples. On the contrary the rapid expanse of the European population throughout the world and the expansion of European imperialism was consistently regarded as part of the progressive advance of humanity. The "problem" of "differential fertility" was a code for the decline of white, Northern European stock.

The early signs that European population growth had come to an end was the focus of eugenicists' fears. Concern was expressed over the "differential fertility" of the rapidly growing Indian and Mexican populations in the United States. There were only a few hundred thousand native Americans left in the United States after nearly three centuries of population decline. One would expect a eugenicist who truly believed that there were valuable qualities in all races to welcome the renewed vigor of Indian and Mexican populations. On the contrary, Osborn saw only problems in the differential growth of Indian populations. While society literature was ostensibly color-blind in these years, it repeatedly expressed concern over the differential fertility among the "genetically inferior" populations of the rural south and west. The "genetically inferior" populations in question were predominantly black, Indian, and Mexican.

It is clear that Frederick Osborn fervently believed that eugenics had developed an entirely new outlook by the late thirties. During the discussion period following the presentation of papers at the Conference on Eugenics in Relation to the Church, Frederick Osborn burst into an uncharacteristic polemic. He was "more bitterly discouraged" than he had ever been in his career in eugenics. He found that the keynote speeches contained nothing "that might not have been written, or said, 20 years ago." Yet since that time, "the whole movement of eugenics

has changed." The "whole emphasis of eugenics today" is on "an unexpected and unparalleled situation" confronting "this vaunted civilization of ours." Our best and finest families are "25 to 50 per cent short of having enough children to replace themselves in another generation." Osborn had hoped that the religious leaders invited to present papers would have spoken to the problem of disintegrating family values among our best stocks. Instead they all tended to focus on sterilization and the ethical issues around negative eugenic efforts. Osborn ended with an apology. Obviously he had been shaken. He said he was embarrassed and had not intended to make such a speech, but "If the Churches cannot teach us the true value of life... where are we going to learn this lesson?"<sup>26</sup>

Despite Osborn's clear sense that he was speaking for a "new" eugenics, his speech carried both the intensity, emotional tone, and ideology of the earlier eugenics. In 1921, according to George Vacher de Lapouge, the human race "was facing a swift descent in the scale of civilization, because the better strains were losing ground."<sup>27</sup> According to Lapouge the world was suffering from a shortage of "minds

<sup>26</sup> F. Osborn, "Round Table Discussion at the Conference on the Relation of Eugenics to the Church," 8 May 1939. AES Papers.

<sup>27</sup> G.V. Lapouge, "La race chez les populations mélangées," Eugenics in Race and State II (Baltimore 1923) p. 1. A transcript of the speech in English can be found in the New York Times 9/28/21 p. 11.

big enough to deal with its problems." The poorer races and classes were threatening the more advanced and there was little hope for the future unless action were drastic and immediate. There is hardly any difference here in tone and emphasis. Osborn's call for more babies and bigger families among the better stock was as old as the eugenics movement itself.

What Osborn himself considered new in American eugenics relied heavily on European models. There were in Europe two models of interest to Americans. The first was that of the totalitarian states of Italy and Germany. The Germans had developed a eugenics program fit for a totalitarian society and both the Germans and Italians had developed policies to encourage population growth. While there was initial interest and enthusiasm in Nazi and fascist programs, by 1938 one begins to see open criticism of "totalitarian" eugenic policies published in the Eugenical News.<sup>28</sup> These programs were now criticized as unworkable. A successful eugenics program was as only possible within a democratic society. Sweden, on the other hand, presented a model of eugenic policies for "democratic" societies.

It is not difficult to understand why this change in attitude should have occurred between 1938 and 1940. As late as 1937, Osborn and the Society were praising the Nazi

---

<sup>28</sup> At the time the official publication of the American Eugenics Society.

eugenics programs. The later critiques were not aimed so much at specifics of the Nazi program as at the idea of eugenics within a totalitarian society. In fact, criticism of Italy and Germany were lumped together despite very large differences between the two countries with regard to their eugenics programs. Americans had initially responded benignly to European fascism. It was only in the late thirties that antagonisms arose. The Eugenics Society was particularly sensitive to these criticisms in this period precisely because it was striving for acceptance. Furthermore, only by the late thirties were there actually two "models" of eugenic programs developing in Europe. The Americans were looking to Europe for leadership and they found it in the Swedish program.

The main elements of the Swedish eugenics program aimed at encouraging larger families through state subsidies for housing, free school lunch programs, a nationwide system of nurseries, and maternal care and other social welfare benefits. The American leaders believed even more could be done with nationally subsidized recreation and health care, salary scales based on size of family, and a tax system which favored the large family over the small. The idea was to tax the bachelor to pay for the large family and to tax the wealthier sectors to aid the poorly paid professional classes and other eugenic elements in the society. Social welfare benefits had to be targeted at those who ought to have large families. As the Eugenics Society saw it, the

contemporary trend was to tax the eugenic elements to pay for the care of the dysgenic elements, and this was a trend that had to be reversed.<sup>29</sup>

The American leaders took pains to introduce the Swedish program to Americans, to follow its progress, and to report the results of demographic studies which showed its success. The "new" eugenics was based on a belief that by creating a model welfare state the dysgenic trend would be reversed. Osborn dubbed this new view the "eugenic hypothesis." Stated simply, the hypothesis was that within a free society with a combination of widespread social welfare and universally available birth control of all types a eugenic trend in births would naturally ensue. The "eugenic hypothesis" included the acceptance of compulsory sterilization for those elements of the population which were a "menace" but focused on the broad main body of the population, claiming that sterilization was only a minor aspect of eugenic policy.

There was very little solid evidence for the "hypothesis" and Osborn himself admitted that it was only a "hypothesis." It served, however, as a method of leading eugenics out of the mire of criticism that had grown up around the movement. The new face of eugenics was positive,

---

<sup>29</sup> See Greta Jones, "Eugenics and Social Policy Between the Wars," The Historical Journal 25 #3 (1982) pp. 717-728 for a discussion of the English Eugenics Society's view of family allowance which is a similiar issue.

optimistic, and as Ludmerer stated, "in tune to a changed America."<sup>30</sup>

In a democratic society the eugenics program would run without coercion. A eugenic trend in births would be the natural result of conditions which stressed family values and aided those who wished to have large families. "Except in cases of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency" should attempt to "define the 'fit' or the 'unfit,' nor would any arbitrary power determine who should have children."<sup>31</sup> This was the major problem with the older eugenics programs and with eugenics programs in totalitarian societies. The eugenic hypothesis was a sort of religious faith that the best will out without strict control.

In January 1939 Frederick Osborn published a short article on the "Social Implications of the Eugenic Program," in Child Study.<sup>32</sup> Osborn began by stating that "today the women of child bearing age in the United States are not having enough children to replace their own numbers." "It is evident," Osborn observed that we need both more births and "a more eugenic distribution of births." Osborn stressed that such a program must be based on individual differences.

---

<sup>30</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174.

<sup>31</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Social Implications of the Eugenic Program," Child Study (January 1939) p. 96.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., pp. 95-97.



A eugenic program based on social class, economic or racial distinctions would be contrary to the scientific knowledge now available.

The differences in average heredity between racial and class groups in the United States are small compared to the individual differences in hereditary capacity within each group. "Eugenics should therefore be concerned with individual differences."

The first step to an effective eugenics program was to further equalize the freedom of all parents to have as few or as many children as they would like. We must increase the availability of contraception and reduce the economic handicaps to raising children, Osborn noted. "Measures for reducing the cost of children may be eugenic or dysgenic, depending on how they are applied."

In Sweden, Osborn went on, eugenic programs take the form of free services and subsidized rent payments. In Germany and Italy they take the form of cash payments. In these latter countries population policies were adopted in 1934 that aimed chiefly at increasing the number of children, and the bonuses were distributed without regard to quality.<sup>33</sup> The Swedish program, on the other hand, was

---

<sup>33</sup> This is clearly a distortion of the German marriage loan program. There were strict guidelines under the Nazi program defining those who could qualify for the loans. Osborn was well acquainted with the program which he praised just two years earlier. Its not clear why he distorts it here.

framed "with the hope that they would appeal to the more responsible type of parents." In Sweden there were subsidies for housing, extensive day nurseries, and free public education supplemented by free meals in the schools.

Osborn pointed to recent studies in Stockholm which showed "that the upper professional and business executive groups are having more children than those in the lower economic groups, the skilled laborers more children than the unskilled laborers." This was the reverse of trends that existed in the U.S. and was evidence when birth control is universally available "size of family tends to vary to some extent directly instead of inversely both with income and with the proven abilities of the parents.

There are "powerful dysgenic factors" at work in American society making for a "disproportionate population increase in people with below-the-average hereditary capacities." Conditions must be established for "a natural and unconscious process" favoring "those genetic types capable of developing their own culture to its highest point."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Osborn, "Social Implications," Child Study (January 1939) p. 96.

Except in the case of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency would attempt to define the "fit" or the "unfit," nor would any arbitrary power determine who should and who should not have children. Eugenic efforts would be directed to the creation of environmental conditions under which parents would tend to have children in proportion to their mental and physical health...<sup>35</sup>

Thus, the question of values, which had plagued the eugenics movement, had to give way to a simpler formula of improving the environment for all individuals. However, the dysgenic effects of unequal availability of birth control and the economic hardships of raising large families had to be reversed before attempts to improve the environment generally would be successful. That is, once the conditions for a more eugenic distribution of births was in place, then a general effort at raising the social welfare of all classes would be successful. But in absence of a eugenic distribution of births American society might well "fail to produce" enough people able to take advantage of the improved environment. In that case we would end up subsidizing the prevailing dysgenic trend.<sup>36</sup>

This then was the new eugenics that emerged between 1935 and 1940. There were, of course, other elements which have not been discussed here. By 1940 eugenics was already taking a back seat to the birth control and population

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

control movements.<sup>37</sup> The AES began to focus its activities on holding conferences to bring experts from various fields together and to insert eugenic concerns into a wide variety of social movements. It began a concerted effort to encourage the teaching of genetics in medical schools and the establishment of genetic counselling clinics. The war, of course, interrupted this trend, but by 1945 the new direction for the American Eugenics Society was already set. So was the stage for the resurgence of eugenics. As early as the 1960s voices could already be heard questioning the accuracy of the "eugenic hypothesis." What after all must one conclude if in fact the dysgenic trend in population were not reversed by the "new eugenic" approach.

---

<sup>37</sup> Garland Allen, "The Work of Raymond Pearl: From Eugenics to Population Control," Science for the People (July-August 1980) pp. 22-28.

## Chapter Eight

### Conclusion

American, German, English, and Scandinavian eugenics all contained unique elements. The English eugenics movement was molded by Francis Galton and Karl Pearson; in America it was Charles Davenport; in Norway Jon Alfred Mjoen was inspired by the German race hygiene movement founded by Alfred Ploetz. These important first generation advocates of eugenics did not always share common political and social views, and they interpreted eugenics in their own idiosyncratic ways. Likewise, later generations of eugenic leaders came from widely diverse political perspectives, and in each case local conditions molded the national eugenics movements in different countries, but a core of values remained constant.

At the heart of eugenics was the belief that the human species could be perfected by science - science raised to an ethic. With the aid of science tests could be devised to identify the weak minded, the physically unfit, the morally corrupt. With the aid of science society could be improved though the improvement of the stock itself. The germ plasm of the nation could be purified and uplifted. It all came down to inhibiting the reproduction of inferior grades of

humanity and encouraging reproduction among the "better stocks."<sup>1</sup>

There were many views on how to control the direction of human evolution. The focus of this study has been on the development of such views in America between 1921 and 1940. The evolution and growth of American eugenics in these years was complex. Although there were dramatic occurrences - the great successes between 1924 and 1927, the many defeats later, the resignation of staunch supporters, the rise of new leaders - there was no dramatic change at any time during this period from an "old" eugenics to a "new" eugenics.

Naturally the movement changed over time, but in the end the goal was still to identify the inferior individuals and encourage the breeding of the better stocks. In the end the American Eugenics Society still favored sterilization, anti-miscegenation legislation, and strict immigration control. In the end its leaders still maintained the inferiority of Negroes, Indians, and Mexicans. They admitted that there was no way of knowing to what extent this inferiority was rooted in the genome, although they suspected it was considerable. In the end, the ideology remained remarkably intact.

This thesis highlights the continuity in both policy and ideology of the American Eugenics Society. The outlines

---

<sup>1</sup> This has not been established for Latin America.

of the ideological orientation of the AES were first presented by the keynote speakers at the Second International Congress of Eugenics. Those speakers - British, American, French, and Scandinavian - articulated a vision of a eugenic society which they hoped would emerge out of what they perceived to be the rapidly declining and troubled societies of the West. They recommended sweeping eugenic reforms to encourage the increase of the better stocks. They warned of the dangers of the dysgenic trend which prevailed world-wide and of the need to reverse that trend.

Eugenicists advocacy of immigration restriction, anti-miscegenation, and eugenic sterilization remained remarkably constant even as the rationale for these positions was adjusted to suit changed social conditions and more sophisticated genetics. Thus, the belief in "inferiority" of identifiable sub-populations remained constant even if sophisticated readers of the genetics literature realized that the "genetic" component of "inferiority" could not be positively identified. Where the genetic arguments began to falter, sociological arguments could be brought in to bolster the case. The demographic trend was clear. The unemployed had larger families than the employed, the working class had larger families than the professional classes, and in general there was a reverse correlation between social status and family size. Furthermore, the historic advance of Northern European peoples had come to an

end. For the future, the demographic evidence pointed to a diminishing white population. The conviction that this pattern represented a dysgenic trend was never doubted.

Policy with regard to immigration and sterilization remained constant even if some particulars might have changed. After 1924 one would expect interest in southern and eastern Europeans to decline. The eugenicists had won that battle. Furthermore, the eastern European immigrants were rapidly assimilating into American society with none of the dire consequences envisioned by Madison Grant and Henry Fairfield Osborn. The eugenicists naturally turned their attention to the newly perceived threats from Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean.

There was very little change in basic ideology in the society's leadership in these years. From Henry Fairfield Osborn to Frederick Osborn and from Madison Grant to Warren Thompson the ideology and philosophy remained stable. Henry Fairfield Osborn and Madison Grant were antisemites and overt racists. Frederick Osborn and Warren Thompson did not see themselves as racists, but how shall we judge their horror at the declining birth rate of Northern Europeans? How shall we judge their concern over the increasing population of Mexicans, Native Americans, and Blacks? In these matters Henry Fairfield Osborn, Madison Grant, Frederick Osborn, and Warren Thompson agreed.



In 1935 there was a significant change in the organization of the Society with the dissolution of the advisory council, but this organizational change had little immediate impact on the society's ideology. What emerged by 1940 as the "new eugenics" was an evolution of earlier positions. In many ways these positions were simply restatements of earlier positions in more contemporary language.

For example, a key element in the society's "new eugenics" was the belief that the focus of a democratic eugenic program ought to be on the majority of the population falling within the normal ranges of ability, not on the ten percent of the population that was degenerate in one way or other. There was really nothing new about this.<sup>2</sup> Eugenics advocates had been seesawing back and forth between an emphasis on positive and negative eugenics since its earliest inception. Furthermore, the advocates of eugenics at the Second International Congress of Eugenics clearly hoped that eugenics would permeate every aspect of social organization. Thus, they too, believed that eugenics had to focus on the majority of the society to be effective.

The idea of a "democratic eugenics" actually developed out of this broad focus. In democratic societies eugenics program had to be part of the fabric of the society and

---

<sup>2</sup> Galton stressed the extremes, but the AES leadership clearly recognized the importance of reaching the whole population.

permeate its social welfare programs in such way as to naturally encourage a eugenic distribution of births. "Except in cases of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency" would attempt to "define the 'fit' or the 'unfit,' nor would any arbitrary power determine who should have children."<sup>3</sup>

The leaders at the Second International Congress of Eugenics had articulated the essentials of this ideology when they expressed the hope that eugenics would eventually become an internalized ideal by which young people would, naturally and without coercion, take eugenics into account in selecting mates. While the speakers at the Congress in 1921 emphasized the need for immediate action to "stem the tide of racial degeneracy," they did not think that emergency efforts were all that was needed. They were consciously trying to spur society to action but their long range vision for a eugenic future were much the same in 1921 as in 1940.

Following their lead, the AES programs called for a eugenic approach to legislation, education, research, propaganda, and theology. The leaders of the AES did not simply call for specific legislation, they hoped eugenics would influence all legislative proceedings. The leaders of

---

<sup>3</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Social Implications of the Eugenic Program," Child Study (January 1939) p. 96. It is worth noting that this exception included several million individuals.

the AES believed that tax law might be just as important as sterilization in the effort to affect society. In the twenties the society was fighting important battles which called for immediate action, but by the 30s other items on the agenda were ready for more focused action.

Another focus of the mid-thirties was the "discovery" that the West was facing the dual problem of declining birth rates and a dysgenic trend in births. This too, was clearly present in the earlier period. In fact, the statements of the early twenties and mid-thirties share so much in common that it is hard to understand why this was considered a "new" aspect of eugenics by leader of the AES in the thirties. Even the cry that these problems were new and unprecedented paralleled earlier statements.<sup>4</sup>

American eugenicists viewed Europe as being a few years ahead of America both in the emergence of demographic trends and in the development of policies to deal with these problems. America might have been a leader in establishing eugenic sterilization, but European ideologists were important in framing American perspectives. American eugenics leaders looked to Europe for ideological leadership and imported a good deal of European ideology. Madison Grant's writings were very popular in the United States, but

---

<sup>4</sup> The leaders of the thirties may have believed that earlier predictions of doom were not based on sound evidence. By 1935 Frederick Osborn could point to demographic studies which confirmed their fears.

his ideas were distinctly European. His work synthesized the European race ideology of De Gobineau, Chamberlain, and Hans Günther, just as the earlier work of William Z. Ripley was a synthesis of European ideas on race.

In the late 1930s Americans began to distinguish between two European models for eugenic policies. The first was that of the totalitarian states of Italy and Germany. The second was the "democratic" model of Sweden. At the heart of the new model which Sweden presented was the idea that in a democratic society the dysgenic trend could be reversed naturally as social welfare programs and wide spread free access to birth control became available. Hidden within this model were social policies aimed at increasing the economic burden on elements of the community considered dysgenic. This model was not new but the demographic evidence of its success was quite important.

The main thrust of the Swedish eugenics program was to encourage larger families through state subsidies for housing, free school lunch programs, and a nationwide system of nurseries and maternal care. The American leaders believed even more could be done with nationally subsidized recreation and health care, salary scales based on size of family, and a tax system which would favor the large family over the small.

It was natural to find eugenics reflecting the national values of the society in which it developed. In each

country there was a wide array of opinion on eugenic matters and those leaders who were closest to the main stream of political power would naturally rise to leadership positions. While American eugenicists clearly had praise for the Nazi sterilization law, they believed that the eugenics program developing in Germany was unsuited to America. Sweden, on the other hand, was a democratic state. The model of eugenics it presented was attractive because it allowed American eugenicists to ride with the social-political tide rather than against it. That, in fact, is exactly what eugenicists in Germany did in the 30s. They adapted themselves to their political reality. In this sense Kenneth Ludmerer is right in saying that American eugenicists "propounded a new eugenics creed which was both scientifically and philosophically attuned to a changed America."<sup>5</sup>

This, however, did not mean that American eugenics advocates abandoned their positions on immigration, miscegenation, and sterilization. They still believed that a tenth of the population required negative eugenics measures, including coercive sterilization. In fact, the American eugenicists of the mid-thirties stressed the need for much wider use of sterilization. They wanted sterilization to be freely available to the entire population. Sterilization was described as a privilege and

---

<sup>5</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174.

a right which should not be denied to those at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder simply because they could not afford it. It was also mandated for those "dangerous" elements of society that needed to be prevented from procreating.

Society leaders advocated integrating eugenics with current social and political concerns. During the anti-foreign hysteria of the post-war period (1919-1924) eugenicists led the immigration restriction movement. In a later period of social welfare experimentation, eugenicists pondered ways of integrating eugenics into the social welfare state. After the revelations of the Holocaust, eugenics leaders withdrew from the public arena. The time was not right for aggressive propaganda or legislative campaigns. It is not surprising that a movement with such broad support should continue to exercise influence over American social development from the 1940s to the present.

Eugenics was a movement of international dimensions in the twenties and thirties and in America it was advocated by some of our leading scholars, scientists, politicians, and clergymen. We should not be surprised at its continued vigor. A movement of this diversity and strength is quite likely to resurface as social conditions allow.

## ♦Appendix: AES: Advisory Council and Board, 1923-1940.♦

The following appendix includes all members of the AES Advisory Council from 1923 to 1935 plus all members of the Board of Directors of the Society from 1923 to 1940 for whom biographical data could be found. The biographies focus on elements that relate to the individuals activities as a leader in the American eugenics movement. I have listed membership in professional organizations which were clearly related to eugenics such as the American Social Hygiene Association or the American Genetics Association. I have also listed other organizational affiliation where the individual served as an officer. I have also concentrated more effort on those who are less well known than those who are prominent in the historical literature. Thus, I have a shorter entry for Charles Davenport than for Frank Babbott. Information on Davenport is available in numerous studies of eugenics, while very little is available on Frank Babbott.

Information for these biographies was collected from the Biography and Genealogy Master Index (2nd edition, Detroit 1980) and the 1981-1985 cumulation of the Index (Detroit 1985). Further information was gathered from the Eugenical News as well as other sources. The primary source material for this appendix was originally gathered into two three ring binders. Copies of this material will be deposited with the American Philosophical Society and will

be available to scholars interested in the American Eugenics Society.

AES Advisory Council and Board Members, 1923-1940.

	NAME		Years
1	ANDERSON	W. Prof.	23-35
2	BABBOTT	Frank Mr.	23-30
3	BANKER	Howard Dr.	27-35
4	BARKER	Lewellys Prof.	23-35
5	BELKNAP	Chauncy Mr.	BOD 37-40
6	BIGELOW	Frederick Mr.	23-35
7	BIGGS	Herman Dr.	23
8	BLODGETT	Mrs. John Mrs.	27-35
9	BOGARDUS	Emory Prof.	27-35
10	BOWDITCH	Harold Dr.	23
11	BRIGHMAN	Carl Prof.	27-35
12	BROWN	Philip Dr.	23-35
13	BURCH	Guy	BOD 35-40
14	BURR	Charles Dr.	28-35
15	CAMPBELL	W. Pres.	25-35
16	CANNON	Walter Dr.	23-30
17	CARSTENS	Christian Mr.	27-35
18	CARVER	Thomas Prof.	25-35
19	CASTLE	William Prof.	23-28
20	COE	Wesley Prof.	27-35
21	COLE	Leon Prof.	27-35
22	CONKLIN	Edwin Prof.	BOD 23-30
23	COOK	Robert	BOD 40
24	COOPER	John Rev.	23-30
25	COPELAND	Royal Senator	23
26	COXE	Alexander Mr.	23
27	CRAMPTON	Henry Prof.	BOD 23-35
28	CUMMING	Hugh Surg.-Gen.	23
29	DANFORTH	Charles Prof.	23-35
30	DAVENPORT	Charles Dr.	BOD 23-35
31	DAVIS	Katherine Dr.	28-35
32	DAVIS	Watson	BOD 40 Dir.
33	DENNY	George	BOD 40
34	DICKENSON	Robert Dr.	27-35
35	DOWLING	Oscar Dr.	23
36	DUNLAP	Knight Dr.	23
37	EAST	Edward Prof.	23-35
38	ELIOT	Charles Pres.	23-26
39	EMERSON	Haven Dr.	23-35
40	ESTABROOK	Arthur Dr.	23-35
41	FAIRCHILD	David Dr.	23-35
42	FAIRCHILD	Henry Prof.	BOD 25-40
43	FARRAND	Livingston Pres.	23-35
44	FERNALD	Walter Dr.	23
45	FISHER	Irving Prof.	BOD 23-40



46	FISK	Eugene	Dr.	23-30
47	FLETCHER	Austin	Mr.	23
48	FOLKS	Homer	Mr.	23
49	FOLSOM	Joseph	Professor	BOD 37-40
50	FOSDICK	Harry	Rev.	23-35
51	FOSDICK	Raymond	Mr.	25-35
52	GARRETT	Robert	Mr.	23-35
53	GIDDINGS	Franklin	Prof.	23-30
54	GILDERSLEEVE	Virginia	Dean	25-35
55	GODDARD	Henry	Prof.	25-35
56	GOETHE	Charles	Mr.	30-35
57	GOODSELL	Willystine		BOD 35-40
58	GOSNEY	Ezra	Mr.	27-35
59	GOULD	Charles	Mr.	23-30
60	GRANT	Madison	Mr.	BOD 23-30
61	GREGORY	William	Prof.	23-35
62	GROVES	Ernest	Prof.	30-35
63	GURNEE	Bell		BOD 40
64	GUYER	Michael	Prof.	23-35
65	HALL	Winfield	Prof.	23
66	HANKINS	Frank	Prof.	BOD 40
67	HARRIMAN	Mary	Mrs.	23
68	HARRIS	Arthur	Prof.	25-30
69	HARRISON	Ross	Prof.	23
70	HAVILAND	C.	DR.	25-28
71	HOLMES	Samuel	Prof.	23-40
72	HOOTON	Earnest	Prof.	23-35
73	HOWE	Lucien	Dr.	23-35
74	HRDLICKA	Ales	Prof.	23-35
75	HUMPHREY	Seth	Prof.	30-35
76	HUNTER	Arthur	Mr.	23
77	HUNTINGTON	Ellsworth	Prof.	23-40
78	HUNTSMAN	Archibald	Prof.	27-35
79	HURTY	John	Dr.	23-26
80	HUTCHINSON	Woods	Dr.	23
81	JAMES	Walter	Dr.	23
82	JAMES	Wortham	Mrs.	23-35
83	JENKINS	Helen	Mrs.	23-30
84	JENNINGS	Herbert	Prof.	23-24
85	JOHNSON	Albert	Hon.	23-35
86	JOHNSON	Roswell	Prof.	23-35
87	JONES	Cheney	Mr.	27-35
88	JORDAN	David	Prof.	23-30
89	JORDAN	Harvey	Prof.	23-35
90	KAHN	Addie	Mrs.	23-35
91	KEEN	William	Dr.	23
92	KELLEY	Truman	Prof.	27-35
93	KELLOGG	John	Dr.	23-35
94	KELLOGG	Vernon	Prof.	23-35
95	KING	Helen	Prof.	23-35
96	KOFOID	Charles	Prof.	23-35
97	KRETCH	Shepard	Mrs.	BOD 40
98	LARUE	Daniel	Prof.	23-35
99	LAUGHLIN	Harry	Dr.	BOD 23-39

100	LAWRENCE	William	Bishop	23-35
101	LILLIE	Frank	Prof.	23-35
102	LINDEMAN	Eduard	Prof.	BOD 40
103	LITTELL	Robert	Mr.	BOD 40
104	LITTLE	Clarence	Prof.	BOD 23-35
105	LLOYD	Francis	Prof.	27-35
106	LORIMER	Frank	Prof.	BOD 37-40
107	LYNCH	Frederick	Rev.	23-26
108	MACIVER	Robert	Prof.	BOD 29-32
109	MANN	Louis	Rabbi	27-35
110	MCCLUNG	Clarence	Prof.	23
111	MCDUGALL	William	Prof.	23-35
112	MERRIAM	John	Dr.	23-35
113	METCALF	Maynard	Prof.	23
114	MEYER	Adolf	Dr.	23-35
115	MORGAN	Ann	Dr.	23-35
116	MORGAN	Arthur	Pres.	27-35
117	MURLIN	Lemuel	Pres.	23
118	NABOURS	Robert	Prof.	27-35
119	NACTRIEB	Henry	Prof.	23-35
120	NEILSON	William	Pres.	23-35
121	NEWMAN	Horatio	Prof.	27-35
122	OLSON	Harry	Judge	BOD 23-30
123	OSBORN	Frederick	Mr.	28-81
124	OSBORN	Henry	Prof.	BOD 23-35
125	OWEN	Robert	Sen.	23
126	PARKER	George	Prof.	23-35
127	PATON	Stewart	Dr.	23-35
128	PENDLETON	Ellen	Pres.	23
129	PERKINS	Henry	Prof.	BOD 31-40
130	PHILLIPS	John	Gov.	27-35
131	PINCHOT	Gifford	Gov.	27-35
132	POPENOE	Paul	Mr.	BOD 23-40
133	RAMOS	D.	DR.	30-35
134	RANKIN	Watson	Dr.	23-35
135	RICE	Stuart	Prof.	27-35
136	ROSANOFF	Aaron	Dr.	23-35
137	ROSS	Edward	Prof.	27-30
138	RUMSEY	Mary	Mrs.	23-35
139	SAWYER	Charles	Brig.-Gen.	23
140	SEASHORE	Carl	Prof.	23-35
141	SHERBON	Florence	Dr.	27-35
142	SHULL	Aaron	Prof.	27-35
143	SNOW	William	Dr.	23-40
144	SPRAGUE	Robert	Dean	27-28
145	STOCKARD	Charles	Prof.	23-35
146	STODDARD	Theodore	Mr.	23-35
147	SUMNER	Francis	Prof.	27-35
148	SWINGLE	Wilbur	Prof.	27-35
149	TERMAN	Lewis	Prof.	23-35
150	TERRY	Robert	Dr.	23-35
151	THORNDIKE	Edward	Prof.	23-35
152	THOMPSON	Warren		BOD 37-40
153	VANDERLIP	Frank	Mrs.	BOD 37-40

154	VAUGHAN	Victor	Dr.	23-30
155	VISHER	Stephen	Prof.	30-35
156	VOLLMAR	August	Mr.	27-35
157	WALTER	Herbert	Prof.	23-35
158	WARD	Robert	Prof.	23-35
159	WELCH	William	Dr.	23-30
160	WHEELER	William	Prof.	23-35
161	WIGGAM	Albert	Mr.	BOD 28-40
162	WILBUR	Ray	Pres.	23-35
163	WILDER	Harris	Prof.	23
164	WILLCOX	Walter	Prof.	23-35
165	WINTERNITZ	Milton	Prof.	BOD 35
166	WISSLER	Clark	Dr.	23-35
167	WOODS	Frederick	Dr.	23-35
168	WOODWARD	Robert	Dr.	23
169	WRIGHT	Sewall	Prof.	27-35
170	YERKES	Robert	Prof.	27-35

Note: An asterik has been placed before the names of those included in the statistical analysis in Chapter Four.

\*W.S. ANDERSON (no dates available) Professor of Genetics, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Chairman of the Kentucky State Committee of the AES. Anderson was one of the few active members of the AES Advisory Council for whom very little biographical data is available. He is not listed in any of the standard biographical indexes.

Anderson began teaching genetics at Kentucky in 1914. He introduced a eugenics curriculum into the College of Agriculture. The curriculum was extended over the years to all students at the University. He was particularly proud of the relevance of his eugenics courses for education students. His eugenics classes averaged between fifty and one hundred students per semester per class. Anderson's

eugenics course was required for all domestic science majors. Male and female students were taught separately.

♣ \*Frank Lusk BABBOTT (1854-1933) b. Waterville, NY; manufacturer; descended from Edward Babbott who came from Wales in 1643 and settled in Plymouth, Massachusetts. Ed. A.B., Amherst, 78. Advisory council, 1923-30.

Babbott, a Presbyterian, was described as a reformer. Active in Brooklyn politics, he served as a member the Board of Education and a director of the Brooklyn Public Library, a trustee of the Brooklyn Academy of Music, pres. of the Brooklyn Free Kindergarten Society, a trustee of Vassar college, and a member of the board of home missions of the Presbyterian Church.

He was director of the Atlantic Avenue Elevated Railroad, the Long Island Railroad, and the Brooklyn Trust Company. Upon his death he left \$1.5 million to the Long Island College of Medicine, \$1.1 million to Amherst College, and slightly over \$1/2 million to Vassar.

Babbott was a member of the AES Committee on Finance and the AES Immigration Committee. He was also quite active in the Eugenics Research Association (ERA). He was formally elected a member of the ERA in June 1922, joined the executive board in 1924, serving as pres. in 1927. In June 1922, he was appointed to the ERA Committee on Immigration. The Committee on Immigration was one of the most active

committees of the ERA, and Babbott presented several reports directly to Congress. He reported regularly on the progress of the committee's work in the pages of the Eugenical News. In 1926 he served as Chairman of the Immigration Committee of the ERA. Babbott was particularly interested in a study of deportation of aliens in America, and he established "The Babbott Fund" to pay the expenses of the committee's work.

♣ \*Howard James BANKER (1866-1940) b. Schaghticoke, NY; biologist; Banker was an ordained Methodist minister whose family came from Holland to Harlem in 1673. Ed. A.B., Syracuse U., 92; A.M., Columbia, 00, Ph.D., 06. Advisory council, 1925-35.

After receiving M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in botany from Columbia University, Banker went to work for the Eugenics Record Office and was what one might call a "professional eugenicist." He was acting superintendent of the Eugenics Record Office (ERO) in 1915-16 and acting assistant director in 1920-21 and 1923. He served on the AES Committee on Biologic Genealogy and the Committee on History and Survey of the Eugenics Movement.

Banker was a specialist in genealogical matters. He was particularly interested in heredity in "aristogenic families." He compiled histories of the several prominent eugenic families, including the Bowditch family of New England, the Underwood Families, and his own Banker family.

In his family studies he stressed inclusion of character traits which he hoped would be used for genetical analysis.

He published numerous articles on eugenics, especially in the J. of Heredity. He was on the executive Committee of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, a member of the Am. Genetics Assn., and a lifelong Republican. He married the daughter of a Methodist minister and died without issue.

♠ \*Lewellys F(ranklin) BARKER (1867-1930) b. in Norwich, Canada; physician. Ed. M.B., U. of Toronto, 90; fellow, Hopkins, 92-94; Liepzig, 95; Munich and Berlin, 04. Advisory council, 1923-30.

Barker taught at Johns Hopkins University from 1897 to the end of his career. He was pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. in 1922. One of the most prominent physicians in America, he was the author of numerous text books and popular books on medicine and health. He was chairman of the board of the Wistar Institute of Anatomy in Philadelphia, a member of the National Committee For Mental Hygiene (pres. 1909-18), pres. of the Assn. of Am. Physicians (1913), pres. of the Am. Neurological Assn. (1916), and pres. of the Southern Medical Assn. (1919).

♠ Chauncey BELKNAP (1891-1984) b. Roselle, NJ; lawyer. Ed. Litt. B., Princeton, 12; LL.B., Harvard, 15. Board of Directors, 1937-40.

Belknap served as legal secretary to Oliver Wendell Holmes, 1915-16. He was a member of the firm of Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Tyler, 1920-80. Trustee of Princeton.

♠ \*Frederick Southgate BIGELOW (1871-1954) b. Boston, MA; of old New England stock; editor. Ed. M.I.T., 90-93 (no degree). Advisory council, 1923-35.

A Republican and Episcopalian, he was associate editor of the Saturday Evening Post. He also wrote frequently for the Readers Digest, Ladies Home Journal, Esquire, and Cosmopolitan. Bigelow was active in the immigration restriction movement. Under Bigelow's direction the Saturday Evening Post published numerous articles in support of immigration restriction and eugenics between 1920 and 1940. He served on the advisory council from 1923 to 1930.

♠ \*Herman BIGGS (1859-1923) b. Trumansburg, NY; physician, public health official. Ed. A.B., Cornell, 82; M.D. Bellevue Hospital Medical Coll., 83. He was a descendant of George Biggs, a native of England who came to America in 1690. Advisory council, 1923.

Biggs was one of the leading pioneers in public health in America. He was one of the founders of anti-tuberculosis movement and in 1904 he founded one of the first municipal health dispensaries for the poor in America.

He headed the State Department of Health and was a director of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research in

1901. He had a long and close relationship with the Rockefeller Foundations and the Rockefeller funded International Health Board. He was a pres. of the Assn. of Am. Physicians, the Am. Social Hygiene Assn., and the National Assn. for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis.

♠ \*Minnie A. Cumnock (Mrs. John Wood) BLODGETT (no dates).  
Advisory council, 1927-35.

Very little information is available on Minnie Blodgett. She was originally from Lowell, MA. Her husband was a lumberman, banker, and manufacturer from Michigan. She is listed as a member of the AES Council from 1927 to 1935 although her date of death is noted in her husbands biography as 12 October 1931.

♠ \*Emory Stephen BOGARDUS (1882-1973) b. Belvidere, IL; sociologist. Ed. Northwestern U. B.A., 08, M.A., 09; Ph.D., U. of Chicago, 11. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Bogardus was a Professor U. of S. California, 11-15; director Social Work div., 20-37, dean, 37-39, and became professor emeritus in 1949. He was pres. of the Social Research Soc. of S. Calif., 24-28; pres. L.A. Chapter, Am. Assn. of Social Workers, 23-25; member executive committee Am. Sociol. Soc., 20-26, 2nd v.p., 1927. He served as Editor of the Sociological Monographs of S. Calif., 16-21; contr. editor J. of Social Forces; J. of Ednl. Sociology, and organizer of the J. of Applied Sociology (editor, 21-



27). He was editor of the J. of Sociology and Social Research from 1916-61. Bogardus was author of a number of standard textbooks such as Introduction to the Social Sciences (1913 & 1922); Introduction to Sociology, numerous editions. He also authored Immigration and Race Attitudes (1928) and A Forty-Year Racial Distance Study (1967).

♠ \*Harold BOWDITCH (1883-1964) b. Boston, MA; physician and heraldist; descendant of William Pickering, who arrived in this country from England in 1671. Ed. A.B., Harvard, 05, M.D., 09. Advisory council, 1923.

Bowdich taught at Harvard from 1909-12. He maintained a private medical practice in Boston from 1912-44 and in Brookline from 1944-58. He also served for many years as an assistant professor of medicine at Boston University. He was a member of the Unitarian Church and independent in politics.

♠ \*Carl Campbell BRIGHAM (1890-1943) b. Marlboro, MA; Psychologist. Ed. Princeton, Litt. B., 12, A.M., 13, Ph.D., 16. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Professor of Psychology at Princeton, a protege of Robert M. Yerkes and a junior member of the World War I Army Testing group. Brigham's influential book, A Study of American Intelligence (1923), lent scientific credibility to the work of Madison Grant and Charles W. Gould. Yerkes, Grant, and Gould were also members of the advisory council

and worked together with Brigham on immigration matters. He served on the AES Committee on Psychometry, was a member of the Galton Society, and the Eugenics Research Assn.

♣ \*Philip King BROWN (1869-1940) b. Napa, CA; physician. Ed. A.B., Harvard, 90, M.D., 93; postdoc work in Berlin; Göttingen; Prague; Vienna; Paris. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Like many southern and west coast members of the advisory council he was a Democrat. He was a local leader in public health matters and founder of the Arequipa Sanatorium in San Francisco. The sanitarium was specifically designed to help working class women with tuberculosis. He was also a founder of the San Francisco Settlement Legion and an organizer of the local Boys Clubs.

♣ Guy Irving BURCH (1899-1951) b. Clayton, NM; population analyst. Ed. Culver Military Acad., 14-16; Pawling Sch., 17-18; Cavalry Officers Training Sch., Tex., 18; Columbia U., 19-23 (no degrees). Board of Directors, 1935-40.

Founder and director of the Population Reference Bureau (1929). Burch was a key figure in the transition from eugenics to population control. He was a contributing editor to Eugenics (1931); a member of the Council on Population Policy (1935-36), and chairman of 1947 Population Resources Round Table. He helped organize the Population Assn. of America and was one of its first fellows (1931-

1935). He served as a member of board of the AES from 1932-47 and was secretary between 1933-36. He was the editor of the Population Bulletin (1940-50) and was author of Population Roads to Peace or War [with E. Pendell] (1945) revised and published as Human Breeding and Survival (1947).

♠ \*Charles W. BURR (1861-1944) b. Philadelphia, PA; neurologist. Ed. B.S., U. of Pa., 83, M.D., 86; postdoctoral work in Berlin and Vienna. Advisory Council, 1928-35; a member of the AES Committee on Crime Prevention.

Burr was one of the most prominent psychiatrist in Philadelphia. He served as chief of the psychiatric service at the Philadelphia General Hospital. He was a specialist in the criminally insane and testified as an expert witness in numerous murder trials.

He was the editor of American edition of Curschmann's Textbook of Nervous Diseases. He also served as pres. of the Am. Neurological Society (1908) and pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. in 1925. He died unmarried in 1944. He was an Episcopalian.

♠ \*William Wallace CAMPBELL (1862-1938) b. Hancock, OH; astronomer. Ed. B.S., U. of Mich., 86, M.S., 89; Western U. of Pa., Sc.D., 99. His Scottish Ancestors moved to Pennsylvania in 1785. Advisory council, 1925-35.

He was pres. of the AAAS in 1915 and of the NAS in 1931. Campbell pioneered the use of the spectrograph for

observing astronomical objects. He recorded observations on gaseous nebulae, planetary nebulae, and novae. He helped design the Mills spectrograph and lay the foundations for a new science of astrophysics. In 1923 he laid aside his astronomical work to become pres. of the University of California. He retired in 1930 and committed suicide in 1938.

▲ \*Walter Bradford CANNON (1871-1945) b. Prairie du Chien, WI; physician. Ed. A.B., Harvard, 96, A.m., 97, M.D., 00. His family arrived in Boston from Ulster in 1718. He served on the AES Committee on Eugenics and Dysgenics of Birth Control along with Robert L. Dickenson who served as Chairman. Advisory council, 1923-30.

A student of Charles Davenport and one America's most distinguished physicians and physiologists. A member of the National Academy of Sciences and pres. of the AAAS (1939). A graduate of Harvard Medical School (M.D., 1900), he was one of the first to use X-rays to study the digestive system. His early research laid the ground for the development of gastrointestinal radiology. He was the author of The Mechanical Factors of Digestion (1911). Cannon spent a decade elaborating Claude Bernard's concept of milieu intérieur. Cannon later employed the specific designation "homeostasis" for these conditions.

In 1908 as a result of attacks on the Rockefeller Institute by antivivisectionists, Cannon was appointed head

of a Defense Committee appointed by the AMA. He remained a leader in the struggle against antivivisectionism for the next twenty years.

Cannon taught at the Peking Union Medical College in 1935 and helped to found the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy. He also helped found the American-Soviet Medical Society and the Bureau for Medical Aid to China. His interest in Russia having been stimulated by his association with Pavlov, whose interest in physiology were quite similar. As a result of his international activities he was attacked as a godless communist. He was later involved in the rescue of scientists from Nazi Germany.

♠ C(hristian) C(arl) CARSTENS (1865-1939) b. Bredstedt, Germany; social worker. Ed. A.B., Grinnell Coll., 91; A.M., U. of Pa., 00, Ph.D., 03. A member of the AES Committee on Cooperation with Social Workers (1926). Advisory council, 1927-35.

He served as assistant secretary for both the Philadelphia (96-99) and New York (00-03) Charity Organization Societies. He was General Secretary of the MA. Soc. for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (07-20) and Executive Director of the Child Welfare League of America. A Republican, he was appointed by President Hoover as chairman of the Section on Handicapped Children of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection in 1929. His section produced four volumes of reports. He was also

the U.S. Rep. to the Pan Am Child Welfare Conference in Havana in 1927.

Carstens believed that a child was first of all a member of the community in which his family had legal residence. He or she is entitled to such services as exist in that community and it was the obligation of the community to do whatever was necessary to assist needy children and to preserve the family.

♣ \*Thomas Nixon CARVER (1865-1961) b. Kirkville, IA; educator. Ed. A.B., U. of S. Ca., 91; Ph.D., Cornell, 94. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Professor of economics at Oberlin, 1894-1902; Prof. of Political Economy at Harvard, 1902-34. A prolific writer, he published over twenty books including several widely used general textbooks on economics such as Principles of Political Economy (1919), Elementary Economics (1920) and Principles of National Economics (1921).

♣ \*William Ernest CASTLE (1867-1962) b. Alexandria, OH; zoologist. Ed. A.B., Denison U., 89; A.B., Harvard, 93, A.M., 94, Ph.D., 95. Castle's English ancestors settled in New England in the seventeenth century. Advisory council, 1923-28.

He spent most of his adult career at Harvard University's Bussey Institute where he was in charge of mammalian genetics. He was the author of Heredity in

Relation to Evolution and Animal Breeding (1911) and Genetics and Eugenics (1916). Castle maintained throughout his career a strong concern for eugenics.

He was a Research Associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and a Fellow of the AAAS. Castle helped to found the Am. Breeders Assn. in 1903. He helped to reorganize the Am. Genetics Assn. in 1913 and the Genetics Society of America in 1932. He was vice-pres. of the Am. Genetics Assn. and chairman of the joint section on genetics (1924) as well as pres. of the Am. Society of Naturalist (1919). Castle was on the editorial board of the J. of Experimental Zoology from its founding in 1904 until his death. He also helped found the J. of Heredity in 1913 and Genetics in 1916.

♣ \*Wesley Roswell COE (1869-1960) b. Middlefield, CT; biologist; His first paternal American ancestor was Robert Coe who came to the colonies from England in 1635. Ed. Meridian (Conn.) High Sch., 89; Ph.B., Sheffield Scientific School (Yale), 92; Ph.D., 95; postdoctoral work in Wurzburg and Naples. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Coe published over a hundred monographs and articles on morphology and embryology. A full professor of biology at Yale between 1907 and 1938, he was also curator of the Peabody Museum (1914-26), v.p. of section F of the AAAS in 1930, pres. of the Am. Society of Zoologists in 1940, a member of the Am. Genetics Assn., and the Eugenics Research

Assn. He was Associate Editor of the American Journal of Science from 1917 to 1944. He was a Methodist and a Republican.

♠ \*Leon Jacob COLE (1877-1948) b. Allegany, NY; zoologist, geneticist. Ed. A.B., U. of Mich., 01; Ph.D., Harvard, 06. Advisory council, 1925-35.

A zoologist and animal geneticists, Cole taught at Harvard, Yale, and Wisconsin. He was a Fellow of the AAAS, chairman of the NRC division on biology and agriculture, and a v.p. of section F of the AAAS in 1940. He was also a member of the Am. Genetics Assn. He served as both vice-pres. and later pres. of the Genetics Society of America (1937 and 1940 respectively). He worked closely with Davenport, Laughlin, Wissler, Stockard, and Barker on the NRC Committee on Heredity.

♠ \*Edwin Grant CONKLIN (1863-1952) b. Waldo, OH; biologist, zoologist, geneticist. Ed. A.B., Johns Hopkins, A.M., 89; Ph.D., 91. Advisory council, 1923-26; Board of Directors, 1927-30.

One of America's most influential zoologists, Conklin spent most of his career at Princeton. He came from a religious family and seriously considered entering the ministry. He was elected pres. of the Am. Society of Zoologists (1899), the Am. Society of Naturalists (1912), and the Am. Assn. for the Advancement of Science (1936). He



also served on the editorial board of a number of journals including the Biological Bulletin (Woods Hole), the Journal of Morphology, Journal of Experimental Zoology, Genetics and the Quarterly Review of Biology.

He was a prolific writer and lecturer, particularly interested in the nature/nurture issue, and wrote Heredity and Environment in the Development of Man (1915). He also gave popular lectures on "Science and the Future of Man" and "The Biological Basis of Democracy."

Conklin was a Charter Fellow of the Galton Society, a member of the Eugenics Research Assn., a member of the advisory council of the Eugenics Committee of the USA in 1923, and the Board of Directors in 1927. Conklin served on the Committee on Eugenics and Dysgenics of Birth Regulation in 1926 and was a signer of the 1927 "Memorial on Immigration" sent to the President and Congress requesting restriction of immigration to whites only. He was a participant in the Third International Congress of Eugenics. His text, Heredity and Environment (1925) was used as a standard textbook in many colleges.

◆ Robert Carter **COOK** (1898-??) b. WA; geneticist and population expert. Ed. Friends School, 1915-16; Tech. H.S., 15-16; George Washington U., 17-19; pre-med student, U. Md., 20-21. Board of Directors, 1940-??.

Editor of the J. of Heredity, 1922-62; dir. Population Reference Bureau, 51-58, pres., 59-68; editor of Population Bulletin, 51-69. Cook lectured on medical genetics at George Washington U., 44-63. He was the organizer of section 1 of the Inter-American Conf. on Conservation, 48 and a member of the adv. com. Conservation Foundation. Cook served as a member of the Bd. dirs. of the Assn. for Research in Human Heredity, 47-50. Recipient of the Albert and Mary Lasker Found. award in planned parenthood, 56. Fellow of the AAAS; editor of the Eugenical News, 42. Author of Human Fertility: The Modern Dilemma (1951).

♠ \*John Montgomery COOPER (1881-1949) b. Rockville, MD; anthropologist; descended from James Cooper, an English Quaker who had immigrated to Pennsylvania in 1684. Advisory council, 1923-30. He was a member of the AES Committee on the Eugenics and Dysgenics of Birth Regulation, 1926; and the Committee on Cooperation with the Clergy.

Cooper was a Roman Catholic priest and prominent anthropologist. He was pres. of the Am. Anthropological Assn. in 1940, secretary and treasurer of the Catholic Anthropological Conf. from 1926 on. He wrote a number of books including Birth Control (1923). His four-volume Religious Outlines for Colleges (1924-1930) was adopted as a standard text in many colleges. He was also author of Children's Institutions (1931), a major contribution to applied sociology.

His interest in the relationship between cultural anthropology and social problems resulted in the publication of a notable contribution to cultural anthropology, Analytical and Critical Bibliography of the Indians of Tierra del Fuego (1917).

He served as a professor of anthropology and sociology at the Catholic University from 1920 until his death. He founded and edited several journals including Primitive Man (retitled Anthropological Quarterly in 1953). He played a major role in the organization of the Am. Anthropological Assn. and served as pres. in 1940. He was also active in the National Probation Assn., the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and the Am. Social Hygiene Assn.

♣ \*Royal Samuel COPELAND (1868-1938) b. Dexter, MI; ophthalmologist, politician. Ed. M.D., University of Michigan, 1889; post-doctoral work in England, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Belgium. Dr. Copeland was descended from Lawrence Copeland who emigrated from England to Plymouth in 1650. Advisory council, 1923.

In 1908 Copeland became dean of Flower Hospital Medical College. In 1918 he was appointed New York City Commissioner of Public Health. During his administration infant mortality in the city dropped some sixty percent. He was the author of Dr. Copeland's Home Medical Book (1934).

Copeland was active in city, state, and national politics. He was friendly with both the Hearst interests and Tammany Hall. He wrote a syndicated health column for the Hearst papers. He served in the Senate from 1923 to 1938 and was a member of the Senate Immigration Committee during those years. In the Senate he was known as an exceptionally conscientious legislator with a special interest in pure food and drug legislation. Copeland was an avowed conservative and opponent of the New Deal. A devout Methodist, he was a delegate to Methodist Ecumenical Conference in London in 1900. He was a regular and active member of the Methodist general conferences in the U.S.

♣ \*Alexander B. COXE. (no dates) Advisory council, 1923; Eugenics Research Assn., 1926. His address was listed as Paoli, PA. No other biographical data could be found.

♣ \*Henry Edward CRAMPTON (1875-1956) b. N.Y.C., NY; zoologist and experimental biologist. Ed. A.B., Columbia, 93, fellow, 96-97, Ph.D., 99. Crampton was descended from Dennis Crampton who came to Guilford, Conn., from England in 1650. He was a very active eugenicist serving as secretary-treasurer for the Eugenics Committee of the USA between 1922 and 1925. Advisory council, 1926-1935.

Columbia University Professor of zoology and experimental biology. He was author of The Doctrine of Evolution (1911) and pres. of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1926-27. He taught at Barnard College between

1900 to 1941. He was also an associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, a curator at the Am. Museum of Natural History, 1909-21, and a member of the NRC. He traveled extensively and had a world wide reputation. He was especially interested in the nature/nurture question. Crampton was a Presbyterian and a Republican.

♣ \*Hugh S. CUMMING (1869-1948) b. VI; surgeon. Ed. M.D., U of VA, 93; U College of Medicine, Richmond, 94. Advisory council, 1923.

He served with the U.S. Public Health Service from 1894 to 1936. Between 1920 and 1936 he was the Surgeon-General. He was an Episcopalian and particularly active in Pan American Health issues and received honors from the governments of Peru, Ecuador, Chile, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, Guatamala, Paraguay, and Venezuela.

♣ \*Charles H. DANFORTH (1883-1969) b. Oxford, ME; anatomist and geneticists. Ed. A.B. Tufts, 08, fellow, 08-09, A.M, 10; Ph.D, Washington U, 12. He was a member of the Committee on Research Problems in Eugencis (Davenport served as chairman) and the Committee on Formal Education. He was member of the Eugenics Research Assn. and the Galton Society. In 1932 he presented a paper, "Family Size as a Factor in Human Selection" at the Third International Congress of Eugenics. Advisory council, 1923-1935.

He taught anatomy at Washington University from 1908-22. In 1922 he moved to Stanford where taught anatomy from 1922 to 1949. He did a fair amount of work in human genetics, especially with the mechanism of twinning. He served with the U.S. Surgeon General's office as an anthropologist in WW I and helped do measuring of some 104,000 soldiers.

♠ \*Charles B. DAVENPORT (1866-1944) b. Stamford, CT; zoologist, geneticist. Ed. B.S. Brooklyn Polytech, 87; A.B, Harvard, 89, A.M, 90, Ph.D, 92. Member of the original founding committee of the Eugenics Committee, 1921. Vice-Chairman of the Eugenics Committee of the United States, 1923-26. Editorial Committee of the Eugenical News, 1921-1938. Chairman of the AES Committee on Research Problems in Eugenics. AES Board of Directors, 1926-1930; advisory council, 1931-35.

Davenport taught at Harvard between 1888-04. In 1904 he was appointed Director of the Station for Experimental Evolution (1904-34) and Eugenics Record Office (1910-34). He served as the Associate editor of the J. of Experimental Zoology ; J. of Physical Anthropology and Genetics . One of the key figures in American eugenics. Davenport was twice a v.p. of the AAAS, Pres. of the Am. Zool. Soc, Hon. pres of the Eugenics Research Assn. in 1937, pres. of the Galton Society between 1918 and 1930, Pres. of the Int. Fed of Eug. Org. 1927-32, and pres. of the Third International Congress

of Eugenics. He wrote various textbooks on statistical methods and zoology. He also wrote important eugenic texts such as Heredity in Relation to Eugenics (1911).

♠ \*Katherine Bement DAVIS (1860-1935) b. Buffalo, NY; sociologist. Ed. A.B, Vassar, 92; fellow in political economy, U. of Chicago, 97-98, Ph.D, 1900. Advisory council, 1925-35.

An active Republican, she was Director of the N.Y. State Reformatory for Women between 1901 and 1914. She was appointed commissioner of corrections by the Mayor Mitchell of N.Y. in 1914 and chairman of the parole commission in 1915. Between 1918 and 1928 she served as the general secretary of the Bureau of Social Hygiene. As was generally the case with women members of the advisory council, Davis was unmarried and had no children.

She also served as Chairman of the Board of the Home for Unwed Negro Mothers. In 1915 she was selected one of the three most famous American women by the Woman's Board of the Panama-Pacific Exposition. Seven years later a poll sponsored by the League of Women Voters named her one of the twelve greatest living Americans of her sex.

♠ Watson DAVIS (1896-1967) b. WA; editor. Ed. B.S., George Washington U, 18, Civil Engineering, 20. AES Board of Directors, 1940-??.

Chapter Seven  
The Eugenic Hypothesis  
1938-1940

There is good reason to question the notion of a "new eugenics" as presented by Mark Haller and Kenneth Ludmerer. The idea that the old eugenics "collapsed" and a new leadership had "rebuilt" American eugenics is too simplistic and far too extreme. I have traced the development of particular policies with regard to immigration and sterilization within the American Eugenics Society from its earliest days to 1940. Focusing on those two important issues I have shown that there was a good deal more continuity in policy between 1921 and 1940 than is usually supposed in the literature. I have also looked at the society's leadership from 1923 to 1935. It is quite clear that at least up to 1935 there was very little change in the ideology, philosophy, and leadership of the society.

The idea of a "new" eugenics appearing between 1930 and 1940 was not created by Haller and Ludmerer. In the late thirties the AES leadership began to articulate an ideology which they themselves described as new. As we shall see, however, the essentials of the "new" eugenics had clear



roots in the older philosophy and the differences have not yet been clearly articulated.<sup>1</sup>

The notion of a "new" eugenics is not entirely without merit. Important changes occurred between 1930 and 1940. In 1934 Charles Davenport retired as Director of the Carnegie Institution's Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor.<sup>2</sup> Institutional changes as well took place within the AES beginning in the early thirties with the resignations of Davenport, Howe, Campbell, and others. In 1935 major changes in the institutional structure of the Society were inaugurated with the elimination of the advisory council and the reframing of the constitutional structure of the society. At the end of 1938 control of the Eugenical News was transferred from the ERO to the AES.<sup>3</sup> By

<sup>1</sup> What has been referred to in the literature as the "new eugenics" was not articulated until the late 1930s. A self-conscious expression of this newer philosophy of eugenics is not found in the AES papers or its publications until after 1935.

<sup>2</sup> For a full examination of the closing of the Eugenics Record Office see Garland Allen, "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An Essay in Institutional History," Osiris 2nd series, 2: pp. 250-253.

<sup>3</sup> Minutes, 2/9/39. In February 1939 the Board of the American Eugenics Society met to consider policy regarding the Eugenical News. It was agreed "that a severe editorial policy be adopted in publishing Eugenical News and that definite methods of editorial control be adopted." All future material submitted to the Eugenical News was to be subject to review by at least one of the directors of the society, the editorial committee and an outside authority. Scientific material would be stressed, all book reviews would be signed, biographical statements on the contributors be included, and as soon as possible, the society would begin paying for solicited materials.

the end of 1939 Harry Laughlin was retired by the Carnegie Institution from the Eugenics Record Office which was subsequently closed down.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, by 1939 Frederick Osborn's position of leadership within the East Coast eugenics establishment had been consolidated and the center of eugenics activity had clearly transferred from the ERO at Cold Spring Harbor to the AES in New York. Osborn served as one of the Directors of the Society, generally presided at the meetings, and either wrote or supervised the composition of the society's most important platform statements. His 1940 monograph, A Preface to Eugenics, was considered the most important statement on eugenics of the period and still stands as the foundation of the "new" eugenics.

Between 1937 and 1939, the AES was intensely active. Membership nearly doubled during these years and finances were stable.<sup>5</sup> The AES organized eight conferences on eugenics in relationship to recreation, nursing, education, medicine, publicity, birth control, housing, and the church. AES leaders also participated in fourteen other conferences in which eugenics was included as part of the program.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In January 1940 Laughlin returned to Kirksville, Missouri.

<sup>5</sup> Membership was approaching five hundred by 1939. The gross income for 1937-38 was \$7,156. The Society maintained two employees.

<sup>6</sup> Minutes 14th Annual Meeting (16 May 1940) p. 2. Recreation held January 37; Nursing, February 1937;

Thus, the Society was assiduously engaged in defining its goals in relation to other social issues. A close examination of presentations given by the leadership of the AES during this period will illuminate the essentials of the so-called "new" eugenics.<sup>7</sup>

"We are at a major turning point in human biology," Frederick Osborn told his colleagues at the New York Academy of Medicine in April 1939. Speaking at a lecture in honor of Herman Biggs, Osborn told his audience that "European peoples appear headed for a serious decline." Between 1650 and 1930 Europeans achieved a "seven-fold increase" from one hundred million to seven hundred million at a time when the world population increased only four-fold. However, Osborn explained, for the past one hundred years the trend in the west had been towards a decrease in the number of births per married woman. This trend was most marked in Europe. By 1935 England had a net rate of reproduction which was 24 per cent short of replacement; Germany, France, and Sweden had similar rates.<sup>8</sup> By 1932, "for the first time in our history, the women of childbearing age in the United States

---

Education, March 1937; Medicine, April 1937; Publicity, December 1937; Birth Control, January 1938; Housing, April, 1938; The Church, May, 1938.

<sup>7</sup> The material that follows has been taken either from AES pamphlets of the period or from statements by representatives of the Society at AES or other conferences.

<sup>8</sup> Frederick Osborn, "The Significance to Medicine of Present Population Trends," Address before the New York Academy of Medicine, 6 April 1939. p. 5.

were failing to replace their own numbers in the next generation."<sup>9</sup> The problem was even more serious than the gross numbers indicated. While the western world as a whole was losing ground to non-European populations, reproduction within the the U.S. and Europe was from the worst stocks.

More than one-third of the births annually in the U.S. were occurring in families on relief, or with total incomes of less than \$750 per year.<sup>10</sup> Over half of the natural increase was contributed by that third of the population living in the poorest rural areas. In 1930, cities with populations of 25,000 or more inhabitants had an average fertility only 85 per cent of the amount required for replacement. Within each city fertility was highest among the poor, uneducated, and unskilled. "The Nation's new born citizens are somewhat fewer than the number required to maintain a stationary population," said Frank Notestein, a Princeton University demographer, at the AES Conference on Birth Control, "and they are being recruited heavily from

---

<sup>9</sup> Frederick Osborn, "The Significance to Medicine of Present Population Trends," Address before the New York Academy of Medicine, 6 April 1939. See also, P.K. Whelpton, "An Empirical Method of Calculating Future Population," Journal of the American Statistical Association (September 1936) 31 #196, pp. 457-473; Frank Notestein, "Some Implication of Current Demographic Trends for Birth Control and Eugenics," Paper presented at the Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control of the American Eugenics Society (28 January 1938) AES Papers.

<sup>10</sup> Eric M. Matsner, Medical Director of the American Birth Control League "Birth Control: Future Policies as Evidenced by Present Day Trends," Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control (28 January 1938).

... the most impoverished rural areas of the South and West."<sup>11</sup>

Warren Thompson, Director of Scripps Foundation and a member of the AES Board, summed up the problem at the AES Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Housing:

The inverse relation between economic and social status and size of family has been found in practically all studies on this point in the United States of which this writer has knowledge. Unskilled laborers have larger families than skilled workers, and skilled workers have more children than professional and business men.... Since there is good reason to believe that a large part of those who are on the borderline between hereditary normality and abnormality, as well as most of the hereditarily defective, are to be found in the lower income classes... it seems fair to assume that the groups whose reproduction is of least benefit to the community have larger families on the average than those who are of sound stock....<sup>12</sup>

Thompson pointed to Swedish studies which indicated that people adjust the size of their families to the size of available housing. He noted therefore, that public housing can have either a eugenic or dysgenic effect on the population. If, for example, we wish to encourage the professional classes to have larger families the society must insure that adequate housing is available within the

---

<sup>11</sup> Frank W. Notestein, "Some Implications of Current Demographic Trends for Birth Control and Eugenics," Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control of the American Eugenics Society (28 January 1938) p. 2. AES Papers.

<sup>12</sup> Warren Thompson, "Housing and Population" Paper presented at the AES Conference on the Eugenic Aspects of Housing. Town Hall Club, 1 April 1938. AES Papers.

range of the professional classes. Thompson also concluded that housing policy might help reduce the birth rate among certain groups by maintaining high rents. Thompson hinted at a housing policy which would subsidize the middle class and maintain housing pressures on the unemployed and lower working class.<sup>13</sup>

The perceived dysgenic trend presented a clear challenge which the Eugenics Society felt had to be addressed on a number of fronts. Birth control, of course, was desperately needed in the rural South and generally in the lower class neighborhoods so that "genetically inferior persons" would be able to "limit their own fertility."<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, sterilization was "especially important" in connection with groups such as the Jukes, Kallikaks, and

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. Thompson was quite circumspect in his advocacy of this tactic! "I am not saying that it may not be a good thing, under certain circumstances, to seek to reduce the birth rate below maintenance level and that high rents may not be a perfectly proper agency to use to depress the birth rate, but I do maintain that we should know what we are doing and that we should not inadvertently allow a housing program to set up a train of consequences as regards population growth of which we are unaware." After untangling all the negatives and placing the quotation in context, it is clear that Thompson, who was specifically addressing administrators of federal housing projects for the poor, was saying that public housing should not be used to encourage large families among the poor, whom he specifically associates with "hereditary defectives." Rather, public housing ought to be used to encourage large families among the professional classes.

<sup>14</sup> Frank W. Notestein, "Some Implications of Current Demographic Trends for Birth Control and Eugenics," Conference on Eugenics and Birth Control of the American Eugenics Society (January 28, 1938). p. 2. AES Papers.

Nams. These "scattered groups of defective families in rural areas present a special and difficult problem."<sup>15</sup>

There were marked differences in approach to sterilization in this period. Society literature in the 1920s assumed that feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, mental illness, and criminal tendencies were genetic in origin. Eugenic sterilization was seen as a direct method of reducing these genetic disabilities. By 1935 this position was no longer tenable. Advances in the mechanisms of heredity made by T.H. Morgan at Columbia, H.S. Jennings at Johns Hopkins, and others were discrediting the simplistic notions of human heredity propagated by Davenport.

The Society leadership now freely admitted that if these problems did have a genetic element it was probably recessive, and sterilization could not eliminate recessive hereditary defects from a population within any reasonable period of time. Nevertheless, the leadership of the Society still insisted that sterilization could "substantially reduce the proportion of defectives from generation to generation."<sup>16</sup> This reduction would not come about as a result of the decrease of defective genomes; it would result

---

<sup>15</sup> "Practical Eugenics: Aims and and Methods of the American Eugenics Society" (New York 1938) p. 19. AES Pamphlet, AES Papers.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 13. In other words, the "new" approach was to freely admit that there was little certainty with regard to the genetic transmission of human character traits. Sterilization was defended despite these uncertainties.

from a decrease of families incapable of providing an environment suitable for the nurture of normal children. Osborn noted in 1933 that "the relation between genetics and eugenics" had been "over-stressed".<sup>17</sup> Eugenic sterilization could be justified without recourse to genetics.

The AES recommended that sterilization be applied even in cases where "there is no certainty that the traits of the parents will be passed on to their children through heredity." Sterilization was recommended on social rather than specifically eugenic grounds since "mentally deficient or defective parents cannot provide a home environment suitable for rearing children."<sup>18</sup>

The emphasis was placed on the humanitarian character of sterilization. Individuals were "afflicted" with hereditary disorders and sterilization was a medical treatment which people "deserved." Thus, it was stressed that sterilization ought to be "available" to "afflicted" groups just as medical care generally ought to be available to all citizens in need of such care. It should be voluntary as much as possible and should not be imposed on those who oppose it from a religious or ethical standpoint

---

<sup>17</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Memorandum on the Eugenics Situation in the United States," 24 May 1933. AES Papers.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 14.



provided the friends or co-religionists of such people furnish the means of effective segregation at their own expense...<sup>19</sup>

Nevertheless, among those afflicted with defects some were a "menace to society." This group could not be trusted to refrain voluntarily from having children. For them, sterilization was preferable to segregation since most of those sterilized could still lead "normal, useful, self-supporting" lives.

While, the Society praised laws in Nebraska and South Dakota which provided for the registration of the feeble-minded and prohibited the issuance of a marriage license "to any defective" except on proof of previous sterilization.<sup>20</sup> The emphasis in these years was on the legalization of "voluntary sterilization" which was "a natural consequence of the fact that sterilization is not a punishment but a protection." Handicapped people "eagerly sought" sterilization, and most of those in need of sterilization "could not or should not be committed to State institutions for the feeble-minded." Restriction of legal sterilization to such institutions deprives a class of citizens of appropriate health care. "Every State should adopt the necessary legislation, authorizing hospitals supported by taxpayers to accept patients who request to be sterilized." Widespread legalized voluntary sterilization

---

<sup>19</sup> "Practical Eugenics" (New York 1938) p. 14. AES Papers.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

is a "highly valuable protection for people who for any reason ought not to have children."<sup>21</sup>

Throughout the literature of this period one finds sterilization described as a right which should not be denied to those at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder simply because they could not afford it. With proper education and incentive the dysgenic elements of the population would flock to sterilization centers. Thus, what distinguished the old eugenics from the new with regard to sterilization was not so much orientation as emphasis. In the twenties the Society was pushing for the initial passage of eugenic sterilization laws. By the thirties many states already had such laws although few sterilizations were actually being performed. By the late thirties the society still supported eugenic sterilization but also began to stress the benefits of sterilization for the individual sterilized rather than the necessity of sterilization for the society at large. The only thing really new in this position was the emphasis on voluntary sterilization. Studies in the early twenties touted the benefits of sterilization as a cure for masturbation and prostitution.<sup>22</sup> In the twenties, the benefits were mentioned as an

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>22</sup> See, for example, the work of Harry Sharp and Hoyt Pilcher. They claimed that sterilization was of great benefit to the individual. For a review of this literature see Phillip Reilly, "Involuntary Sterilization of Institutionalized Persons in the United States: 1899-1942," M.D., Thesis (Yale 1981).

afterthought. In the thirties, they were given a more prominent position in sterilization advocacy.

It is quite extraordinary that throughout the eugenic literature of the twenties and thirties, one finds almost no recognition that sterilization might be perceived by those sterilized as a violation and a punishment. In fact, until Carrie Buck was interviewed by Gary Robertson, a reporter for the Richmond Times-Dispatch, in February 1980, no one had ever asked the question, "what ever became of the victims of involuntary sterilization?" Carey Buck told Robertson of her life-long desire to have have children. At the age of 76 she still suffered from the injustice done to her. Regarding the sterilization she said, "they done me wrong. They done us all wrong." Another victim described the dissolution of his marriage. His wife "could never accept the fact we couldn't have children."

After 13 years, I'd lost everything I'd worked for. She could just never bring herself to talk to me about her feelings. It was terrible. ... they took alot of my life away from me. Having children is supposed to be a part of the Human race. Sometimes I feel there's a part of me that I'm missing.<sup>23</sup>

It is quite telling about the ethics, not only of the eugenics movement, but more generally of the academic

---

<sup>23</sup> Gary Robertson, "Test Case Figure Back in Public Eye," (27 Feb. 1980) p. 1; Bill Mckelway, "Patient 'Assembly Line' Recalled by Sterilized Man," (24 Feb. 1980) Richmond Times Dispatch. In 1982 CBS aired "Marian Rose White," a T.V. movie based on the true story of a sterilization victim.

establishment, that so little thought has been given to the perspective of the victims of eugenic sterilization.

Osborn believed that Americans would shortly awaken to the reality of population decline. The new eugenics was devised to deal with this "new" reality. In the 1920s there was really no solid evidence of overall population decline in the west. The sophisticated demographic analysis did not come until the early thirties. Nevertheless, as is clear from the pronouncements at the Second International Congress of Eugenics, the leaders of the twenties held very pessimistic views about the future of western civilization. Statements were specifically made with regard to the eventual extinction of the Mayflower stock and the "rising tide of color." The difference between the statements of the twenties and those of the thirties and forties is not in substance. It is rather in tone, language, and emphasis.

Osborn was confident that Americans would awaken to the problem of population decline just as the Europeans had. In fact, in France, Germany, England, and Scandinavia population decline was a major issue and governments all over Europe were taking steps to increase their birth rates in the thirties. Osborn was particularly fearful that Americans might simply demand "large families indiscriminately in order to stem the decline in population."

Before this stage is reached public opinion must be educated to demand that the large families be born to couples with a desirable biological inheritance.<sup>24</sup>

This then was the basic outline of the eugenics situation in the latter half of the 1930s. The perception of an "unparalleled" situation in which the European peoples were in decline, combined with a dysgenic trend in birth ratios, was hardly different from the gloomy fears of Henry Fairfield Osborn and George Vacher de LaPouge nearly two decades earlier. While references to "race suicide" and the "complete destruction of the white race" no longer appeared, the basic elements were substantially the same. The tone of the forties, however, was much more subdued. There was little in the way of hyperbolic pronouncements. Underlying the eugenics of the forties was a faith that, despite gloomy appearances, western civilization would muddle through. In this respect, eugenics of the forties was somewhat more sober than the eugenics of the earlier period. Osborn realized by 1940 that eugenics was not going to sweep the world as a new religion and save civilization. Eugenics might have an influence on housing, medical education, and population policies, but it was not going to play the kind of central role that his uncle Henry Fairfield Osborn had hoped it would.

---

<sup>24</sup> "Practical Eugenics" p. 6.

As early as 1935 and certainly by 1940, Osborn and other leaders of the eugenics movement in America had faced enough defeats and frustrations to realize that eugenics faced powerful and deeply entrenched opposition in American society. In 1926 the AES leadership believed that eugenics would become an integral part of American education, law, health care, and politics. After working closely with Congress on the passage of a eugenically oriented immigration bill the AES leadership believed further advances would be forthcoming, including extension of the immigration quotas to the western hemisphere. The AES legislative program called for numerous legislative initiatives on both the state and federal levels. For example, the society wanted the U.S. census to carefully record peoples ancestry more carefully so that a eugenical record of the entire population could be kept.<sup>25</sup> They failed in this endeavor as they did in numerous other initiatives during the period 1924 to 1935.

Eugenics simply was not an idea that caught people's imaginations. Instead there was stiff resistance to eugenics. Intellectuals and social prophets might see eugenics as the ultimate reform but among the mass of the literate and voting population it simply was too radical.

---

<sup>25</sup> They lobbied for the inclusion on a) the name and racial descent of the father, b) maiden name and racial descent of the mother, and as far as possible, the racial descent of each parent by listing the predominating race of each grandparent. See Minutes, 6/1/29. AES Papers.

It is for this reason that the society was trying to avoid controversy during this period. Osborn believed that eugenics went against an ingrained American individualism. The idea that people are born with innate limitations went against fundamental American beliefs as expressed in the Horatio Alger myth. In America, it was thought, anyone could succeed with a little luck and pluck. It was for this reason that eugenics in the late thirties avoided the issue of race and class and stressed the individual. The society was groping for a eugenic ideology which would be more acceptable to the American people.

The society was particularly interested in expanding its efforts to bring the clergy into the fold. In May 1939 the AES held a conference on eugenics in relation to the church. The conference was attended by over 135 religious leaders as well as numerous leaders of eugenics, birth control, and philanthropy. It was clearly recognized that one of the staunchest bastions of opposition to eugenics was from conservative religious leaders of all stripes. Eugenics clearly did not go over well among rural Baptists and urban Catholics. A particular effort was made to bring leaders of these groups into the society and thus reduce the tensions between eugenics and the church.

On numerous occasions in these years society literature disavowed the overt racism of a few years earlier. The official position of the society was that all racial and

social groups were of value and that genetic differences between such groups were small compared to difference within each group. Therefore the society believed that a eugenic policy must aim at all sectors of American society, not at one group. The emphasis was constantly placed on the fact that talent was distributed throughout the population. It was a serious mistake of the earlier eugenicists to label whole groups as inferior. While the literature still refers to "inferior stocks" these were identified only as a generic category. This was somewhat ingenuous since the degenerates referred to were still within the usual groups. Thus, for example, the society still fought vigorously against Mexican immigration and still regarded degeneracy as being more frequent among the poor.

In fact, the racism of the eugenicists was only thinly veiled beneath the surface. Nowhere in the literature was there a concern for the declining Negro population, nowhere was concern expressed over the three centuries of differential fertility in which the European populations were growing at a rate nearly twice that of non-white peoples. On the contrary the rapid expanse of the European population throughout the world and the expansion of European imperialism was consistently regarded as part of the progressive advance of humanity. The "problem" of "differential fertility" was a code for the decline of white, Northern European stock.



The early signs that European population growth had come to an end was the focus of eugenicists' fears. Concern was expressed over the "differential fertility" of the rapidly growing Indian and Mexican populations in the United States. There were only a few hundred thousand native Americans left in the United States after nearly three centuries of population decline. One would expect a eugenicist who truly believed that there were valuable qualities in all races to welcome the renewed vigor of Indian and Mexican populations. On the contrary, Osborn saw only problems in the differential growth of Indian populations. While society literature was ostensibly color-blind in these years, it repeatedly expressed concern over the differential fertility among the "genetically inferior" populations of the rural south and west. The "genetically inferior" populations in question were predominantly black, Indian, and Mexican.

It is clear that Frederick Osborn fervently believed that eugenics had developed an entirely new outlook by the late thirties. During the discussion period following the presentation of papers at the Conference on Eugenics in Relation to the Church, Frederick Osborn burst into an uncharacteristic polemic. He was "more bitterly discouraged" than he had ever been in his career in eugenics. He found that the keynote speeches contained nothing "that might not have been written, or said, 20 years ago." Yet since that time, "the whole movement of eugenics

has changed." The "whole emphasis of eugenics today" is on "an unexpected and unparalleled situation" confronting "this vaunted civilization of ours." Our best and finest families are "25 to 50 per cent short of having enough children to replace themselves in another generation." Osborn had hoped that the religious leaders invited to present papers would have spoken to the problem of disintegrating family values among our best stocks. Instead they all tended to focus on sterilization and the ethical issues around negative eugenic efforts. Osborn ended with an apology. Obviously he had been shaken. He said he was embarrassed and had not intended to make such a speech, but "If the Churches cannot teach us the true value of life... where are we going to learn this lesson?"<sup>26</sup>

Despite Osborn's clear sense that he was speaking for a "new" eugenics, his speech carried both the intensity, emotional tone, and ideology of the earlier eugenics. In 1921, according to George Vacher de Lapouge, the human race "was facing a swift descent in the scale of civilization, because the better strains were losing ground."<sup>27</sup> According to Lapouge the world was suffering from a shortage of "minds

---

<sup>26</sup> F. Osborn, "Round Table Discussion at the Conference on the Relation of Eugenics to the Church," 8 May 1939. AES Papers.

<sup>27</sup> G.V. Lapouge, "La race chez les populations mélangées," Eugenics in Race and State II (Baltimore 1923) p. 1. A transcript of the speech in English can be found in the New York Times 9/28/21 p. 11.

big enough to deal with its problems." The poorer races and classes were threatening the more advanced and there was little hope for the future unless action were drastic and immediate. There is hardly any difference here in tone and emphasis. Osborn's call for more babies and bigger families among the better stock was as old as the eugenics movement itself.

What Osborn himself considered new in American eugenics relied heavily on European models. There were in Europe two models of interest to Americans. The first was that of the totalitarian states of Italy and Germany. The Germans had developed a eugenics program fit for a totalitarian society and both the Germans and Italians had developed policies to encourage population growth. While there was initial interest and enthusiasm in Nazi and fascist programs, by 1938 one begins to see open criticism of "totalitarian" eugenic policies published in the Eugenical News.<sup>28</sup> These programs were now criticized as unworkable. A successful eugenics program was as only possible within a democratic society. Sweden, on the other hand, presented a model of eugenic policies for "democratic" societies.

It is not difficult to understand why this change in attitude should have occurred between 1938 and 1940. As late as 1937, Osborn and the Society were praising the Nazi

---

<sup>28</sup> At the time the official publication of the American Eugenics Society.

eugenics programs. The later critiques were not aimed so much at specifics of the Nazi program as at the idea of eugenics within a totalitarian society. In fact, criticism of Italy and Germany were lumped together despite very large differences between the two countries with regard to their eugenics programs. Americans had initially responded benignly to European fascism. It was only in the late thirties that antagonisms arose. The Eugenics Society was particularly sensitive to these criticisms in this period precisely because it was striving for acceptance. Furthermore, only by the late thirties were there actually two "models" of eugenic programs developing in Europe. The Americans were looking to Europe for leadership and they found it in the Swedish program.

The main elements of the Swedish eugenics program aimed at encouraging larger families through state subsidies for housing, free school lunch programs, a nationwide system of nurseries, and maternal care and other social welfare benefits. The American leaders believed even more could be done with nationally subsidized recreation and health care, salary scales based on size of family, and a tax system which favored the large family over the small. The idea was to tax the bachelor to pay for the large family and to tax the wealthier sectors to aid the poorly paid professional classes and other eugenic elements in the society. Social welfare benefits had to be targeted at those who ought to have large families. As the Eugenics Society saw it, the

contemporary trend was to tax the eugenic elements to pay for the care of the dysgenic elements, and this was a trend that had to be reversed.<sup>29</sup>

The American leaders took pains to introduce the Swedish program to Americans, to follow its progress, and to report the results of demographic studies which showed its success. The "new" eugenics was based on a belief that by creating a model welfare state the dysgenic trend would be reversed. Osborn dubbed this new view the "eugenic hypothesis." Stated simply, the hypothesis was that within a free society with a combination of widespread social welfare and universally available birth control of all types a eugenic trend in births would naturally ensue. The "eugenic hypothesis" included the acceptance of compulsory sterilization for those elements of the population which were a "menace" but focused on the broad main body of the population, claiming that sterilization was only a minor aspect of eugenic policy.

There was very little solid evidence for the "hypothesis" and Osborn himself admitted that it was only a "hypothesis." It served, however, as a method of leading eugenics out of the mire of criticism that had grown up around the movement. The new face of eugenics was positive,

---

<sup>29</sup> See Greta Jones, "Eugenics and Social Policy Between the Wars," The Historical Journal 25 #3 (1982) pp. 717-728 for a discussion of the English Eugenics Society's view of family allowance which is a similiar issue.

optimistic, and as Ludmerer stated, "in tune to a changed America."<sup>30</sup>

In a democratic society the eugenics program would run without coercion. A eugenic trend in births would be the natural result of conditions which stressed family values and aided those who wished to have large families. "Except in cases of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency" should attempt to "define the 'fit' or the 'unfit,' nor would any arbitrary power determine who should have children."<sup>31</sup> This was the major problem with the older eugenics programs and with eugenics programs in totalitarian societies. The eugenic hypothesis was a sort of religious faith that the best will out without strict control.

In January 1939 Frederick Osborn published a short article on the "Social Implications of the Eugenic Program," in Child Study.<sup>32</sup> Osborn began by stating that "today the women of child bearing age in the United States are not having enough children to replace their own numbers." "It is evident," Osborn observed that we need both more births and "a more eugenic distribution of births." Osborn stressed that such a program must be based on individual differences.

---

<sup>30</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174.

<sup>31</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Social Implications of the Eugenic Program," Child Study (January 1939) p. 96.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., pp. 95-97.

A eugenic program based on social class, economic or racial distinctions would be contrary to the scientific knowledge now available.

The differences in average heredity between racial and class groups in the United States are small compared to the individual differences in hereditary capacity within each group. "Eugenics should therefore be concerned with individual differences."

The first step to an effective eugenics program was to further equalize the freedom of all parents to have as few or as many children as they would like. We must increase the availability of contraception and reduce the economic handicaps to raising children, Osborn noted. "Measures for reducing the cost of children may be eugenic or dysgenic, depending on how they are applied."

In Sweden, Osborn went on, eugenic programs take the form of free services and subsidized rent payments. In Germany and Italy they take the form of cash payments. In these latter countries population policies were adopted in 1934 that aimed chiefly at increasing the number of children, and the bonuses were distributed without regard to quality.<sup>33</sup> The Swedish program, on the other hand, was

---

<sup>33</sup> This is clearly a distortion of the German marriage loan program. There were strict guidelines under the Nazi program defining those who could qualify for the loans. Osborn was well acquainted with the program which he praised just two years earlier. Its not clear why he distorts it here.

framed "with the hope that they would appeal to the more responsible type of parents." In Sweden there were subsidies for housing, extensive day nurseries, and free public education supplemented by free meals in the schools.

Osborn pointed to recent studies in Stockholm which showed "that the upper professional and business executive groups are having more children than those in the lower economic groups, the skilled laborers more children than the unskilled laborers." This was the reverse of trends that existed in the U.S. and was evidence when birth control is universally available "size of family tends to vary to some extent directly instead of inversely both with income and with the proven abilities of the parents.

There are "powerful dysgenic factors" at work in American society making for a "disproportionate population increase in people with below-the-average hereditary capacities." Conditions must be established for "a natural and unconscious process" favoring "those genetic types capable of developing their own culture to its highest point."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Osborn, "Social Implications," Child Study (January 1939) p. 96.



Except in the case of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency would attempt to define the "fit" or the "unfit," nor would any arbitrary power determine who should and who should not have children. Eugenic efforts would be directed to the creation of environmental conditions under which parents would tend to have children in proportion to their mental and physical health...<sup>35</sup>

Thus, the question of values, which had plagued the eugenics movement, had to give way to a simpler formula of improving the environment for all individuals. However, the dysgenic effects of unequal availability of birth control and the economic hardships of raising large families had to be reversed before attempts to improve the environment generally would be successful. That is, once the conditions for a more eugenic distribution of births was in place, then a general effort at raising the social welfare of all classes would be successful. But in absence of a eugenic distribution of births American society might well "fail to produce" enough people able to take advantage of the improved environment. In that case we would end up subsidizing the prevailing dysgenic trend.<sup>36</sup>

This then was the new eugenics that emerged between 1935 and 1940. There were, of course, other elements which have not been discussed here. By 1940 eugenics was already taking a back seat to the birth control and population

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

control movements.<sup>37</sup> The AES began to focus its activities on holding conferences to bring experts from various fields together and to insert eugenic concerns into a wide variety of social movements. It began a concerted effort to encourage the teaching of genetics in medical schools and the establishment of genetic counselling clinics. The war, of course, interrupted this trend, but by 1945 the new direction for the American Eugenics Society was already set. So was the stage for the resurgence of eugenics. As early as the 1960s voices could already be heard questioning the accuracy of the "eugenic hypothesis." What after all must one conclude if in fact the dysgenic trend in population were not reversed by the "new eugenic" approach.

---

<sup>37</sup> Garland Allen, "The Work of Raymond Pearl: From Eugenics to Population Control," Science for the People (July-August 1980) pp. 22-28.

## Chapter Eight

### Conclusion

American, German, English, and Scandinavian eugenics all contained unique elements. The English eugenics movement was molded by Francis Galton and Karl Pearson; in America it was Charles Davenport; in Norway Jon Alfred Mjoen was inspired by the German race hygiene movement founded by Alfred Ploetz. These important first generation advocates of eugenics did not always share common political and social views, and they interpreted eugenics in their own idiosyncratic ways. Likewise, later generations of eugenic leaders came from widely diverse political perspectives, and in each case local conditions molded the national eugenics movements in different countries, but a core of values remained constant.

At the heart of eugenics was the belief that the human species could be perfected by science - science raised to an ethic. With the aid of science tests could be devised to identify the weak minded, the physically unfit, the morally corrupt. With the aid of science society could be improved though the improvement of the stock itself. The germ plasm of the nation could be purified and uplifted. It all came down to inhibiting the reproduction of inferior grades of

humanity and encouraging reproduction among the "better stocks."<sup>1</sup>

There were many views on how to control the direction of human evolution. The focus of this study has been on the development of such views in America between 1921 and 1940. The evolution and growth of American eugenics in these years was complex. Although there were dramatic occurrences - the great successes between 1924 and 1927, the many defeats later, the resignation of staunch supporters, the rise of new leaders - there was no dramatic change at any time during this period from an "old" eugenics to a "new" eugenics.

Naturally the movement changed over time, but in the end the goal was still to identify the inferior individuals and encourage the breeding of the better stocks. In the end the American Eugenics Society still favored sterilization, anti-miscegenation legislation, and strict immigration control. In the end its leaders still maintained the inferiority of Negroes, Indians, and Mexicans. They admitted that there was no way of knowing to what extent this inferiority was rooted in the genome, although they suspected it was considerable. In the end, the ideology remained remarkably intact.

This thesis highlights the continuity in both policy and ideology of the American Eugenics Society. The outlines

---

<sup>1</sup> This has not been established for Latin America.

of the ideological orientation of the AES were first presented by the keynote speakers at the Second International Congress of Eugenics. Those speakers - British, American, French, and Scandinavian - articulated a vision of a eugenic society which they hoped would emerge out of what they perceived to be the rapidly declining and troubled societies of the West. They recommended sweeping eugenic reforms to encourage the increase of the better stocks. They warned of the dangers of the dysgenic trend which prevailed world-wide and of the need to reverse that trend.

Eugenicists advocacy of immigration restriction, anti-miscegenation, and eugenic sterilization remained remarkably constant even as the rationale for these positions was adjusted to suit changed social conditions and more sophisticated genetics. Thus, the belief in "inferiority" of identifiable sub-populations remained constant even if sophisticated readers of the genetics literature realized that the "genetic" component of "inferiority" could not be positively identified. Where the genetic arguments began to falter, sociological arguments could be brought in to bolster the case. The demographic trend was clear. The unemployed had larger families than the employed, the working class had larger families than the professional classes, and in general there was a reverse correlation between social status and family size. Furthermore, the historic advance of Northern European peoples had come to an

end. For the future, the demographic evidence pointed to a diminishing white population. The conviction that this pattern represented a dysgenic trend was never doubted.

Policy with regard to immigration and sterilization remained constant even if some particulars might have changed. After 1924 one would expect interest in southern and eastern Europeans to decline. The eugenicists had won that battle. Furthermore, the eastern European immigrants were rapidly assimilating into American society with none of the dire consequences envisioned by Madison Grant and Henry Fairfield Osborn. The eugenicists naturally turned their attention to the newly perceived threats from Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean.

There was very little change in basic ideology in the society's leadership in these years. From Henry Fairfield Osborn to Frederick Osborn and from Madison Grant to Warren Thompson the ideology and philosophy remained stable. Henry Fairfield Osborn and Madison Grant were antisemites and overt racists. Frederick Osborn and Warren Thompson did not see themselves as racists, but how shall we judge their horror at the declining birth rate of Northern Europeans? How shall we judge their concern over the increasing population of Mexicans, Native Americans, and Blacks? In these matters Henry Fairfield Osborn, Madison Grant, Frederick Osborn, and Warren Thompson agreed.

In 1935 there was a significant change in the organization of the Society with the dissolution of the advisory council, but this organizational change had little immediate impact on the society's ideology. What emerged by 1940 as the "new eugenics" was an evolution of earlier positions. In many ways these positions were simply restatements of earlier positions in more contemporary language.

For example, a key element in the society's "new eugenics" was the belief that the focus of a democratic eugenic program ought to be on the majority of the population falling within the normal ranges of ability, not on the ten percent of the population that was degenerate in one way or other. There was really nothing new about this.<sup>2</sup> Eugenics advocates had been seesawing back and forth between an emphasis on positive and negative eugenics since its earliest inception. Furthermore, the advocates of eugenics at the Second International Congress of Eugenics clearly hoped that eugenics would permeate every aspect of social organization. Thus, they too, believed that eugenics had to focus on the majority of the society to be effective.

The idea of a "democratic eugenics" actually developed out of this broad focus. In democratic societies eugenics program had to be part of the fabric of the society and

---

<sup>2</sup> Galton stressed the extremes, but the AES leadership clearly recognized the importance of reaching the whole population.

permeate its social welfare programs in such way as to naturally encourage a eugenic distribution of births. "Except in cases of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency" would attempt to "define the 'fit' or the 'unfit,' nor would any arbitrary power determine who should have children."<sup>3</sup>

The leaders at the Second International Congress of Eugenics had articulated the essentials of this ideology when they expressed the hope that eugenics would eventually become an internalized ideal by which young people would, naturally and without coercion, take eugenics into account in selecting mates. While the speakers at the Congress in 1921 emphasized the need for immediate action to "stem the tide of racial degeneracy," they did not think that emergency efforts were all that was needed. They were consciously trying to spur society to action but their long range vision for a eugenic future were much the same in 1921 as in 1940.

Following their lead, the AES programs called for a eugenic approach to legislation, education, research, propaganda, and theology. The leaders of the AES did not simply call for specific legislation, they hoped eugenics would influence all legislative proceedings. The leaders of

---

<sup>3</sup> Frederick Osborn, "Social Implications of the Eugenic Program," Child Study (January 1939) p. 96. It is worth noting that this exception included several million individuals.



the AES believed that tax law might be just as important as sterilization in the effort to affect society. In the twenties the society was fighting important battles which called for immediate action, but by the 30s other items on the agenda were ready for more focused action.

Another focus of the mid-thirties was the "discovery" that the West was facing the dual problem of declining birth rates and a dysgenic trend in births. This too, was clearly present in the earlier period. In fact, the statements of the early twenties and mid-thirties share so much in common that it is hard to understand why this was considered a "new" aspect of eugenics by leader of the AES in the thirties. Even the cry that these problems were new and unprecedented paralleled earlier statements.<sup>4</sup>

American eugenicists viewed Europe as being a few years ahead of America both in the emergence of demographic trends and in the development of policies to deal with these problems. America might have been a leader in establishing eugenic sterilization, but European ideologists were important in framing American perspectives. American eugenics leaders looked to Europe for ideological leadership and imported a good deal of European ideology. Madison Grant's writings were very popular in the United States, but

---

<sup>4</sup> The leaders of the thirties may have believed that earlier predictions of doom were not based on sound evidence. By 1935 Frederick Osborn could point to demographic studies which confirmed their fears.

his ideas were distinctly European. His work synthesized the European race ideology of De Gobineau, Chamberlain, and Hans Günther, just as the earlier work of William Z. Ripley was a synthesis of European ideas on race.

In the late 1930s Americans began to distinguish between two European models for eugenic policies. The first was that of the totalitarian states of Italy and Germany. The second was the "democratic" model of Sweden. At the heart of the new model which Sweden presented was the idea that in a democratic society the dysgenic trend could be reversed naturally as social welfare programs and wide spread free access to birth control became available. Hidden within this model were social policies aimed at increasing the economic burden on elements of the community considered dysgenic. This model was not new but the demographic evidence of its success was quite important.

The main thrust of the Swedish eugenics program was to encourage larger families through state subsidies for housing, free school lunch programs, and a nationwide system of nurseries and maternal care. The American leaders believed even more could be done with nationally subsidized recreation and health care, salary scales based on size of family, and a tax system which would favor the large family over the small.

It was natural to find eugenics reflecting the national values of the society in which it developed. In each

country there was a wide array of opinion on eugenic matters and those leaders who were closest to the main stream of political power would naturally rise to leadership positions. While American eugenicists clearly had praise for the Nazi sterilization law, they believed that the eugenics program developing in Germany was unsuited to America. Sweden, on the other hand, was a democratic state. The model of eugenics it presented was attractive because it allowed American eugenicists to ride with the social-political tide rather than against it. That, in fact, is exactly what eugenicists in Germany did in the 30s. They adapted themselves to their political reality. In this sense Kenneth Ludmerer is right in saying that American eugenicists "propounded a new eugenics creed which was both scientifically and philosophically attuned to a changed America."<sup>5</sup>

This, however, did not mean that American eugenics advocates abandoned their positions on immigration, miscegenation, and sterilization. They still believed that a tenth of the population required negative eugenics measures, including coercive sterilization. In fact, the American eugenicists of the mid-thirties stressed the need for much wider use of sterilization. They wanted sterilization to be freely available to the entire population. Sterilization was described as a privilege and

---

<sup>5</sup> Kenneth Ludmerer, Genetics and American Society (Baltimore 1972) p. 174.

a right which should not be denied to those at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder simply because they could not afford it. It was also mandated for those "dangerous" elements of society that needed to be prevented from procreating.

Society leaders advocated integrating eugenics with current social and political concerns. During the anti-foreign hysteria of the post-war period (1919-1924) eugenicists led the immigration restriction movement. In a later period of social welfare experimentation, eugenicists pondered ways of integrating eugenics into the social welfare state. After the revelations of the Holocaust, eugenics leaders withdrew from the public arena. The time was not right for aggressive propaganda or legislative campaigns. It is not surprising that a movement with such broad support should continue to exercise influence over American social development from the 1940s to the present.

Eugenics was a movement of international dimensions in the twenties and thirties and in America it was advocated by some of our leading scholars, scientists, politicians, and clergymen. We should not be surprised at its continued vigor. A movement of this diversity and strength is quite likely to resurface as social conditions allow.

Davis was primarily a science writer and editor. Between 1920 and 1922, he was the science editor for the Washington Herald. In 1921 he became news editor for the Science Service, an organization established for the popularization of science. A decade later he was appointed director of the Science News Service and spent the rest of his life in the field of popular science writing. He wrote such books as, The Story of Copper (1924), Science Today (1931), and The Advance of Science (1934).

♣ George Denny (1899-1959) b. Washington, NC; educational broadcaster. Ed. B.S., U.N.C. AES Board of Directors, 1940-??.

Denny taught acting and directing at a number of schools including Columbia University, 1928-30. He was president of the Town Hall Club and organized and moderated America's Town Meeting on the Air, 1935-52. He also wrote numerous magazine articles and edited a book, Faith for Today.

♣ \*Robert Latou DICKINSON, (1861-1950) b. Jersey City, NJ; gynecologist. His Family came to the colonies from England in 1634. Ed. Poly. Inst. Brooklyn, nd, M.D., Long Island College Hospital, 1882; studied in Switzerland and Germany. Dickenson was quite active in the eugenics cause. Served on the AES Committee on the Eugenic & Dysgenic Effects of Birth Control. He was also a member of Planned Parenthood, and

pres. of the Am. Euthanasia Society (1946-1949). Advisory council, 1925-35.

Dickinson was perhaps the most eminent American gynecologist of his day. He developed several new surgical techniques including the use of electrical cauterization for sterilizations. He was co-editor of the American Textbook of Obstetrics (1895). He was an active member of the AMA and a founder of the Am. College of Surgeons in 1913.

Unlike most of his contemporaries, Dickinson strongly supported a number of feminist causes, including dress reform and contraception, and was among the most progressive male allies of the feminist movement. Dickinson was the single most important physician associated with the birth-control movement. In 1923 he founded the Committee on Maternal Health (which in 1930 became the National Committee) to gather data on contraception.

From 1890 onward, he fought against the cultural taboos that inhibited women's erotic lives, including the notion that sexual urges were shameful and the condemnation of autoeroticism as unnatural and unhealthy. Convinced by his experience as a practicing gynecologist that women were frequently the victims of sexual maladjustments deriving from ignorance and superstition, he early advocated a scientific program of sex education.

Throughout the 1930s he fought to persuade M. Sanger to allow doctors to play a more active role in her N.Y. clinics. Dickinson did much to secure medical support for contraception with his books, Control of Conception (1931, second edition, 1938) and Techniques of Conception Control (w/ W.E. Morris, 1941). He was also author of Palisades Interstate Park (1921) and the New York Walk Book (1923). He was a naturalist, popular writer, and political activist.

♣ \*Oscar DOWLING (1886-1931) b. Montgomery, AL; physician. Ed. M.D. Vanderbilt U. 1888. Post-graduate work in London, Berlin, Paris, and Mexico City. Advisory council, 1923.

Physician from New Orleans and member of the Louisiana State Board of Health in 1906. He served as pres. in 1910, 12 and 16. He toured the state with special exhibits on public health and inspected local water and food supplies. His propaganda activities for public health drew invitations to speak in many parts of the country and he was well known as an important pioneer in public health work.

He served as pres. of the Tri-state Medical Assn. in 1905-06, pres. of the Louisiana State Medical Society in 1907, and a trustee of the Southern Medical Assn. founder and editor of the Journal of Southern Medical Association, his reputation clearly extended beyond the South. He was director of the Am. Public Health Assn. and v.p. of the Southern Sociological Congress. Besides these professional connections he served as director of the State Chamber of

Commerce; member of the State Fair Commission and director of the Southern Commercial Congress.

♣ \*Knight DUNLAP (1875-1949) b. Diamond Spring, CA; psychologist. Ed. Ph.B., U. of Calif., 99; A.M., Harvard, 01; Ph.D., 03. Advisory council, 1923.

Dunlap was particularly interested in functional neuroses and later social psychology and cultural anthropology. He was the author of a number of standard works including A System of Psychology (1912); An Outline of Psychology (1914), and Elements of Scientific Psychology (1922 & 1936). His interest in eugenics found expression in Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment (1920).

He was the managing editor of the Journal of Comparative Psychology, editor of Psychology Classics, Comparative Psychology Monographs, and the J. of Psychobiology, of which he was a founder.

In 1917 he took charge of the Air Force testing of pilots. Later he worked for the Chemical Warfare Service developing and testing the visual range of gas masks. He was chairman of the division of Anthropology and Psychology of the NRC during 1927-29; a fellow of the AAAS; pres. of the APA (1922) and pres. of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (1920).



♣ \*Edward Murray EAST (1875-1938) b. Du Quoin, IL; biologist and plant geneticist. Ed. B.S., Illinois, 00; M.S., 04; Ph.D., 07. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Bussey Institution biologist and plant geneticist. He was Chairman of the Agricultural and Botanical Committees of the NRC during 1917-19. He was acting chief of the statistical division of the U.S. Food Administration in 1918.

In 1925 he conducted a round table on population problems at the Institute of Politics in Williamstown, Mass. In 1928 he was in Paris as a member of the International Committee of Fifteen who organized the International Union for the Scientific investigation of population problems.

East had a tremendous impact on Am. agriculture through his work on maize genetics. He developed numerous strains of corn which were widely used in America. His techniques were widely copied.

In Inbreeding and Outbreeding (1919) written with Donald F. Jones, East looked at the genetical problems involved in eradicating defect from the germ plasm. East defined the problem less as of preventing the multiplication of individuals who carry the defect as preventing the breeding of normal individuals carrying but not showing the defect.

East wrote for American and English popular magazines on issues relating to biology, genetics, and population growth and control. He also published a number of eugenically oriented books including: Mankind at the Crossroads (1923) and Heredity and Human Affairs (1927). He edited Heredity and Human Affairs (1931), which was selected by the Am. Library Assn. as one of the fifty outstanding books of the year. He was on the editorial board of Genetics from 1916 to his death.

He was the v.p. of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, pres. of the Am. Society of Naturalists (1919), and the Genetics Society of America (1937). In 1927 he signed a "Memorial on Immigration" delivered to the President and Congress urging restriction of "non-whites" from North and South America.

♣ \*Charles William ELIOT (1834-1926) b. Boston, MA; educator, chemist, and mathematician. Ed. A.B., Harvard, 53; A.M. 56; LL.D., 09. Advisory council, 1923-26.

Eliot was the oldest member of the advisory council at 89 when he joined the group in 1923. He died in 1926 and it is not clear how active he was in his last years. Nevertheless, Eliot's name lent great prestige to the advisory council since he was the dean of American educators.

Eliot was pres. of Harvard from 1869 to 1909, a Trustee of the Carnegie Foundation of New York (1906-09), a member of the General Education Board, 08-17; Rockefeller Foundation, 14-17, and the International Health Board. He was a key figure in the Eastern educational establishment.

♠ \*Haven EMERSON (1874-1957) b. N.Y.C., NY; physician. Ed. A.B., Harvard, 96; A.M., M.D., Columbia, 99. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Prominent physician in New York public health movement. Emerson wrote an article in 1908 on "Carious Teeth in the Tenement Population of New York" which demonstrated his concern with public health. In 1914 Sigismund Goldwater, N.Y. City Commissioner of Health, appointed him Sanitary Superintendent and Assistant Commissioner.

During Goldwater's tenure the entire city Health Code was revised, the department reorganized, and many reforms instituted. Emerson became commissioner in November 1915. A Democratic party victory in November 1917 resulted in his dismissal, closing an era in which New York City led the nation in public health.

He was chairman of the Committee on Control of Communicable Diseases of the Am. Public Health Assn. and was largely responsible for the publication, Control of Communicable Diseases in Man (1917). This report went through seven editions by 1950 and was translated into a

dozen languages. He directed the Cleveland Hospital and Health Survey in 1922 - the first of over twenty surveys he conducted. In 1922 he became professor of public health and director of the Delamar Institute of Public Health which later became the Columbia School of Public Health.

♠ \*Arthur H. ESTABROOK (1895-??) b. Leicester, MA; biologist, eugenicist. Ed. A.B., Clark, 05; A.M., 06, fellow, 06-07; Ph.D., Hopkins, 10. Estabrook was an investigator with the ERO at Cold Spring Harbor. Advisory council, 1923-35.

He was a special investigator for the Indiana State Commission on Mental Defectives, 1916-18; Captain of the U.S. Sanitary Corp, 1918-20 (psychological division); and pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. in 1925-26. Estabrook was a Republican and Presbyterian.

Author of The Nam Family (1912), The Jukes in 1915 (1916), the Tribe of Ishmael of Indiana (1916-17), and Mongrel Virginians (w/ I.E. McDougale, 1926). He also wrote assorted popular articles and pamphlets.

♠ \*David (Grandison) FAIRCHILD (1869-1954) b. Lansing, MI; botanist. Ed. B.S., Kansas College, 88; M.S., 93; Naples Zool. Sta., 93; Breslau and Berlin, 94; Bonn., 95; Buitenzorg Bot. Gardens, 96; Ph.D. Oberlin, 16. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Fairchild was the son-in-law of Alexander Graham Bell. He served as Director of the Department of Agriculture from 1906 to 1928. His books were widely read. His best known work was The World Was My Garden (1938).

The project for which he is probably best known nationally and internationally is the Fairchild Tropical Garden outside Miami. The garden was dedicated in 1938 and was considered one of the finest in the world and the largest in the United States. Fairchild won many high honors and medals. In 1952 he was named to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, an annual award to the region's man or woman of the year.

He was a member of the National Geographic Board of Directors, pres. of the Am. Genetic Assn., and Chairman of the U. of Miami Board of Regents.

♣ \*Henry Pratt FAIRCHILD (1880-1956) b. Dundee, IL; sociologist. Ed. A.B., Doane College, 00; Ph.D., Yale, 09. His first paternal American ancestor was Thomas Fairchild who came to this country from England in 1638. Advisory council, 1923-27; v.p., 1928; pres. between 1929-31. B.O.D., 1932-40.

Sociologist at Yale and NYU. Fairchild served on the State Commission on Child Welfare, Educational Director of the University Settlement in N.Y.C., investigator for the

NRC, and special immigration agent for the U.S. Department of Labor in 1923.

Fairchild believed effective eugenics and population control policies essential for world peace. He was author of over a dozen books including Immigration (1913), The Melting Pot Mistake (1925), People: The Quality and Quantity of Population (1939), and Race and Nationality as a Factor in American Life (1947). He also wrote a number of standard textbooks in sociology, including: Outline of Applied Sociology (1916), Elements of Social Science (1924), General Sociology (1934), and he edited the Dictionary of Sociology (1944).

Fairchild was pres. of the Eastern Sociology Conference, the People's League for Economic Security, and v.p. of Planned Parenthood (1939-1948). He was pres. of the Am. Sociological Society (1936). Fairchild was a charter member of the AES and served as its first Secretary-Treasurer in 1926. He was an articulate proponent of the sociological dimensions of eugenics. He chaired the AES Committee on Cooperation with Social Workers in 1926 and was particularly active in the anti-immigration efforts of the society. In 1927 he attended the World Population Conference in Geneva, presenting a paper entitled, "Optimum Population." He helped found the Population Assn. of America in June 1931 and served as the organization's first pres.

♣ \*Livingston FARRAND (1867-1939) b. Newark, NJ; psychologist, anthropologist, pres. of Cornell University (1921-1937). Ed. A.B., Princeton, 88; M.D., Columbia, 91; Cambridge, 91-2; Berlin, 92-3. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Farrand taught physiological psychology and anthropology. He led a number of expeditions for the Am. Museum of Natural History to study American Indians. He was the Executive Secretary of the National Assn. for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis and during 1912-14 he was editor of the American Journal of Public Health.

He became pres. of the University of Colorado in 1914 and helped establish the medical school there. He left for France in 1917 to serve as director of the anti-tuberculosis commission of the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. He resigned from the University of Colorado to become chairman of the central committee of the International Red Cross in 1919. In 1921 he resigned from the Red Cross to become pres. of Cornell University.

His activities as pres. of Cornell did not keep him from his public health work. He was associated with Thomas Parran Jr., surgeon general of the U.S., in making a special survey of public health schools in New York State. Between 1930-32 he was chairman of a commission to review public health legislation in the state making important recommendations to then governor Franklin D. Roosevelt. He

was chairman of the State Charities Aid Assn. bond drive for 1936.

He was a member of the Milbank Memorial Fund from 1922 and he was its chairman and a trustee after he left Cornell. At the same time he was technical advisor to the Department of Health of the City of New York and was active in the direction of the city's neighborhood health development.

He was trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from 1929 to his death, a trustee of the Am. Museum of Natural History, and author of Basis of American History (1904). From 1933 to his death he was chairman of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars. He was pres. of the National Tuberculosis Assn. 1923-24.

♣ \*Dr. Walter Elmer FERNALD (1859-1924) b. Kittery, ME; psychiatrist; Psychiatric social worker. Ed. M.D., Medical School of Me. Advisory council, 1923.

Fernald was a pioneer in the care of feeble-minded children. At a time when care of the feeble-minded was primarily custodial, Fernald developed the concept of training them to fit into the community. This attitude was revolutionary and Fernald had major impact on institutional care. Fernald was the superintendent of the Massachusetts School for the Feeble-minded from 1887 to his death, when the school was re-named the Walter E. Fernald State School.



He served as pres. of the Am. Assn. for the Study of the Feeble-minded in 1894 and 1924. In his 1924 presidential address he reviewed the previous thirty years of progress in the care of the feeble-minded. In 1893 there were nineteen state institutions with six thousand patients with virtually no extra-institutional care and only nine private institutions. By 1923 there were fifty-one state institutions and eighty-nine private institutions. Furthermore, by 1923 there were special classes for the feeble-minded in 171 cities.

Fernald lobbied for the passage of a law in Massachusetts to test every child more than three years retarded, and he organized a clinic to train physicians as competent psychiatrists. He advocated a comprehensive program which included a systematic survey of the state to create a "register" of the mentally defective. He wanted legal provision for the institutionalization of defectives and comprehensive extra-institutional supervision which would constitute a "permanent parole" of defectives. He was an avid follower of the "special class" movement in England, Germany, and Scandinavia. Finally, Fernald fought for mental testing of "persons accused of crime and of all inmates of penal institutions" and long-term segregation of delinquents in special institutions.

♣ \*Irving FISHER (1867-1947) b. Saugerties, NY; political economist. Ed. Yale, B.A., 88, Ph.D., 91; Berlin and Paris,

93-4. His great-great grandfather William Fisher was a soldier in the revolutionary war. Advisory council and B.O.D., 1923-40.

Yale political economist and eugenics leader. He served as pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. in 1920 and the Am. Eugenics Society between 1923 and 26. He was a leader of the AES from its organization at the Second International Cong. of Eug. through 1940. He was also pres. of the Third International Cong. of Eug. Chairman of the Board of Scientific Directors of the Eugenics Record Office, and Chairman of the Board of the Life Extension Institute. He was active in national politics, public health, and conservation. A member of Theodore Roosevelt's National Conservation Commission (1919) and pres. of the Am. Assn. for the Advancement of Labor (1915-17).

Fisher taught economics at Yale from 1891 to 1935. He studied the statistics and history of tuberculosis and death rates in general and the means of reducing mortality through preventive medicine. He pointed out that the average American lifespan was shorter than that of other leading industrial nations and that it could be extended by fully one-third with improvements in air, water, and milk purity. He estimated the savings to the nation from decreased mortality would be around 1.5 billion per annum. He advocated a federal department of health and was pres. of the Committee of One Hundred on National Health of the AAAS.

He wrote well over a dozen books and hundreds of articles, many of which were considered standard works and translated into French, Italian, German, and Japanese. He was a man of enormous energy and an enthusiastic joiner. During his career he belonged to dozens of different organizations relating to his interests in political economy, labor, health care, and food value.

♣ \*Eugene Lyman FISK (1867-1931) b. Brooklyn, NY; physician. A descendant of Salem pilgrims. Ed. M.D., University Medical College (later NYU), 88. Advisory council, 1923-30.

In 1891 he was put in charge of the medical division of the Equitable Life Assurance Society and in 1898 was appointed medical director of the Provident Savings Life Assurance Society of New York. While there he organized the first periodic health examination service and educational service to be established by an insurance company.

He became an avid advocate of preventive health care, and when Harold Ley organized the Life Extension Institute in 1913 he was appointed its medical director. By the time of his death the Life Extension Institute had examined more than half a million individuals. He edited How To Live, the monthly journal of the Institute. During the war he worked closely with the U.S. Public Health Service.

He was co-author with Irving Fisher of How To Live (1915), which passed through eighteen editions and was

translated into many languages including Chinese and Japanese.

He was a fellow of the Am. Medical Assn., Am. Public Health Assn., National Tuberculosis Assn., Am. Heart Assn., Am. Social Hygiene Assn., Am. Genetics Assn. as well as numerous other political, academic and social organizations.

♠ \*Austin B. FLETCHER (1871-1928) b. Cambridge, MA; Civil engineer. Ed. B.S., Harvard, 1893. Advisory council, 1923.

Fletcher was of English descent, a Republican and Congregationalist. He was a pioneer in the state highway commissions of the 1890s, helping to organize the Massachusetts state highway commission in 1893 and serving as executive officer and chief engineer by 1910. In 1910 he became chief engineer for the San Diego highway commission and in 1911 was appointed the first state highway engineer of California.

He became active in state, national and international engineering affairs, serving from 1917 to 1923 as pres. of the State Reclamation Board and Director of Public Works. He advised on a number of transportation studies in the United States and Europe. Between 1908 and the First World War he was a delegate to three international road and transportation congresses held in Europe.

♠ \*Homer FOLKS (1867-1963) b. Hanover, MI; social worker. Ed. A.B., Harvard, 90. Advisory council, 1923.

Folks was prominent in education, public health, and child care. He served as Superintendent of the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, Secretary of the State Charities Aid Society of Pennsylvania and Commissioner of Public Charities in New York. He was a Republican.

He organized the first agency in New York for aiding homeless mothers to care for their children (1894). He wrote The Care of Destitute, Neglected and Delinquent Children (1902). In 1909 he was the first vice-chairman of the White House Conference on Dependent Children. In 1935 he became vice-chairman of the National Child Labor Committee, in 1936 chairman of the Governor's Commission on Illegitimacy and in 1940 chairman of the Conference on Children in a Democracy.

Folks was a pioneer in the battle against tuberculosis, attending the first international tuberculosis meeting in Washington in 1909. He lobbied Albany (the capital of New York) for hospitals and dispensaries for the care of tuberculosis, and the state eventually built several hospitals for the care of tubercular patients. Folks was the first layman to be elected pres. of the National Assn. for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis. He was a member of the National and New York Tuberculosis Assns.

Folks was also active with the International Red Cross. He was a special agent to the military government in Cuba and he organized and directed the department of civil

affairs of the Am. Red Cross in France, Italy, Greece, Serbia, Belgium, and France.

♣ Joseph Kirk FOLSOM (1893-1960) Sociologist. Ed. B.S, Rutgers U.; A.M., Clark U., 15; Ph.D., Columbia U., 17. AES Board of Directors, 1937-40.

Professor of sociology and economics at Vassar College between 1931 and 1960. His field of specialization was the family. He is the author of The Family, Its Sociology and Social Psychiatry (1934, revised as The Family and Democratic Society, 1943) and Youth, Family and Education (1941). He was a contributor to Sex Habits of American Men, a Symposium on the Kinsey Report (1948).

In 1939 he was elected president of the Eastern Sociological Society, and from 1942 to 1944 he served as editor of the American Sociological Review. He was a founder of the American Assn. of Marriage Counselors. He believed that family living can be made better through science.

♣ \*Harry Emerson FOSDICK (1878-1969) b. Buffalo, NY; Clergyman, from old Puritan stock (Stephan Fosdick arrived in Charleston, MA. in 1635). Ed. A.B., Colgate, 00; B.D., Union Theological Seminary, 04; A.M., Columbia, 08; D.D., Colgate, 14. Advisory council, 1923-35. He was a member of the AES Committee for Cooperation with the Clergy.

Fosdick was one of the most prominent clergyman in America. He was a liberal Presbyterian who believed in the integration of modern science with religion. In 1925 John D. Rockefeller Jr. agreed to build the Riverside Church, a four-million dollar edifice, to accommodate Fosdick's overflow of worshipers. From its inception the Riverside Church was interdenominational and interracial. By 1938 the membership topped 3000. In 1927 he began a Sunday afternoon program on NBC radio which was carried across the nation and by short wave around the world.

In public affairs he was an active supporter of the League of Nations, Alcoholics Anonymous, the birth control movement, and later in his career, the civil rights movement.

♠ \*Raymond Blaine FOSDICK (1883-1972) b. Buffalo, NY; lawyer, of old New England Stock (see entry above for his brother, H.E. Fosdick); Ed. B.A., Princeton, 05; M.A., 06; LL.B., N.Y. Law Sch., 08. Advisory council, 1923-35.

A liberal Baptist and Democrat, the bulk of Fosdick's career was spent in the employ of the Rockefeller Foundation. Fosdick was a close friend and lifelong associate of John D. Rockefeller Jr. He was elected to the AES Council in November 1924 and served through 1935.

Between 1920 and 1936 Fosdick served the Rockefeller interests in various capacities. He was a trustee of the

Rockefeller Foundation, General Education Board, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, and other Rockefeller projects. His responsibilities were primarily as liaison officer to prevent overlapping of effort. In 1936 he was appointed pres. of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board. The express purpose of the Rockefeller Foundation which was established in 1913 with an endowment of 150 million dollars was to promote the well-being of mankind by promoting public health and furthering science.

He was a comptroller of finances of the Democratic National Committee in 1912 and active in local and national politics. He was also active in military affairs, serving as a civilian aide to General Pershing in France in 1919. He served as undersecretary of the League of Nations in 1919-20. He wrote a number of books including an autobiography, Chronicle of a Generation (1958).

♣ \*Robert GARRETT (1875-1961) b. Baltimore, MD; banker. His family arrived in America from Ireland in the 18th century. Ed. B.S., Princeton, 97. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Partner in Robert Garrett & Sons, Director of the Provident Savings Bank, Maryland Trust Co. and Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. He was a Presbyterian and Republican and with ten children. He was particularly interested in urban planning. He donated parcels of land for city parks, he helped found (and served as pres. of) the Public Athletic



League, which later became as a city agency, the Baltimore Bureau of Recreation, with Garrett as director. He also served as the chairman of the Baltimore Public Improvements Commission, which supervised the expenditure of 75 million dollars in city loan funds.

In 1910 he helped found the playground association of America. He was active in the YMCA and Boy Scouts. He was a Trustee of the Religious Education Foundation, a member of the Council of Churches, and the Presbyterian General Assembly. He was cited for his work in Christian education in 1948 by the International Council of Religious Education.

♠ \*Franklin H. GIDDINGS (1855-1931) b. Sherman, CT; sociologist. His first American ancestor was George Giddings, who came from England in 1635 and settled in Ipswich, MA. His father was a Congregationalist minister. Ed. A.B., Union, 77; A.M., 89. Advisory council, 1923-30.

Giddings succeeded Woodrow Wilson as professor of political economy at Bryn Mawr College in 1888. Two years later he left Bryn Mawr to become the first professor of sociology at Columbia University. He was appointed to a named chair in 1906 and remained at Columbia until his retirement in 1928. He wrote over fifteen volumes including a number of standard texts in sociology such as The Principles of Sociology (1894), Elements of Sociology (1898), and Studies in the Theory of Human Society (1924).

Giddings introduced statistical analysis to sociology as well as the sociological examination of questions of heredity and environment. He was a delegate to the World Population Conference held in Geneva, Switzerland in September 1927. This was one of the first international conferences to bring eugenicists together under the rubric of population control.

A Democrat and charter member of the AES, Giddings was a trustee of Union College, a member of the New York City Board of Education, editor of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (1890-94), and editor of the publications of the Am. Economic Assn. (1891-93). He was a fellow of the Am. Geographical Society, Am. Statistical Society, and pres. of the Am. Sociological Society (1910-11). He also belonged to the Charity Organization Society.

♠ \*Virginia C. GILDERSLEEVE (1877-1965) b. N.Y.C., NY; college administrator, dean of Barnard College. Her mother's family was of French Huguenot ancestry. Her father's family was of English descent and settled on Long Island. Ed. A.B., Barnard 99; Ph.D., Columbia 08. Advisory council, 1925-35.

She became dean of Barnard in 1911. Early in her career she became an advocate of women's education. She criticized the existence of separate educational tracks for women and deplored the notion that wives and mothers did not

need a college education. Under her guidance in the 1920s Barnard pioneered in granting women professional options. She spread her influence to the secondary schools, serving as trustee of the Spence School in New York City and the Masters School in Dobbs Ferry.

In 1919 she helped to found the International Federation of University Women and twice served as its pres. In 1945 she was the only woman on the U.S. founding conference of the United Nations in San Francisco. She assisted in drafting the U.N. charter and worked on behalf of human rights. She also served on the U.S. Educational Mission to Japan and helped restructure the Japanese educational system. She was actively opposed to the founding of Jewish state in Palestine. She was an Episcopalian.

♠ \*Henry Herbert GODDARD (1866-1957) b. Vassalboro, ME; psychologist. A Quaker, his earliest paternal American ancestor was William Goddard, who came from England in 1665 and settled in Watertown, Mass. Ed. A.B., Haverford Coll., 87, A.M., 89; Ph.D., Clark, 99. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Goddard received his Ph.D. from Clark University under G. Stanley Hall. He served as director of research at the New Jersey Training School for Feeble-Minded Boys and Girls at Vineland, N.J. from 1906 to 1918. He studied in France and Germany where he met Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon in 1908. He was the first American to translate and publicize

the Binet intelligence test. He coined the term "moron" from the Greek meaning "slow" or "sluggish." This terminology was officially adopted by the Am. Assn. for the Study of the Feeble-minded in 1910.

In 1911 after testing two thousand public school children, Goddard claimed the test measured innate ability. Upon further investigation he claimed that two percent of the New York City School children were retarded enough to require special education. He elaborated on these views in School Training of Defective Children (1915).

Goddard's best-known work is The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness (1912). Goddard traced the family of Martin Kallikak (a pseudonym coined from the Greek meaning "good and bad") who fathered two sons, one by a promiscuous tavern maid and the other by his wife. Goddard found the legitimate descendants all normal and worthy members of society. The descendants of the tavern girl, on the other hand, represented an unbroken chain of degeneracy.

Goddard firmly believed that feeble-mindedness was hereditary, and he pressed his eugenic theories in Feeble-mindedness: Its Causes and Consequences (1914) and The Criminal Imbecile (1915). Between 1914 and 1915 he served as pres. of the Am. Assn. for the Study of the Feeble-minded.

In 1917 he served on the Committee that designed the army alpha and beta tests of intelligence administered to recruits in World War I. In 1918 he left Vineland to become director of the Ohio State Bureau of Juvenile Research and in 1922 left that office to become professor of Abnormal Psychology at Ohio State.

Goddard was very active in the eugenics movement. He was a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. and the Eugenics Record Office. He helped to formulate the methods of data collection used by ERO eugenic field workers. His work on the Kallikaks was widely cited by eugenicist in their efforts to pass legislation. It also formed part of the testimony in the Buck v. Priddy (1924), the case that led to the Supreme Court ruling in Buck v. Bell (1927) that eugenic sterilization is Constitutional.

▲ \*Charles M. GOETHE (1875-1966) b. Sacramento, CA; banker. Ed. public schools. Advisory council, 1930-35.

Pres. of various Goethe firms, including the Goethe Bank. Founder of the Sacramento Council of Churches, Eugenics Society of Northern California, Sacramento Playground System, and the Immigration Study Commission, which lobbied to extend the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act to Latin America. Goethe was a member of the advisory board of the Sacramento Mental Health Assn., chairman of the board of the Sacramento State College, and a member of advisory board of the Am. Genetics Assn. and a member of the

Eugenics Research Assn. He served on the International Council of the Save the Redwoods League and was a member of the Population Reference Bureau.

Goethe was extremely active in California eugenics, particularly in the movement to restrict Mexican immigration. He was pres. of the California Immigration Study Commission. He was an admirer of Adolf Hitler and Nazi eugenics. He used his position as pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. between 1936 and 1937 to promote support for Nazi eugenics in America. In the early thirties he served as a trustee of the Human Betterment Foundation, working closely with E.S. Gosney and Paul Popenoe.

▲ Willystine GOODSELL (1870-1962) b. Wallingford, CT; teacher, author. Ed. B.S., Teachers Coll., 06, M.A., 07, Ph.D., 10. AES Board of Directors, 1935-40.

She taught at Teachers College from 1905 to her retirement in 1936. She served as on the board of the Am. Eugenics Society (1935-1943) and the Euthanasia Society of America. She was a member of the Am. Assn. of University Women. She was the author of History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution (1915), Education of Women (1923), Problems of the Family (1928), and other works. She was also editor of Pioneers of Women's Education in the U.S. (1931).

♣ \*Ezra Seymour GOSNEY (1855-1942) b. Kenton, KY; financier. Old American family of French Huguenot descent. Ed. B.S., Richmond (Mo.) College, 77; LL.B. at Washington University Law School in St. Louis, 80. Advisory council, 1927-35.

In 1928 he founded the Human Betterment Foundation, a non-profit corporation, which he financed entirely and of which he was pres. until his death. Among its charter members were David Starr Jordan, Robert Millikan, and Rufus B. von Kleinsmid. Its first project was a study of the effects of the 6000 eugenic sterilizations carried out under California law. The foundation published Sterilization for Human Betterment in 1931. It was translated into German and Japanese. In 1938 the foundation published Twenty-Eight Years of Sterilization. A second edition was published in 1939.

After his death the assets of the Human Betterment Foundation were transferred to the California Institute of Technology to establish a permanent Gosney Research Fund. The income from the Fund was designated for research into the biological basis of human qualities.

Gosney was a member of the Am. Social Hygiene Assn., Eugenics Research Assn., Assn. for the Study of the Feeble-Minded, Am. Genetics Assn., as well as a number of European eugenics societies. He was a Republican.

♣ Charles Winthrop GOULD (1849-1931) lawyer; b. N.Y.C., NY; of old New England stock. His family of Goulds, Saltonstalls, and Mumfords were among New England's most prominent blue bloods. Ed. A.B., Yale, 70, M.A., 73; LL.B., Columbia, 72. He served on the advisory council from 1923 to 1930.

Gould was a Republican and an Episcopalian. He was a senior member of the the law firm of Gould and Wilkie from 1892 to his retirement in 1916. President McKinley appointed him special commissioner in charge of Cuban relief in 1898. He was a trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1915-30), trustee of the Cooper Union, and an officer of the Society for the Relief of Cuban Orphans, which he organized.

He was very active in eugenics work, serving on the AES committee on selective immigration and writing America, a Family Matter (1921) and Mental Tests and History. He was a close friend of both Yerkes and Brigham. In his introduction to Brigham's A Study of American Intelligence (1923), Yerkes credits Gould as the inspiration for the Brigham book. He calls Gould, a "fearless thinker on problems of race." Gould died without issue.

♣ \*Madison GRANT (1865-1937) b. N.Y.C., NY; lawyer; of prominent New York blue blood family whose Scottish ancestors came to New Jersey in 1745. Ed. Grant's education included extensive travel and study around the world. A.B.



Yale, 87; LL.B., Columbia, 90. A founding member of the Eugenics Committee of the United States, he was a member of the Board of Directors from 1923-30.

Grant was a Republican and an Episcopalian. With his brother DeForest Grant he took an active part in the reform movement campaigning for William Lafayette Strong for Mayor in 1894. He played a leading role in founding the New York Zoological Society in 1895, along with Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Fairfield Osborn, Elihu Root, and C. Grant La Farge. He served as secretary (1895-1924) and pres. (1925-1937) of the Zoological Society and was a key figure in the establishment of the Bronx Zoo. The need for a highway to reach the zoological park led him to serve as pres. of the Bronx Parkway Commission from 1907 to 1925.

His interest in zoology led him to join Roosevelt, Osborn, and others in the movement to protect wildlife and natural resources. In 1905 he helped found the Am. Bison Society and in 1919 he joined H. F. Osborn and John C. Merriam in founding the Save-the-Redwoods League.

He was a principal leader of the American eugenics movement and was best known to the general public for his adherence to the theory of the superiority so-called 'Nordic' races. From 1922 to his death he served as vice-pres. of the Immigration Restriction League and chairman of the AES committee on selective immigration. He was widely cited as being a key architect of the 1924 immigration

restriction law. He was a Founder of the AES and the Galton Society and a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. and served variously as pres., secretary, and trustee of all three organizations. He was also served as treasurer for the Second International Cong. of Eug. in 1921. He served on the AES Board from 1923 to 1930.

He wrote a number of widely read popular volumes on eugenics including the best selling, The Passing of the Great Race (1916) which went through four editions (1916, 1918, 1920, 1921) and was translated in a number of languages.

♠ \*William K(ing) GREGORY (1876-1970) b. N.Y.C., NY; paleontologist. Ed. A.B., Columbia, 00, A.M., 05, Ph.D., 10. Advisory council, 1923-35.

King served as a research assistant to Henry Fairfield Osborn (1899-1913). Gregory was closely associated throughout his career with the Am. Museum of Natural History and Columbia University. He was a mainstay in New York eugenic circles -- a member of the Executive Committee of the Galton Society and very active in the AES, serving on the board and advisory council from 1923 to 1935. He was pres. of the New York Academy of Medicine (1932-33); v.p. of section H. of the A.A.A.S. and v.p. of the Am. Society of Naturalists (1936). He was a member of the National Academy of Sciences and pres. of the Am. Assn. of Physical Anthropology (1941-42).

♠ \*Ernest R. GROVES (1877-1946) b. Farmington, MA;  
sociologist. Ed. A.B., Dartmouth, 03; B.D., Yale, 01.  
Advisory council, 1930-35.

Groves was the recognized pioneer among educators teaching college courses on sex and marriage. He and his wife Gladys H. Groves wrote over thirty books on the family, parenthood and child rearing. The bulk of his career was spent at the University of North Carolina where he began teaching on the family in 1927.

He began teaching sociology at the University of New Hampshire upon his graduation from Dartmouth. Between 1920 and 1927 he was a professor of sociology at Boston University where he started teaching the very first college credit courses on "preparation for family life" in 1923. He integrated the broader field of social hygiene in a popular college textbook Introduction to Mental Hygiene (1930). He also wrote innovative sociological texts on the history of women and the family in America. In 1942 he wrote, Christianity and the Family in which he stressed the need for a more practical understanding of the interests the family by the protestant ministry.

Groves wrote both popular and scholarly articles on the family for a wide range of journals and magazines including the American Journal of Sociology, Hygenia, Social Forces, American Family, Ladies' Home Journal, Good Housekeeping and Parents' Magazine. Groves was editor of Longmans, Green

Sociological Series from 1926 to 1940; and he is associate editor of Social Forces and of Education. He was corresponding editor of Parents' Magazine and a member of the editorial council of the J. of Educational Sociology.

From 1936 to 1938 he was pres. of the North Carolina Mental Hygiene Society and from 1938 to 1940 he was chairman of the Committee on the Family of the Federated Council of Churches of Christ in America. He was pres. of the National Council on Family Relations (1941).

Groves many books were used as textbooks for college courses on preparation for marriage. Following his work many colleges set up such courses. His own course at the University of North Carolina was described as one of the largest and most popular elective courses there. Groves courses deal with questions of heredity and fertility and he "deals out facts unflinchingly." The primary text for his course was Groves own text, Marriage. Groves described himself as an "independent Democrat.

▲ \*Michael F. GUYER (1874-1959) b. Plattsburg, MO; zoologist. Ed. B.S., Chicago, 94, Ph.D., 00; A.M., Nebraska, 96, Advisory council, 1923-35.

Guyer became chairman of the department of zoology at the University of Wisconsin in 1911, a position he held till his retirement in 1945. At Wisconsin he taught animal biology, heredity, cytology, and eugenics. His book Being

Well Born (1916) was a popular eugenics textbook which argued that there was a hereditary predisposition to crime, disease, and mental characteristics. Animal Biology (1931) was a "leading textbook of introductory zoology, going through four editions"

Guyer was interested in broadening medical education and in the early 1920s he was appointed to the National Commission on Medical Education and the Wisconsin Basic Science Board, an examining body for prospective physicians.

♣ \*Winfield Scott HALL (1861-1942) b. Batavia, IL; physiologist, author, lecturer. His Ancestors came to America from England in 1759 and settled in Vermont. Ed. B.S., Northwestern, 87. M.D., 88, M.S., 89; M.D. Leipzig, 94, Ph.D., 95. Advisory council, 1923.

Hall was professor of physiology at Northwestern from 1895 to 1919 at which point he became emeritus. He was a dean of the medical faculty from 1901 to 1913 as well as medical director of the Bureau of Social Hygiene. He was member of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education.

Hall was the author of some twenty books which included text books in physiology and medicine such as Laboratory Guide to Physiology (1897); Textbook of Physiology (1899) etc. He also wrote both popular and scholarly works on reproduction, health and eugenics such as Sexual Hygiene

(1906), Instead of Wild Oats (1911), and Constructive Eugenics (1915).

Hall was pres. of the Am. Academy of Medicine (1904-05), the Am. Medical Society for the Study of Alcohol, and Other Narcotics (1903-1910), and the Health League of Chicago (1913). He was active in many health related organizations including the Life Extension Institute of America and the International Congress on Tuberculosis.

He was also a member of the National Council of the Boy Scouts, pres. of the Child Conservation League and the U.S. Public Health Service between 1919 and 1929.

♦ Frank Hamilton HANKINS (1877-1970) b. Wilshire, OH; sociologist. A.B. Baker U., 1901; Ph.D. Columbia, 1908. AES Board of Directors, 1940-??.

Hankins taught at Clark University from 1906 to 1922 and at Smith College from 1922 to 1946. He was pres. of the Eastern Sociological Society (1930-31), Am. Sociological Society (1938), and Population Assn. of America (1945). He was a member of the editorial Board of the Birth Control Review. He was on the Am. Committee of the International Population Union. A member of the Euthanasia Society of America and the National Committee for Planned Parenthood. He authored, The Racial Basis of Civilization in 1926 (translated into French in 1935) and An Introduction to the Study of Society (1928, rev. edit. 1935).

♣ \*Mary Williamson Averell HARRIMAN (1851-1932) b. N.Y.C., NY; philanthropist, capitalist. Mrs. Harriman, an Episcopalian and life-long Republican and descendant of William Averell who came from England to Massachusetts in the seventeenth century. Advisory council, 1923.

Mrs. Harriman was the sole heir at fifty-eight of E. H. Harriman (d. 1909) whose estate was estimated at between seventy and one hundred million dollars. She took charge of the business empire as well as assuming responsibility for diverting a portion of the fortune to charity.

Mrs. Harriman did not believe in setting up large foundations on the model of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations. Instead, she personally supervised the Harriman philanthropy. Inundated with requests for funds she commissioned William H. Allen, a director of the Bureau of Municipal Research in New York City to do a survey of American philanthropy. The result was Modern Philanthropy: A Study of Efficient Appealing and Giving (1912) which criticized waste and duplication in philanthropy. In the Forward written by Mrs. Harriman she expressed her belief that the aim of charity was "to insure the equal opportunity for all to become efficient."

Influenced by her daughter, Mary Rumsey, Mrs. Harriman became the single largest individual donor to eugenic causes giving over half a million dollars to establish the Eugenics Record Office in 1910. She was an active member of the

board of visitors of Letchworth Village, a state institution for the care of retarded children in New York. She was also supported a project to set up a Committee on Public Health under the direction of the New York Academy of Medicine.

♣ J(ames) Arthur HARRIS (1880-1930) b. Plantsville, OH; botanist, biometrician. Harris was descended from old American stock of English origin. On his mother's side he was descended from John Lambert, the noted English general under John Cromwell and Quaker ancestry on his fathers side. He was a Unitarian. Ed. A.B., Univ. of Kan., 01, A.M., 02; Ph.D., Washington Univ. St. Louis, 03. Advisory council, 1925-30.

In 1907 Harris joined the staff of the Station for Experimental Evolution with the title botanist. He remained with the Station until 1924 when he left to become head of the Department of Botany at the University of Minnesota.

He studied biometry with Karl Pearson in London in 1908 and 1909 and became a leading champion of biometry in America. In 1921 the University of Oxford conferred on him the Weldon Medal. He was very active in scientific societies and served as pres. of the Am. Society of Naturalists in 1926. At the time of his death he was member-at-large of the Division of Biology and Agriculture of the NRC.



♣ \*Ross G(ranville) HARRISON (1870-1959) b. Germantown, (Phil.) PA; zoologist, anatomist. Ed. A.B., Hopkins, 89, Ph.D., 94; M.D., Bonn, 99. Advisory council, 1923.

Harrison taught at Bryn Mawr, Johns Hopkins, and Yale. His major contributions were in experimental embryology. He studied the development of the nervous system. He was managing editor of the J. of Experimental Zoology (from 1903); trustee of the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, MA. (from 1908); pres. of the Am. Assn. of Anatomists (1911- 13); Am. Society of Naturalists (1912-13), and a member of the National Academy of Sciences. He was also on the Board of Scientific Directors of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research as well as numerous other scientific societies.

♣ \*Clarence) Floyd HAVILAND (1875-1930) b. Spencertown, NY; psychiatrist. Ed. High Sch., 93; M.D., Syracuse, 96. Advisory council, 1925-28. He was also a member of the Eugenics Research Assn.

After graduating from Fulton High School in 1893 Haviland entered Syracuse University Medical School. He received his M.D. in 1896. He went to work for public hospitals in New York City and in 1914 was commissioned by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene to survey care of the insane in Pennsylvania. The survey was published as Treatment and Care of the Insane in Pennsylvania (1915).

In 1915 Haviland took charge of the Connecticut State Hospital at Middletown, Connecticut. Between 1916 and 1921, he was chairman of the executive committee of the Connecticut Society for Mental Hygiene and in 1921 he was elected pres. of the Connecticut Conference on Social Work. In 1926 he returned to New York to become superintendent of the Manhattan State Hospital and was chosen pres. of the Am. Psychiatric Assn. Despite not having any formal training in psychiatry, he was appointed professor of clinical psychiatry at the College of Physicians and Surgeon in New York in 1927.

As an influential member of the New York State Hospital Board he instituted a number of reforms in the care of the insane. He pushed for occupational therapy in all hospitals for the insane, investigations of care at state hospitals, training courses for doctors and nurses and a series of mental diagnostic clinics. He also designed a building plan to prevent overcrowding and give the best fire protection and he supervised the construction of two state hospitals based on these plans. He was very interested in social hygiene and eugenics. He was an editor of Modern Hospital between 1923 and 1930 and the author of a number of books.

♣ \*S(amuel) J(ackson) HOLMES (1868-1964) b. Henry, IL; zoologist, geneticist, eugenicist. Ed. B.S., California, 93; M.S., 94; Ph.D., Chicago, 97. Advisory council, 1923-35; AES Board of Directors, 1935-40.

Holmes taught for 27 years at the University of California. He was pres. of the Western Division of the AAAS; Am. Society of Zoologists; Am. Society of Naturalist and the Am. Eugenics Society. He was an active member of the Eugenics Research Assn.; Population Assn. of Am., and the Am. Genetics Assn. He was a Democrat.

Holmes was a leader in the eugenics movement and authored some of the most widely cited eugenics textbooks such as The Trends of Race (1921), Studies in Evolution and Eugenics (1923), A Bibliography of Eugenics (1924), and The Eugenic Predicament (1933). He also wrote a number of college biology texts such as Studies in Animal Behavior (1916) and The Elements of Animal Biology (1918). He was particularly concerned with the "Negro problem" and wrote The Negroes Struggle for Survival (1937) which predicted that Negroes would continue to move North and increase in numbers.

He was very concerned with the possible extinction of the "highly intelligent" and denounced the tendency of college graduates to have small families. He said that higher education was more devastating than war. In 1939 when he became pres. of the Western Division of the AAAS he urged the substitution of a Darwinian code of morals for the Judeo-Christian code. The New York Times obituary called him "one of the world's foremost authorities on zoology and

genetics, internationally known for his studies of animal heredity and behavior."

\*E(arnest) A(lbert) HOOTON (1887-1954) b. Clemansville, WI; anthropologist. His father, a Methodist minister and native of England, had migrated to Canada in 1872 and later settled in Wisconsin. Ed. B.A., Lawrence Coll., 07; M.A., U. of Wisc., 08, Ph.D. 11. Hooton was an active member in the Am. Eugenics Society serving on the Sub-Committee on Anthropometry in 1926. He also belonged to the Am. Genetic Assn., the Galton Society, and numerous scientific societies. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Hooton was at Oxford, England as a Rhodes scholar between 1910 and 1913 where his interest in physical anthropology was stimulated. Upon his return to the United States in 1913 he was appointed instructor in anthropology at Harvard. He remained at Harvard for rest of his life. From 1914 to his death he was curator of the Peabody Museum and in 1930 he was promoted to full professor.

Hooton was one of Harvard's most popular teachers and he trained many graduate students. He devoted special attention to the analysis of racial characteristics; the biological results of race mixing, criminal anthropology, and the relation of crime to race and nationality in the United States. He developed new methods of racial analysis by the application of statistics to morphological data. Using these techniques he and his students conducted

investigations into the biological results of race mixture in Negro-white crosses in the United States.

Hooton conducted the most extensive examination of criminals made up to 1930. He spent three years (1927-1930) collecting data from ten states on 17,000 criminals and spent nine years analyzing the data. He concluded that criminals were physically inferior to the general population and could be differentiated according to the type of crime they committed and that different races exhibited varied criminal propensities.

Hooton was author of numerous books and articles including, Up from the Ape (1931) and Crime and Man (1939). He ranked as one of the worlds leading anthropologists and his view that heredity was more important than environment had a profound impact on anthropology. He expressed grave concerns over the dysgenic trend in births which resulted from biological degenerates not only being "coddled by well-intentioned busybodies but permitted to reproduce their kind."

\* Lucien HOWE (1848-1928) b. Standish, ME; opthalmic surgeon. Howe was a descendant of Andrew Turnbull, one of the first English settlers in Florida following the termination of Spanish rule. Through his father he was decended from John Howe, an early settler in Sudbury, Mass. in 1639. Howe was a Unitarian. Ed. A.B., Bowdoin, 70,

A.M., 73; M.D., Bellevue Hospital Medical College. Advisory council, 1923-35.

After a period of study in Europe under Helmholtz and others at Heidelberg, Berlin, and Vienna, he began practicing in Buffalo, N.Y. In 1876 he established the Buffalo eye and ear infirmary which he ran for the next fifty years.

Howe's contributions to both the science and the practice of ophthalmology were important. He secured enactment of a law making it obligatory to wash the eyes of new-borns to prevent blindness from ophthalmia neonatorum. This preventive treatment saved the sight of numerous new-borns in New York State and was copied by seventeen states within Howe's lifetime. It became virtually a universal practice.

Howe was pres. of the Am. Ophthalmological Society in 1914-15 and the only American ever to be elected honorary pres. of the French Ophthalmological Society. Howe was very active in the Eugenics movement, serving as pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. (1928), a member of the AES Committee on Selective Immigration and author of a law to preventive the procreation of the hereditary blind.

♠ \*Arles HRDLICKA (1869-1943) b. Humpolec, Bohemia; anthropologist. Ed. M.D., Eclectic Medical College of New York, 1892. He was a member of the AES Sub-Committee on

Anthropometry along with E.A. Hooton. Advisory council, 1923-35.

He emigrated to New York with his father at fourteen. For six years he worked in a cigar factory and attended school at night before entering medical school in 1888. He graduated at the top of his class. After practicing for a few years on the lower east side he took a position as a research intern at the new State Homeopathic Hospital for the Insane at Middletown, New York.

Hrdlicka's interest in anthropology began here when his autopsies began show differences in anatomical structure based on the type of insanity. Hrdlicka went to Europe to study under Leon Manouvrier in Paris in 1896. Upon his return to New York he planned to carry out a study of 40,000 mental patients in state institutions. Hrdlicka was diverted from this work after being invited to join an Am. Museum of Natural History sponsored expedition to Mexico where Hrdlicka became interested in racial differences in body types.

Hrdlicka studied a number of Indian and Eskimo populations and traveled extensively. He had a tremendous influence on anthropology as founder and editor of the Am. Journal of Physical Anthropology (1918-1942) and as founder and first pres. of the American Assn. of Physical Anthropologists (1930-31).

♣ \*Seth King HUMPHREY (1864-1932) b. Fairbault, MN; author and inventor; of English descendants who arrived in the colonies about 1630. Ed. He graduated public school in Fairbault, a mill town. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Humphrey invented a compact mill elevator -- the Humphrey Elevator in 1887. He went to work as a land surveyor for South Dakota and eventually made a study of the U.S. government's western lands. His findings were published in The Indian Dispossessed (1905). He also wrote Mankind (1917) based on eugenic theories which was republished as The Racial Prospect in 1920. He also contributed to the Atlantic Monthly. He was unmarried.

Arthur HUNTER (1869-1964) b. Edinburgh, Scotland; actuary. Ed. George Watson's Coll., Edinburgh (no date available). Advisory council, 1923.

Hunter came to the U.S. in 1892 as an actuary for the New York Life Insurance Company (1892-1941). By 1926 he was a vice-pres. of the company and by 1931 he was a member of the executive committee of the company. He was a delegate of the U.S. government to the International Congresses of Actuaries in Austria, Holland, Britain and France. He was pres. of the Actuarial Society of America (1916-1918). He was a Unitarian.

♣ \*Ellsworth HUNTINGTON (1876-1947) b. Galesburg, IL; geographer, geologist; a descendant of Simon Huntington who



died on the way to America from England in 1933. The son of a Congregationalist minister and Republican. Ed. A.M., Harvard, 02. Ph.D., Yale, 09. Advisory council, 1923-35; AES Board of Directors, 1935-40.

Huntington taught at Yale from 1907 to 1945. He was a special correspondent for Harpers Magazine and a research associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. He served as pres. of the AES between 1934-38, director of the Population Assn. of America and chairman of the AES Committee on Biologic Genealogy. He traveled throughout Asia, Europe, Africa, and Latin America. He authored numerous monographs and textbooks. In all he wrote 28 books and over 340 articles.

From 1910 on Huntington began to express concern that the quality of the human race was on the decline as a result of the rapid multiplication of degenerate humans. He argued that every possible measure should be taken to increase the birth rate of "our old Nordic population as compared with our new Mediterranean and Alpine populations." He was a significant force in the AES for over a quarter of a century. He was a charter member of the organization and chaired the Committee on Biologic Genealogy. He was pres. of the AES between 1934 and 1938. He also served as director of the Population Assn. of America.

Huntington was pres. of the Ecological Society of America (1917), the Assn. of Am. Geographers (1923) and

served as a member of the NRC in both geology and geography (1919-1922) and biology and agriculture (1921-1924). He was a member of the Connecticut Planned Parenthood League.

♣ \*Archibald Gowanlock **HUNTSMAN** (1883-1973) b. Ontario, Canada; biologist. Ed. B.A., Univ. of Toronto, 05, M.B., 07, M.D., 33. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Huntsman was a member of the Royal Society of Canada. He was pres. of the Am. Fisheries Society (1936-37), v.p. of Section D of the British Assn. for the Advancement of Science.

Huntsman was an early ecologist. He was director of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada and in that post he studied the management of wild populations of salmon and other fish. His major work was Life and the Universe (1959).

♣ \*John Newell **HURTY** (1852-1925) b. Lebanon, OH; physician, public health official. Descended from Andrew Hurtig who migrated from Germany to New York in the 18th century. Advisory council, 1923-26.

Hurty was a druggist for Eli Lilly in Paris, Ill. Between 1875-79 he was foreman of the pharmaceutical works of Johnstone and Lilly of Indianapolis. In 1879 he opened his own pharmacy in Indianapolis. While running his pharmacy he also lectured on physics and chemistry and held

the chair of hygiene at the Medical College of Indiana where he was graduated in 1892.

Hurty founded the School of Pharmacy at Purdue in 1881, serving as dean for two years. Governor Mathews appointed him secretary of the state board of health and state commissioner of health in 1896 and he served in that capacity until 1922 when he resigned to run for the state legislature. He served one term in the legislature.

Through his efforts Indiana passed the country's first food and drug law in 1889. He was also instrumental in the passage of numerous laws affecting public health including laws relating to the quarantine of the sick, medical school inspections, inspection of sanitary conditions in public schools and food production industries, regulation to protect infants from blindness (see Lucien Howe), and the establishment of a hygiene laboratory.

He fought for the states sterilization law passed in 1907, the first in the nation, which was declared unconstitutional by the state supreme court in 1921. Dr. Hurty was pres. of the Am. Public Health Assn. and was a major figure in Indiana public health. His writings included Life and Health (1906) and The Indiana Baby Book (1913). He also wrote a column that appeared in the Indianapolis News between 1923-24 under the title, "Doctors Advice."

♠ \*Woods HUTCHINSON (1862-1930) b. Yorkshire, England of Quaker stock; physician, public health official, popular science writer. His family emigrated to Iowa when he was a boy. Ed., Penn. Coll., Oskaloosa, Ia., 80, A.M., 83; M.D., U of Mich., 84. Advisory council, 1923.

Hutchinson served as the State health officer for Oregon from 1903 to 1905; pres. of the Am. Academy of Medicine (15-16) and editor of *vis Medicatrix* (1890-91). About 1905 he moved to New York City to devote himself entirely to writing. From 1907 to 1909 he was professor of clinical medicine at New York Polyclinic. He was a prolific writer, turning out some nine volumes, numerous articles in both American and British magazines, and contributing syndicated articles to the daily press. His name was familiar to millions of readers as an interpreter of medical information to the layman. He also lectured extensively and was politically active. Although he wrote on a wide range of health and science issues, his main interest was in preventive medicine.

He was the author of The Gospel According to Darwin (1898), Community Hygiene (1915) and many popular books on health care such as Building Strong Bodies (1924) and the New Handbook of Health (1926).

♠ \*Walter Belknap JAMES (1858-1927) b. Baltimore, MD; physician. His father was founder of one of the largest lumber company in the country and pres. of the Citizens'

National Bank. Ed. A.B., Yale, 79, A.M., 06; M.D., Columbia, 83, LL.D., 04. Advisory council, 1923-35.

James received his M.D. in 1883 from the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York. He spent two years in Europe studying with Virchow and Koch. Besides a large private practice he lectured at the College of Physicians and Surgeons from 1889-1918. He also ran a sanatorium for Tubercular patients in upstate New York.

James was a leading promoter of the large scale Medical Center in Washington Heights and was an active member of the New York State hospital development commission which was established in 1915. He was the first chairman of the state commission on mental defectives (1918). He served for a number of years as pres. of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene of the N.Y. Charity Aid Assn. He was a trustee of the Am. Museum of Natural History as well as a member of the executive committee, the committee on building and the African Hall collection. He was a fellow of the National Geographic Society, pres. of the New York Academy of Medicine (1915-18).

♣ \*Mrs. Wortham JAMES (no dates). No biographical data available. She was a member of the Executive Committee of the Eugenics Research Assn. She chaired the program committee for the 1926 and 1927 joint annual meeting of the ERA and AES. Advisory council, 1923-35.

♣ \*Helen Hartley JENKINS (1860-1934) b. N.Y.C., NY; philanthropist; of old New York blue-blood stock, she was a member of the Society of Cincinnati and Daughter of the American Revolution. Her grandfather helped establish the Assn. for Improving the Conditions of the Poor and her father founded the Hartley House Settlement. Ed. M.A., Trinity College, Hartford. She was a member of the AES committee on Finance. Advisory council, 1923-30.

Her main interests were child welfare and higher education. She served as pres. of the Hartley Corporation, Trustee of Teachers' College, Columbia University, v.p. Hartley House Settlement. She established a number of public hospitals and donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to charity in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. She gave generously to support higher education founding the school of nursing at Columbia University. She fought for "clean city government" and was involved in prison reform and automobile traffic control.

In 1943 Mrs. Jenkins was one of the key supporters of the Fusion movement which elected John P. Mitchel Mayor of New York. She was also a keen supporter of Thomas Mott Osborne in prison welfare work and a close friend of Lewis E. Lawes Warden of Sing Sing. She was a member of the National Prison Assn. She was pres. of the National Institute of Social Sciences in 1923. She created the Hartley Corporation for philanthropic work. She was

chairman of the Committee on Social Hygiene of the National Committee on Prisons, on the executive committee of the New York State Prison Committee. She was also involved in numerous patriotic organizations such as the Founders and Patriots of America, Colonial Dames and Daughters of 1812.

♠ \*Herbert Spencer JENNINGS (1868-1947) b. Tonica, IL; naturalist, geneticist, zoologist. His American family goes back at least to his great-grandfather Thaddeus Jennings. Ed. B.S., Michigan, 93, Sc.D., 18; Morgan and Parker fellowships, Harvard, 95-97, A.M., 95, Ph.D., 96. Advisory council, 1923-24.

Jennings did post-doctoral work at Jena and Naples. He spent the bulk of his career at Johns Hopkins (1906-1938). He wrote nine books which included two specifically related to eugenics Prometheus or Biology and the Advancement of Man (1925) and The Biological Basis of Human Nature (1930). At various times he was editor of the J. of Experimental Zoology, J. of Animal Behavior, Biological Bulletin, and Human Biology and Genetics. Between 1922-1925 he was on the executive committee of the NRC's section on biology and agriculture. He was pres. of the Am. Society of Zoologists (1908-9) and Am. Society of Naturalists (1910-11). Jennings resigned from the AES Advisory Council in 1925 after severely criticizing H. H. Laughlin's analysis of immigration data. He was one of the biologists of the time who publicly criticized eugenics.

♣ \*Albert JOHNSON (1869-1957) b. Springfield, IL; editor and politician; Ed. Johnson graduated high school in Hiawatha, Kansas and learned the printers trade on the side. Advisory council and Board of Directors, 1923-35.

He went to work for a number of newspapers moving to Seattle, Washington when S. Albert Perkins, the Republican National committeeman from the state selected Johnson to edit his Tacoma News. In 1912 Johnson earned a reputation after leading a citizens' movement that broke up the IWW strike that had paralyzed the lumber industry. He ran for Congress, crusading against immigration and radicalism. He defeated the incumbent, a Republican who ran as a Progressive. In 1913 he began a 22 year tenure as Congressman from the Third District of Washington. Johnson led the immigration restriction movement in the 1920s and was elected pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. in 1923. The Johnson-Reed Act (Immigration Restriction Act of 1924) became law on 26 May 1924.

♣ \*Roswell JOHNSON (1877-??) b. Buffalo, NY; geologist; Ed. B.S. Chicago, 00; M.S., Wisconsin, 03. Advisory council, 1923-27; Pres. 1927; Board of Directors, 1928-35.

Johnson was an investigator for the Station for Experimental Evolution between 1905-08 and specialist in oil production at the U. of Pittsburgh. Johnson was very active in the Eugenics movement. He served on the AES Advisory Council from 1923 to 1935. He was a member of the AES



Committee on Selective Immigration, Committee on Eugenic and Dysgenic Effects of Birth Regulation (1926), and a member of the AES Board of Directors between 1929-32. He was a member of the Am. Genetic Assn. and the Eugenics Research Assn. He co-authored Applied Eugenics (1918) with Paul Popenoe.

♠ \*Cheney Church JONES (1880-1954) b. Richardson County, NE; social worker; Ed. A.B., Doane Coll.; LL.B., Yale, 09; LL.D., Doane, 33. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Jones served as a Special Agent for the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Boston 1909-13. Editor of the Little Wanderers Advocate 1923-1951. Jones was mainly concerned with child welfare issues and worked in Boston, Cleveland, and Minneapolis. He was a member of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection 1929-30 and the official delegate from Massachusetts to the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy, 1939-40. He was pres. of the Child Welfare League of America 1929-32, National Committee for Mental Hygiene and on the executive committee of the National Conference of Social Work, 1939-42.

♠ \*David Starr JORDAN (1851-1931) b. Gainsville, NY; Ichthyologist, educator. His first American ancestor was Rufus Jordan who arrived in the Colonies from Devonshire about 1700. Ed. M.S., Cornell, 72; M.D., Ind. Med. Coll., 75; Ph.D., Butler, 78. Advisory council, 1923-30.

Jordan achieved international recognition in education, science, and peace activism. He has been called a poet, reformer, and minor prophet of democracy. He was the first pres. of Stanford University (1891-1913) and Chancellor (1913-16). He was chief director of the World Peace Foundation (1910-1914) and extremely active in anti-imperialist and anti-war activities. He had an international reputation and travelled extensively. He authored at least two dozen books and wrote voluminously for journals and periodicals of all kinds. He was one of the original Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation, pres. of the AAAS, the National Educational Assn., the Indiana Academy of Science, and the California Academy of Science. He was v.p. of the English Eugenics Education Society and served on the AES Committee on Eugenics and War (1924). He believed that war had a dysgenic effect. He was also a member of the Eugenics Research Assn.

♣ \*H(arvey) E(rnest) JORDAN (1878-??) b. Coopersburg, PA; anatomist. Ed. A.B. Lehigh U., 03, A.M., 04; studied at Columbia, 04-05; Marine Biological Lab., 05-06; Ph.D., Princeton, 07. Member of the Eugenics Research Assn. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Jordan specialized in histology and embryology. He taught at the University of Virginia from 1907 to 1949 and lived in Charlottesville. He advanced to Professor of anatomy, director of the Anatomical Labs at the University

and Dean of the Department of Medicine. He was 1st v.p. of the Am. Assn. of Anatomists (1936-38), member of the Am. Genetics Assn., pres. of the Virginia Academy of Science in 1937, and a member of the NRC (1927-33).

♠ \*Addie Wolf (Mrs. Otto H.) KAHN (1876-1949) b. Morristown, NJ; philanthropist. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Mrs. Otto Kahn was an important contributor to the AES. Besides being a patron of the arts she was director of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. She was a parton of the Women's Trade Union League and a supporter of the Country Home for Convalescent Babies. She was active in the Federation of Women's Clubs, served on the state committee to investigate milk safety in New York in 1939. She was an executive member of the New York Women's Division of the Committee for the Marshall Plan.

Her husband was a noted investment banker and senior partner at Kuhn, Loeb & Co. She was the daughter of Abraham Wolff of Morristown, N.J. and was undoubtedly of Jewish origins, although the New York Times obituary studiously avoids mention of her religion and it is quite possible that either she or her parents converted to Christianity. Her husband is referred to as a Christian convert.

♠ \*William Williams KEEN (1837-1932) b. Philadelphia, PA; surgeon. Ed. A.M., Brown, 59, LL.D., 91; M.D., Jefferson Med. Coll., 62. Advisory council, 1923-26.

Keen studied in Europe between 1864 and 1866. Private practice in Philadelphia and lecturer at Jefferson Med. Coll. He was a fellow of the Royal Society of Surgeons in England and the Surgical Society of Paris. Manager of the Am. Baptist Publication Society and trustee of Crozer Theological Seminary of Brown University. He wrote extensively for professional periodicals and wrote a number of standard texts including editing Gray's Anatomy. Keen was in ill health from 1923 to his death in 1934. Although he was not able to devote time to the society he was willing to lend his name to the council.

▲ \*Truman Lee KELLEY (1884-1961) b. Muskegon Co. MI; psychologist, psychometrician, educator; descended from John Kelly, a native of England who arrived in Mass. prior to 1630. Ed. A.B. U. of Illinois, 09, A.M., 11; Ph.D., Columbia, 1914. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Kelly was a student of Thorndike. He collaborated with Terman on the Stanford-Binet and was pres. of the Am. Psychometric Society (1938-9) and author of numerous important texts on psychometrics including Fundamentals of Statistics (1947). He was considered the leading statistical psychologists of the 1920s. He was a firm believer in eugenics and wrote a number of eugenical works including Mental Aspects of Delinquency (1917), The Influence of Nurture upon Native Differences (1926). President of the Psychometric Society (1938-39).

♠ \*John Harvey **KELLOGG** (1852-1945) b. Tyron, MI;  
physician, surgeon, originator of flaked cereals. Descended  
from Joseph Kellogg who came to the colonies in 1651.  
Ed. M.D., Bellevue Hosp. Med. Coll., 75; studied in Europe  
83, 89, 99, 02, 07, 11, 25. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Kellogg was a member of the AES Committee on Finance  
(1926). He was a mainstay of the AES and served in numerous  
capacities over the years. He was also a member of the  
Eugenics Research Assn.

Kellogg ran the Battle Creek Sanitarium which was  
recognized as one of the worlds leading health institutions.  
Over 300,000 people visited the Sanatorium from all over the  
world during Kellogg's tenure as director and chief surgeon.  
He studied under the most celebrated surgeons of Europe in  
London, Berlin, Vienna, Paris, Berne, Leningrad and Prague.  
He personally performed over 20,000 operations and was  
recognized as one of America's leading surgeons.

In 1906 Kellogg founded the Am. Medical Missionary  
Board and in 1914 changed the name to the Race Betterment  
Foundation. The Race Betterment Foundation quickly became  
one of America's leading eugenic organizations. It  
sponsored three national eugenic conferences in 1914, 1915,  
and 1923. These conferences brought together hundreds of  
leading eugenicists from around the country and published  
the proceedings in a number of volumes. The Foundation also  
published the journal Good Health. The Foundation also

established the Battle Creek College which specialized in training public health experts. The college folded in 1938 due to financial difficulties.

Kellogg published over 25 books including many books on diet, practical hygiene, and eugenics. Besides being editor of Good Health he edited Modern Medicine and Bacteriological Review. He was a member of the Michigan State Board of Health between 1878-1890 and 1912-18. Kellogg established a Mission in Chicago to work with tenement dwellers. He had no natural children but he adopted eight children and established a Home for Orphans in Battle Creek.

Kellogg's father was an abolitionist and Baptist. He later became a Seventh Day Adventist and J. H. Kellogg was raised in a strict and religious atmosphere. Kellogg was excommunicated from the Adventist Church in 1907 as a result of a battle over control of the Sanitarium. In the early years of the century hundreds of prominent Americans such as J. C. Penny and C. W. Barron regularly came to the Sanitarium to be rejuvenated. Kellogg invented granola. His early sex education manual, Plain Facts about Sexual Life (1877) sold over a million copies. His wife Ella was an active member of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

♣ \*Vernon Lyman KELLOGG (1867-1937) b. Emporia, KS; zoologist. Relative of J. H. Kellogg, descended from Joseph Kellogg who came to the colonies in 1651. Ed. B.S., Kansas, 89, M.S., 92; Cornell, 91-92; Liepzig, 93-94, 97-98; Paris,

04-05, 08-09. Kellogg was a member of the Eugenics Committee and active in the Society as a member of the Committee on Biologic Genealogy. Advisory council, 1923-35.

In 1890 Kellogg became assistant professor of entomology at the University of Kansas. By 1896 he was a full professor at Stanford University. He was an intimate friend of David Starr Jordan, pres. of Stanford, and they collaborated on a number of scientific works. He wrote upwards of 200 books and articles. He joined with Herbert Hoover on the Commission for Relief in Belgium and Northern France in 1915. With the entry of the U.S. into the War Kellogg served with Hoover on the U.S. Food Administration and during the same period was active in the formation of the NRC. He became chairman of the division of agriculture, biology, forestry, zoology and fisheries. In 1920 he became permanent secretary of the NRC until 1931 when failing health forced him to resign. Kellogg was a major influence in the NRC and had an international reputation and a member of the executive committee of the International Research Council. He was a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and Brookings Institute. A fellow of the AAAS and member of the International Health Board and several League of Nation committees. Kellogg had one child.

♣ Helen Dean KING (1869-1955) b. Owego, NY; zoologist, Dean of the Wistar Institute (PA). Ed. A.B., Vassar, 92; Ph.D., Bryn Mawr, 99, fellow, 06-08. Advisory council, 1923-35.

King was a professor of anatomy Wistar Institute 08-48. An internationally-known zoologist. Her most famous work was on 150 generations of inbred rats. She was a v.p. of the Am. Soc. of Zoologists (1937). She was also a member of the Am. Genetic Assn. and the Eugenics Research Assn. King never married and had no children. Few of the professional women in this group were married. Apparently marriage and professional career were not compatible at this time.

♠ \*Charles Atwood KOFOID (1865-1947) b. Granville, IL; zoologist. Ed. A.B., Oberlin, 90; A.M., Harvard, 92, Ph.D., 94. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Kofoid served as Director of the Biological Station at the U of Illinois, Havana, IL., 95-00. He moved to U of Calif. in 1901. He specialized in plankton and pelagic life of the Pacific Ocean. He was one of the founders of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla, CA. He helped establish the Biological Abstracts and served as editor of the biology section for many years. He was an associate editor of Isis.

♠ \*Daniel Wolford LARUE (1878-1959) b. Lackawana County, PA; psychologists. Ed. A.B., Dickinson Coll., 04, A.M., 05; A.M., Harvard, 07, Ph.D., 11. Advisory council, 1923-35.

LaRue served as Professor of Psychology and head of the Department of Education of the State Teachers Coll., East Stroudsburg, 1911-49. He was a Member of the Nat. Comm. for



Mental Hygiene and Am. Genetic Assoc. He wrote Outline of the Study of the Self [w/ Yerkes] (1914). Wrote several other books on psychology. He was a Unitarian and had one child. LaRue was a member of the Eugenics Research Assn.'s Committee on the Genetic Basis of Human Behavior.

♠ \*Harry Hamilton LAUGHLIN (1880-1943) b. Oskaloosa, IA; eugenicist. Ed. B.S., North Missouri State Normal Sch., 00; M.S., Princeton, 16, Sc.D., 17. Laughlin served in numerous capacities in the Advisory council and Board of Directors, 1923-39.

Dir. Eugenics Record Office, leading expert on eugenic sterilization. Laughlin graduated Kirksville Normal School with a B.S. in science education and became principle of the local high school. In 1910 Davenport chose Laughlin to be superintendent of the ERO. Laughlin served as Secretary-Treasurer of the Eugenics Research Assn. He was co-editor with Davenport of the Eugenical News. He was major figure in eugenics playing especially important roles in the passage of eugenic sterilization laws and immigration restriction. He was appointed eugenics expert of the House Committee on Immigration and expert eugenics agent of the Chicago Municipal Court. Laughlin was married but had no children. By 1939 it was clear that he was suffering from a form of epilepsy.

♠ \*William LAWRENCE (1850-1941) b. Boston, MA; Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts. His ancestors were farmers. His

two grandfathers came to Boston in their youth and became successful merchants. His father was a admirer of John Brown and active in the effort to make Kansas a free state. In recognition of those efforts Lawrence, Kansas, was named after him. Ed. A.B., Harvard, 71; B.D., Episcopal Theol. Sch., 75. Advisory council, 1923-35.

William Lawrence was one of the few Episcopal ministers who protested against child labor in the 1870s and 1880s. He was elected Bishop of Massachusetts in 1893 and served in that post for thirty-four years. He was regarded as a leading liberal within the Church as well as one of the ablest administrators of his time. He was noted for his ability to raise large sums of money for worthwhile causes which included millions of dollars for the Church Pension Fund. His fund raising was very modern, taking advantage of publicity agent Ivy Lee. He served as Trustee of Wellesley College. Lawrence was an important associate of Harvard College. He served as pres. of the Alumni Assn. and from 1913 to 1931 he was a fellow of the seven member Harvard Corporation. In that capacity he secured a five million dollar gift from George F. Baker to found the Harvard Business School. Lawrence was a close political associate of Theodore Roosevelt and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge (one of his Harvard classmates). In 1927 Lawrence campaigned for the pardon of Sacco and Vanzetti. He was one of the few members of the Society who took the eugenics credo personally. He was married and had eight children.

♣ \*Frank Rattay LILLIE (1870-1947) b. Toronto, Ontario; zoologist, embryologist. His grandfather was a native of Scotland who emigrated to Canada in 1830. Ed. B.A., Toronto, 91, D.Sc., 20; Ph.D., Chicago, 94. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Between 1900 and 1935 Lillie was a professor of zoology and embryology at the University of Chicago. He was also head of the dept. of zoology and marine biology at Woods Hole (1893-97). He became director of the Marine Biological Laboratory in 1908 and was elected pres. of the corporation in 1926 (1926-42). He was v.p. of the AAAS in 1914, pres. of the National Academy of Sciences (1935-39), Chairman of the NRC (1935-36). He was pres. of the Am. Soc. of Naturalists (1914) and Am. Soc. of Zoologist (1905-08). He was managing editor of the Biological Bulletin (1912-26).

♣ \*Clarence C(ook) LITTLE (1888-1971) b. Brookline, MA; biologist. A.B., Harvard, 06, M.S. 10, Ph.D. 12. Advisory council, and Board of Directors, 1923-35.

Little was no dilettante in the field of eugenics. He was Secretary General and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Second International Eugenics Congress; an early member of the Eugenics Committee, and later a member of the AES Advisory Council. Little was an active member of the AES and served as pres. of the Society between 1928-29. In 1925 he served as Director of the Am. Birth Control League and the Population Assn. of America; vice-pres. of

the Social Hygiene Assn. and on the Executive Committee of the first World Population Conference in Geneva in 1927; pres. of the Race Betterment Congress in 1928 and 1929. He also served as pres. of the International Neo-Malthusian League in 1925 and a member of the Euthanasia Society of America (1938-43) and the Eugenics Research Assn.

Little had a distinguished career in science and academia serving as a research associate in genetics and cancer research at Harvard between 1910 and 1916; an assistant dean of Harvard (1916-17); Associate in Comparative Pathology at Harvard Medical School (1917-18). In 1921 he became assistant director of the Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor. At the age of 34 he left the laboratory to become pres. of the University of Maine. In 1925 he became pres. of the University of Michigan. At Michigan he fought with politicians over issues of disposal of educational funds and academic freedom. In 1929 Little resigned from the University of Michigan and took over the newly created Roscoe B. Jackson Memorial Laboratory for Cancer Research. Little had persuaded Jackson, the founder of the Hudson Motor Company to build the laboratory for him. When Jackson died his children and friends completed the project in his honor. In the same year Little became managing director of the Am. Society for the Control of Cancer.

♠ Francis Ernest LLOYD (1868-1947) b. Manchester, England; botanist. B.A., Princeton, 91, M.A., 95, Munich, 98, Bonn, 01. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Lloyd taught in the United States for a number of years before moving to McGill in Montreal where he taught from 1912 to 1934 (emeritus after 34). He traveled extensively on botanical expeditions for various organizations such as the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the N.Y. Botanical Gardens. He was the editor of The Plant World (05-08) and Secretary and vice-pres. of section G of the AAAS (1923). He was pres. of the Am. Society of Plant Physiology in 1927 and chairman of section V of the Royal Society in 1922.

♠ Frank LORIMER (1894) b. Bradley, ME; author, sociologist. A.B., Yale, 16; A.M., U. Chgo., 21; B.D., Union Theol. Sem., 23; Ph.D. (under John Dewey), Columbia, (29). Advisory council, 1937-40.

Lorimer was a Research Fellow of the Eugenics Research Assn., 1930-34. Lorimer was an important figure in the organization of the Population Assn. of America. He served as secretary from 1934-39 and as pres. from 1946-47. Prof. of Sociology at the Graduate School of Sociology, Am. U., 1938-64. Author of Dynamics of Population, 1934 (with Frederick Osborn) and Foundations of American Population Policy, 1940 (with E. Wilson and L. Kiser).

♣ \*Frederick H(enry) Lynch (1867-1934) b. Peace Dale, RI; Congregationalist clergyman. Ed. A.B., Yale, 94, B.D., 97; ordained Congregational Minister, 99. Advisory council, 1923-26.

Lynch served as Pastor of Pilgrims Church in N.Y.C. between 1903 and 1908. He was editor of Christian Work (06-26); on the editorial staff of the Yale Divinity Quarterly (20-24); Am. Scandinavian Rev. (21-29); and Christian Century (26-27). A founder and secretary of the World Alliance for International Friendship (14-26), he was a well-know peace activist serving in numerous capacities at peace conferences held around the world and active in many international relief efforts. He was author of The Peace Problem (1911); Through Europe on the Eve of the War (1914); Mobilizing for Peace (1924) and other works.

♣ \*Robert Morrison MACIVER (1882-1970) b. Stornoway, Scotland; Sociologist. Ed. M.A., Edinburgh, 03, D. Phil. 1915. AES Board of Directors, 1929-32.

MacIver was Professor of social science at Barnard between 1927 and 1936; Professor of political science and sociology Columbia, 1929-50. He later served as pres. of the New School for Social Research. He was described as a humanist in an age of behaviorists and a giant in the field of sociology. He was author of 17 books and numerous articles. His name appears on the letterhead and on various

pamphlet produced by the Society but he apparently never attended a Board meeting.

♠ Louis Leopold MANN (1890-1966) b. Louisville, KY; rabbi. His father was a livestock commissioner. Ed. B.A., U. of Cincinnati; M.A. & B.H.L. Hebrew Union College 11, rabbi, 14; Ph.D., Yale, 1920. Advisory council, 1925-30.

He was one of the most prominent reform rabbis in America at the time serving as rabbi for Congregation Mishkan Israel (1914-23) in New Haven and Chicago's Sinai Temple (1923-62). He lectured at Yale and U. of Chicago. In addition to his educational and rabbinical activities he was active in numerous organizations concerned with religion and social problems. He was Vice-Chancellor of the Jewish Chautauqua Society, a member of the board of governors of Hebrew Union College, a founder of B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation, and a founder of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Founder of the Am. Birth Control League (later Planned Parenthood); a member of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. He was associate editor of Unity, editor of the ethics department of the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia and a contributing editor to the family magazine, World Unity.

He was a member of the AES Committee on Cooperation with Clergymen from 1926 on. The committee which included thirty-five clergymen contained one other Jewish representative, Rabbi De Sola Pool. The committee oversaw

the publication of regular articles which appeared in the religious press and judged the yearly eugenic sermon contests for the AES.

♣ C(larence) E(rwin) McCLUNG (1870-1946) b. Clayton, CA; zoologist. His first American ancestor, James McClung came to Lancaster, Pa. from Ireland in 1740. Ed. B.A., 89, M.A., 98; Ph.D., University of Kansas, 03. He did further graduate work at Columbia University in 1897 and the University of Chicago in 1899. Advisory council, 1923.

McClung began teaching histology at Kansas in 1896 and was a full professor by 1906. He also served as curator of the collection of vertebrate paleontology and between 1902 and 1906 was acting dean of the medical school. Between 1912 and 1940 he was professor of zoology and director of the zoological laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania. He was managing editor of the J. of Morphology for twenty years. He did important work on the mechanism of heredity in relation to sex determination. As early as 1901 he was recognized as a leading authority on sex determination. His work on chromosomes and its relation to heredity was particularly important.

McClung was a major figure in American science. He was a member of the board of editors of Acta Zoologica, Cytologia, pres. of the Board of Biological Abstracts (25-33). He was a member of the AAAS and the NAS; v.p. of section F (26); pres. of the Am. Society of Zoologists (14);



Am. Society of Naturalists (27). He was chairman of the division of biology of the NRC and between 1923-27, he was pres. of the Union of Am. Biological Societies. He was a Trustee at Woods Hole and a member of the advisory board of the Wistar Institute as well as the Cancer Research Institute in Philadelphia. He was a Congregationalist and Republican and had two daughters.

♠ \*William McDougall (1871-1930) b. Lancashire, England; psychologists. Ed. B.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, 94; St. Thomas Hospital, London, M.B., B. Chir. and M.A., 97. Advisory council, 1923-35.

McDougall was an active eugenicist. In February 1925 he delivered a talk before the Galton Society on the topic of "Racial Psychology" in which he criticized behaviorists, social psychologists, Bolsheviks, and Jews for discounting racial influence on psychology. McDougall claimed that race was all important.

McDougall was influential in both England and America teaching at both Oxford (1902-20) and Harvard (1920-27). He traveled with the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Straits to study the "sensory capacity" of the natives. He furthered traveled through Borneo and published a two volume work with Charles R. Hose entitled The Pagan Tribes of Borneo (1912). He was elected a fellow of the Royal Society in 1912.

In 1900 McDougall studied experimental psychology with G.E. Müller in Göttingen and was greatly influenced by the work of William James. McDougall published a number of important works which brought him wide recognition. Among them were Physiological Psychology (1905); An Introduction to Social Psychology (1908); Psychology, the Study of Behavior (1912) and The Group Mind (1920). In 1920 McDougall accepted a position at Harvard in psychology. Based on the Army I.Q. tests McDougall published Is America Safe for Democracy? in 1921. In this work he openly proclaimed the superiority of the Nordic race and called for a vigorous eugenic program. McDougall was always somewhat out of phase with other American psychologists. For seventeen years he did experimental work trying to prove the inheritance of acquired characteristics. McDougall's best known works are Outline of Psychology (1923) and Outline of Abnormal Psychology (1926). McDougall held some unorthodox views which included a belief in para-psychology and for some thirty years he carried on research in this area. His work had much greater influence on the public at large and non-academic philosophers and theologians than on academic psychologists. He mixed beliefs in indeterminacy and free will with instinct and inheritance and related these to theories of race. He was a Unitarian, married and had five children.

♣ John C(ampbell) MERRIAM (1869-1945) b. Hopkington, IA; paleontologist, educator, administrator. His mother, a

schoolteacher, had grown up in Scotland. His father was from old American stock. Ed. B.S., Lenox Coll., 87; Ph.D., Munich, 93. Advisory council, 1923-35.

He was an active member of the AES and the Galton Society. About once a month he would travel from Washington to New York to attend the meetings of the Galton Society. Merriam was pres. of the Pacific Division of the AAAS (19-20), Geological Society (20), and Am. Paleontological Society (17).

Merriam began teaching paleontology and histology in 1894 at the University of California. He rose to full professor by 1912. He played a key role in the development of paleontology on the west coast and became a major politician of science. Between 1920 and 1938 Merriam served as the pres. of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. He was chairman of the Committee on Government Relations of the National Academy of Science. From 1933 to 1935 he served on F.D.R's Scientific Advisory Board. He was also an ardent conservationist. In 1917 along with H. F. Osborn and Madison Grant he helped establish the Save-the-Redwoods League. He served as pres. of the League for 25 years. Merriam was a Congregationalist and Republican.

♠ Maynard M(ayo) METCALF (1868-1940) b. Elyria, OH; zoologist. Ed. A.B., Oberlin, 89; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 93. Advisory council, 1923.

Metcalf taught at Goucher between 1893 and 1906 and Oberlin from 1906-14. He was a Research Assoc. and prof. in Zoology at Hopkins from 1924 on. He studied in Naples and Germany (06-8) and served as a Trustee of the Marine Biological Lab at Woods Hole. He was Chairman of the NRC section in Biology and Agriculture (24-25), a member of the Am. Genetics Assn., Pres. of the Am. Soc. of Zoologists (18, sec-treas. 02-09), and a member of the Child Hygiene Assn. His work dealt mainly with Protozoa, Tunicata, and Mollusca.

♠ Adolf MEYER (1866-1950) b. Zurich, Switzerland; psychiatrists, neurologists. Ed. Staatsexamen, Zurich, 90; Paris, Edinburgh, London, Vienna, 90-92, M.D., Zurich, 92. Advisory council, 1923 to 1935.

Meyer was an active member of the AES. He served as pres. of the Eugenics Research Assn. between 1916-1917. He attended the Baltimore Conference on Birth Control in 1923 and edited the papers of the conference for publication in 1925.

Meyer came to the U.S. in 1892 shortly after receiving his M.D. from Zurich. In the United States he quickly gained a reputation as a leading psychiatrist and in 1902 was appointed director of the Pathological Service of the New York State Hospital at Ward's Island. By 1910 he was already recognized as one of America's foremost psychiatrists and was invited to become professor of psychiatry and director of the newly endowed Psychiatric

clinic at Johns Hopkins. He remained at Johns Hopkins until his retirement in 1941. He suggested the term "mental hygiene" and helped establish the National Committee on Mental Hygiene in 1909. He served as its pres. from 1940 to 1943. He also helped establish the International Committee for Mental Hygiene of which he was pres. from 1937 to 1947. He was a member of the editorial boards of the J. of Comparative Neurology; J. of Criminal Law and Criminology and the Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry. He was pres. of the Am. Psychiatric Assoc. (27-28); Am. Neurological Assoc. (22); N.Y. Psychiatric Soc. (05-07). He was a Zwinglian Protestant (his father was a minister).

♠ Ann Haven MORGAN (1882-1966) b. Waterford CT; zoologists, educator. Ed. A.B., Cornell, 06, Ph.D. 12. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Morgan taught at Mt. Holyoke from 1914 to 1947 (Chairman 1916-47). She did summer research at Woods Hole (18, 19, 21, 23). Morgan was interested in ecology and conservation. She was one of three women included in the 1933 edition of Am. Men of Science, 5th ed. She was an active member of the AES serving on the Committee on Formal Education in 1926. She was a member of the Am. Social Hygiene Assn. and the Nat. Committee on Policies in Conservation. She was a Congregationalist.

♣ Arthur Ernest MORGAN (1878-1975) b. Cincinnati, OH; civil engineer and college pres. Ed. high school graduate; hon. D.Sc., U. of Colo. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Morgan was one of America's leading civil engineers. He was a conservationist with a national reputation. He drafted water drainage and conservation laws which were adopted in six states. He supervised over 75 water control projects including an eight million dollar Federal project in Arkansas. He was appointed pres. of Antioch College in 1920 and served in that post till 1936. He was an admirer of Edward Bellamy, the utopian socialist and authored Edward Bellamy, A Biography (1944) and The Philosophy of Edward Bellamy (1945). He was v.p. of the Progressive Educational Assn. and the Am. Unitarian Assn. He authored over a dozen books as well as magazine articles for the popular press. He was an active member of the AES and was chairman of the Committee on Organization which drafted the AES Constitution in 1926.

♣ Lemuel Herbert MURLIN (1861-1935) b. Mercer, Co. OH; university pres. His grandfather migrated from Conn. to Ohio where his father was a pioneer Methodist minister. Ed. A.B., Depauw, 91, S.T.B. (92); in Europe, 98; B.D. Garrett Bible Inst., 99; D.D. Cornell Coll., 97; LL.D. De Pauw, 09. Advisory council, 1923.

Pastor of the Am. Church Berlin (09-10; 28-29). Member of the General Conf. of Methodists Churches five times

between 1900-24 and Chmn. of the Gov.'s Commn. on Higher Education. in Kansas and Massachusetts. President of Boston University 1911-25 and of De Pauw U. 1925-28. He was a pres. of the Am. Assn. of Urban Universities (20-25); Educational Assn. of Methodist Episcopal Churches (05-15), and the New England Assn. of Colleges and Secondary Schools (20-25).

Robert Kirkland NABOURS (1875-60) b. Many, La.; zoologist. Ed. B.Ed., U. of Chi., 05, Ph.D. 11. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Nabours taught at U. of Chi. 1906 to 1912. Prof. and Head of Department of zoology at Kansas Agr. Coll. (Manhattan, Kan.) 1912-44; Congregationalist; four children. Elected a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. in 1923. He taught a course on heredity and Eugenics at Kansas State Agricultural College and participated in the Third Int. Congress of Eugenics in 1932.

♣ Henry Francis NACHTRIEB (1857-1942) b. Galion, OH; zoologist. Ed. B.S. Minnesota, 82; Hopkins, 83-85, fellow 84-85. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Taught zoology at Minnesota 1884-1925. Curator of the zoological museum and zoologist for the Minn. Geological and Natural Hist. Survey, 87-19. He was an active Minnesota conservationist and surveyed the natural flora and fauna of Minnesota. He introduced the first course in animal

genetics to the University of Minnesota and was able to attract funding to build a large zoology department.

Nachtrieb was a founding member of the Minnesota Eugenics Society in March 1923 and served as its secretary for most of his professional career. He was a fellow of the AAAS, a member of the Am. Genetics Assn., and the Eugenics Research Assn.

♣ William Allen NEILSON (1869-1946) b. Doune, Scotland; educator, college pres. Ed. M.A., U. of Edinburgh, 91; M.A., Harvard, 96, Ph.D. 98. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Neilson emigrated from Scotland to Canada and later to the United States. He taught English literature at Bryn Mawr, Harvard, and Columbia. He joined Charles W. Eliot as assoc. ed. of the fifty volume Harvard classics series. Published a number of books on English literature and edited the second edition of Webster's New International Dictionary which appeared in 1934. He was reared in the Scottish Kirk but became a liberal in religion. He was pres. of Smith College between 1917 and 1939 and became one of the most influential college presidents of the day. He vastly improved Smith college expanding its facilities and raising its standards. He openly condemned the ethnic quotas which were prevalent at major universities. He was always an active liberal and was openly criticized at Smith for his defense of Sacco and Vanzetti. He was an active board member of the NAACP and headed its committee of 100 which



raised money for its legal work. He was a strong opponent of fascism and became director of the National Refugee Service.

♠ Horatio Hackett NEWMAN (1875-1957) b. nr. Seale, AL; zoologist. Ed. B.A., McMaster U., Toronto, 96; fellow in zoology, U. Chgo., 93-00, Ph.D. 05. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Newman taught briefly at the University of Michigan and the U. of Texas. Between 1911 and 1940 he taught zoology and embryology at the U. of Chicago. He also served as Dean in the College of Sciences. He is best known for his work on twins with F.N. Freeman and K.J. Holzinger Twins: A Study of Heredity and Environment (1937). He also wrote Readings in Evolution, Genetics and Eugenics (1921) as well as popular text books such as Vertebrate Zoölogy (1919) and Outlines of General Zoology (1924). Newman was particularly concerned with the dangers of miscegenation.

♠ Harry OLSON (1867-1935) b. Chicago, IL; judge. Ed. LL.B., Union Col., Chi., 91; LL.D. Lake Forest (IL) University., 23. Advisory council and Board of Directors, 1923-30.

Olson, a Republican and Lutheran, served as Assist. States Attorney in Cook Co. for eight years. He was Chief Justice Chicago Municipal Court, 1906-1930 and a Trustee of Northwestern University. Olson was a member of the inner circle of the AES leadership. He helped establish the

Psychopathic Laboratory of Chicago Municipal Court in 1914 and appointed Harry Laughlin its official eugenics expert. He was chairman of the AES committee on crime prevention and a regular at board meetings.

♣ Frederick Henry Osborn (1887-1981) b. NY; business, eugenics, population control. His first paternal American ancestor was William Osborn who came to America from England in 1684 and settled in Salem, MA. His father, William Church Osborn was the brother of Henry Fairfield Osborn. Ed. A.B., Princeton, 10; post-grad. Trinity Coll., Cambridge 11-12. AES Board of Directors, 1928-72.

Began in business 1912 as Treas. and v.p. of the Detroit, Toledo and Ironton R.R. He was a partner in G.M.P. Murphy & Co. bankers, N.Y., 21-38. Apptd. Chairman of the presidents Advisory Committee on Selective Service (1940). Apptd. to brig. gen. rank in army moral division, 41; promoted to maj. gen., 43 as dir. of information and education. Apptd. deputy rep. U.S. on U.N. Atomic Energy Commission, 47-50. Trustee of the Population Council, the Carnegie Corporation of N.Y., The Frick College, Princeton, the Milbank Memorial Fund. dir. of the Population Assn. Author w/ F. Lorimer of Dynamic of Population (34); ed. Heredity and Environment (33) and Preface to Eugenics (40). One of the leading figures in the AES from 1928 to 1972. He was a Democrat and Presbyterian.

♠ Henry Fairfield OSBORN (1857-1935) b. Fairfield, CT; paleontologist. Ed. A.B. Princeton, 77; Sc.D. 80. His birthplace (Fairfiled, Conn.) was the home of generations of his mothers ancestors. His first paternal American ancestor arrived in America in 1684. His Uncle J. P. Morgan financed a number of his scholarly works. A founder of the AES he served on the board and advisory council, 1923-35.

Osborn studied anatomy and histology at Princeton under William Welch. Welch wrote that Osborn was the best student he ever had and introduced him to William Osler. In 1879 Osborn went to Europe and studied with Thomas Huxley in London. There he was introduced to Darwin and other important figures in European science. He returned to Princeton in 1881 where he taught for ten years. In 1891 he went to Columbia University to organize a department of biology and to organize and head the department of mammalian paleontology at the Am. Museum of Natural History. His connection with the Museum continued for the next forty-five years.

Osborn was America's best known paleontologist. He engaged in public debates with William Jennings Bryan and John Roach Straton, a Baptist minister. He took an active part in preparing the defense in the Scopes trial in Tennessee in 1925. He published a number of popular books in defense of evolution including The Earth Speaks to Bryan (1925) and Evolution and Religion in Education (1926). In

1908 he became pres. of the Museum and held that post for the next 25 years. He also published Men of the Stone Age (1925) which was also very popular.

Osborn was one of the great statesmen of science of his day. He was known world-wide and received almost every honor open to a man of science including awards from learned societies in fifteen countries. Among his other distinctions he was senior paleontologist and geologists of the United States Geological Survey, pres. of the Paleontological Society, the New York Zoological Society, and the Audubon Society of New York.

Osborn was interested in eugenics from the very beginning of his career. He collaborated with Francis Galton in 1880 on a paper, "Questions Upon the Visualizing and other Allied Faculties." He became a major leader of American Eugenics. He was a founder of the Am. Eugenics Society, pres. of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, a member of the Galton Society and the Eugenics Research Assn. Osborn was v.p. of the International Commission of Eugenics. Osborn was active in the AES from its origins as the Committee on Eugenics in 1921 to his death in 1935.

♣ \*Robert Latham OWEN (1856-1947) b. Lynchburg, VA; banker, U.S. Senator. His father was President of the Virginia & Tennessee Railroad and a member of the Virginia state legislature. He was part Cherokee on his mother's side. Ed. A.M., Washington & Lee University, 77. Advisory council, 1923.

After graduating from Washington and Lee he moved with his mother to Indian Territory (later Oklahoma). Robert Owen was active in Indian affairs and is best known as author of the Act of Congress of 3 March 1901 which gave citizenship to all Indians in the Indian Territory. He also acted as a lawyer for a number of Indian tribes winning millions of dollars from the Federal government for the Choctaws, Cherokees, and Chickasaws. The largest settlement being five million dollars for the eastern Cherokees.

Owen served as the first Senator from Oklahoma from 1907 to 1925. He opened the first bank on Indian territory and became chairman of the Senate committee on banking and currency. He was largely responsible for drafting the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. He fought for the U.S. Public Health Service, child labor legislation, and womens suffrage and was a leading advocate of the League of Nations Covenant. He was an Episcopalian and a Democrat.

♣ \*George Howard PARKER (1864-1955) b. Philadelphia, PA; zoologist. Ed. Harvard, B.S., 87; S.D., 91; Leipzig, Berlin, Freiberg, Naples, 91-93. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Parker did his graduate work at Harvard under E. L. Marks. He also worked with William James who encouraged him in his study of the evolution of the nervous systems. After returning from his post-graduate study in Europe he was appointed an instructor in zoology at Harvard and remained at Harvard the rest of his career and was promoted to full professor in 1906.

Parker was best known for his introductory course in zoology which he taught for thirty years. Spending his summers working at Woods Holes, he began by working with the U.S. Department of Fisheries and later the Marine Biological Laboratory. His experimental work in neurology brought him international recognition. He wrote or contributed to six books and authored nearly 300 articles. Among those relating to eugenics were The Evolution of Man (1922); What Evolution Is (1925); Human Biology and Racial Welfare edited by E.V. Cowdry (1930); and The Problem of Mental Disorder (1934).

▲ \*Stewart PATON (1865-1942) b. New York, NY; psychiatrist. Ed. Princeton, B.A. 86, M.A. 89; M.D. Columbia, 89. Post graduate study in Germany and Italy. Lecturer in neurology at Princeton, 11-26. Consultant in mental hygiene at Yale, 26-28. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Paton was a Trustee of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Considered a leader in the field of psychiatry and mental hygiene, he was an extremely active member of the

Eugenics Research Assn. from at least 1919 to 1928. He served as President from 1919-20 and a member of the Executive Committee of the ERA from 1923 to 1928. He was the Chairman of the ERA Committee on Human Behavior and was particularly interested in devising means to interests college students in their "eugenic genealogy." Among his major publication were Psychiatry: Text-Book for Students and Physicians, (1905), Human Behavior (1921), Signs of Sanity and the Principles of Mental Hygiene (1922), and Prohibiting Minds and the Present Social and Economic Crisis (1933).

♠ \*Ellen Fitz PENDELTON (1864-1936) b. Westerly, RI; college pres.. Her ancestors settled in Watertown, Mass., about 1635. Ed. B.A., Wellesley 86, M.A. 91. Advisory council, 1923.

Pendelton spent her entire career at Wellesley beginning as a tutor in 1886. She served as dean and associate professor of math between 1901-11 and President from 1911 to 1936. She served at various times as President of the New England Assn. of Colleges and chairman of the College Entrance Examination Board. She was a Republican, Baptist, and liberal.

♠ \*Henry Farnham PERKINS (1877-??) b. Burlington, VT; zoologist. Ed. B.A., U. of Vt., 98; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 02. An important member of the AES, he served as President of the Society (1931-34) and as a director (1934-1947). He

led the campaign for eugenic sterilization in Vermont which resulted in the eugenic sterilization law of 1931.

Perkins taught at Vermont from 1902 to 1945. He was curator of the University Museum (1926-31) and director (1931-45). He was research assistant at the Carnegie Institution (1903-5) and director of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont (1925-37). The Survey was funded by a grant for \$87,000 from the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Foundation. He was secretary of the Commission on Country Life in Vt. (1928-31). He was a Republican and a Congregationalist. He was also a member of the Life Extension Institute.

♠ \*John Clayton PHILLIPS (1870-1943) b. nr. Vermont, IL; governor of Arizona. Ed. Hedding College, 89-93 (n.d.), Sprague Correspondence School. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Phillips was admitted to the bar in 1896. He moved to Phoenix in 1898. Territorial Probate Judge, 02-12. Member, Arizona House of Rep., 1916-22, Ariz. Senate, 22-24; gov. of Ariz., 29-31. Phillips was a Progressive Republican, Methodist, and a conservationist. He was instrumental in setting up the state fish and game department during his term as governor.

♠ \*Gifford PINCHOT (1865-1946) b. Simsbury, CT; Governor of Pennsylvania. His grandfather, a soldier in Napoleon's army, came to the U.S. in 1815. Ed. A.B., Yale, 89; studied forestry in France, Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.



Pinchot was an important figure in the Eugenics movement. He was a delegate to the first and second International Congresses of Eugenics. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Pinchot led the push for a Federal National Forest Commission in 1895. When the commission was appointed in 1896, Pinchot became one of its seven members. Two years later he was invited to become chief of the forestry division of the Department of Agriculture. In 1905 he was appointed the first chief forester for the Forest Reserves created by Congress. During his tenure he gained a national reputation as the chief apostle of the conservation movement.

Pinchot took an active part in the formation of the Progressive Party when Roosevelt failed to secure the Republican nomination for pres. in 1912. He helped to draft the new parties platform and became one of the leaders of the Party. In 1923 Pinchot defeated the Republican "Old Guard" and became the Governor of Pennsylvania. During his tenure he revised the laws regarding the care and treatment of the feeble-minded and insane. In Pennsylvania a governor cannot succeed himself but Pinchot served a second term between 1931-35. Pinchot was founder and pres. of the Society of Am. Foresters (1900-08; 10-11), chairman of the National Conservation Assn. (08-10; pres. 10-25), member of the National Society of Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims and the Am. Museum of Nat. History. He was the author of

numerous books on conservation and progressive politics including The Power of Monopoly Its Make-Up and Its Menace (1928). He was a Republican and a member of the Episcopal Church.

♣ \*Paul Bowman POPENOE (1888-??) b. Topeka, KA; author, biologist, eugenicist. Ed. Occidental College, L.A., 05-07; Stanford 08. His family, originally French Huguenots arrived in America in 1696. Popenoe was a major figure in American eugenics. He was an admirer of Hitler and a defender of the Nazi eugenics program in the thirties. He served on the advisory council from 1923 to 1935 and on the board after that and served on the AES Committee on the History and Survey of the Eugenics Movement. He was a member of the Eugenics Research Assn., the Am. Genetics Assoc., the Genetics Assoc. of Am., the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, the Am. Assoc. for the Study of Human Heredity, the Population Assn. of Am., and the Am. Social Hygiene Assoc.

Popenoe was influenced by David Starr Jordan at Stanford. He was editor of the J. of Heredity between 1913 and 1917. After the War Popenoe joined the Am. Social Hygiene Assn. in New York becoming executive secretary in 1920. Between 1926-37 he served as director of the Human Betterment Foundation in Pasadena. In 1930 he founded the Am. Inst. for Family Relations in L.A.. The Institute was

the first in America to serve as a research and counselling agency in the fields of marriage, heredity, and parenthood.

He was the author along with Roswell Johnson of Applied Eugenics (1918, revised 1933) which served as a standard work in the field. It was translated into German and Japanese. He is also known for his book Sterilization for Human Betterment (1929) published by the Foundation for Human Betterment with E.S. Gosney as co-author. This work, too, was translated into German and Japanese.

♠ \*Domingo F. RAMOS (no dates). Physician and Assoc. Prof. of Clinical Surgery at the School of Medicine, U. of Havana. Besides Archibald Hunstman, the only other foreign member of the advisory council serving from 1923 to 1935.

He was a member of the International Committee of Eugenics as early as 1912. He was a founder of the Pan American Assn. of Eugenics and Homiculture. He served as v.p. for the Third International Cong. of Eugenics in 1931. He was appointed Director of Sanitation of the Cuban Government in 1935. The Pan American Health Conference and Eugenics Assn. were closely associated. In 1935 the Tenth Pan American Health Conference met simultaneously with the Third conference on Eugenics and Homiculture.

♠ \*Watson Smith RANKIN (1879-1970) b. Mooresville, NC; physician and public health official. Ed. N.C. M.D., U. of

Maryland, 01; post-grad., Johns Hopkins, 02. Advisory council, 1923-35.

In 1927, he joined with other members of the AES to petition to the President, Senate and Congress to restrict the flow on "non-white" immigrants from North and South America.

Rankin investigated hookworm for N. C. Board of Health, 04-05. Credited with helping eradicate hookworm in N.C. Dean of School of Medicine at Wake Forest College (later the Bowman Grey School of Medicine). He was appointed director of the N.C. State Board of Health, 1909-25. He led the way to the establishment of county health departments throughout the state. In 1924 he served as director for the Am. Public Health Assn.'s committee on municipal health departments. In this capacity he originated the uniform scale of standards for city and county health associations. He also served as a trustee of the Duke Endowment from 1925-65 and was a leader in the establishment of Blue Cross in North Carolina. He also served as secretary and pres. of the Conference of Secretaries of State and Provincial Boards of Health Authorities of North America. He contributed numerous articles on public health and hospital matters to professional journals and spoke widely on public health issues. In 1955 the Watson Rankin Award for service to public health in N.C. was established. He served as President of the Am. Public Health Assn. in 1920. He was a

member of the National Assoc. for the Prevention of Tuberculosis and National Assoc. for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality. He was affiliated with the Myers Park Baptist Church and the Democratic party.

♠ \*Stuart Arthur RICE (1889-1969) b. Wadena, MN; sociologist. Ed. U. of Washington, A.B., 12, A.M., 15; Ph.D., Columbia, 24. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Rice worked in community service in New York, 1913-17. Taught sociology at Dartmouth, 23-26; at U. of PA., 26-40. Assist. Dir. of the Census, 33-36. He was a member of the staff of the SSRC, 31-32. Member of the Int. U. for the Study of Pop.; Pres. of the Am. Statistical Assoc., 1933; v.p. of the AAAS, 1937; Asst. Dir. Bureau of Budget for statistics, Office of the President, 1940-55. He was author of Farmers and Workers in American Politics (1924) and Quantitative Methods in Politics (1928). Editor of Statistics in Social Studies (1930).

♠ \*Aaron J(oshua) ROSANOFF (1878-1943) b. Pinsk, Russia; emigrated to the United States in 1891; psychiatrist. Ed. M.D. Cornell, 00. physician, Kings Park Hospital, 01-22. He was closely associated with ERO and a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Rosanoff was a psychiatrist for the L.A. Diagnostic Clinic, 22-43. He was California's State Director of Institutions and State Commissioner of Lunacy in 1933. He

was the author of the Manual of Psychiatry (1920), a medical school textbook. He was a member of the editorial Board of the Am. J. of Psychiatry.

♠ \*Edward Alsworth ROSS (1866-1961) b. Virden, IL; sociologist. Ed. A.B., Coe College, 86; U. of Berlin, 88-89; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 91. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Professor of economics at Cornell, Stanford, Nebraska and other schools until taking up a position at the U. of Wisconsin, 1906-37. President of the Am. Sociological Soc. 1914-15; sec. Am. Econ. Assn., 92-93. Author Social Control (1901); The Foundations of Sociology (1905) and other standard texts in sociology. He also authored two important works in eugenics and population control, The Old World in the New (1914) and Standing Room Only (1927). Ross was quite active in the eugenics movement and later in the population control movement. He lectured widely outside academia and was popular both for his lectures and for his many popular books and articles. He coined the term "race suicide" which became a rallying cry within the eugenics movement.

♠ \*Mary Harriman (Mrs. Charles Carey) Rumsey (1881-1934) b. N.Y.C., NY; philanthropist. Her first American ancestor arrived in the America in 1637. Ed. Barnard, B.A., 1905. Advisory council, 1923 to her death in 1934.

Mary Rumsey was a member of the board of the Eugenics Record Office from 1932 to 1934. She was in charge of entertainment at the Third International Congress of Eugenics. Her interest in eugenics also led her to be Chairman of the Mental Hygiene Committee of the New York State Charities Aid Assn..

Rumsey was the eldest the Harriman's six children. In 1901 she led the New York debutantes in founding the Junior league which aimed at encouraging girls of the privileged class to take an interest in community welfare. She broke with the families Republican tradition and supported Alfred E. Smith for pres. in 1928. Rumsey was also a personal friends with Eleanor Roosevelt and Francis Perkins. After the death of her husband she lived with Perkins in Washington. She was an ardent supporter of the New Deal. President Roosevelt appointed her chairman of the consumer's advisory council board of the National Recovery Administration in 1934. She fell from a horse in a riding accident in 1934 and was killed. She was considered one of the most distinguished women in the United States.

At Barnard College she took courses in eugenics and after spending a summer at the Biological Laboratory at Cold Spring Harbor working with Charles Davenport, she became an ardent supporter of eugenics. It was in part at her urging that Mrs. E. H. Harriman agreed to finance the Eugenics Record Office in 1910. Rumsey even experimented with cattle

breeding and developed a lively interest in agricultural affairs.

▲ \*Charles Elmer SAWYER (1860-1924) b. Nevada, OH; physician. Received M.D. at Homeopathic Hospital College, Cleveland, Ohio in 1881. Advisory council, 1923-24.

He developed the Sawyer Sanatorium in Marion, Ohio. A close associate of Warren G. Harding, he went to Washington, D.C. with Harding in 1921 after the presidential election. He was commissioned Brigadier-general of the medical reserve corp of the U.S. Army. He returned to Marion shortly after the death of Harding in 1923. Sawyer was v.p. of the Marion National Bank, a fellow and governor of the Am. College of Physicians and Surgeons, and pres. and chairman of the executive committee of the Am. Inst. of Homeopathy. He was also pres. of the Ohio State Medical Board. He was a Lutheran and a Republican.

▲ \*Carl Emil SEASHORE (1866-1949) b. in Sweden; psychologist and college dean. Ed. A.B., Gustavus Adolphus Coll., 91; Ph.D., Yale, 95. Advisory council, 1923-35. He was also a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. and a close associate of Charles Davenport. Between 1921 and 1930 Seashore and Davenport mounted a joint project to study the inheritance of musical ability. The Eugenics Record Office prepared a special package to explain and record the Seashore music test. Seashore presented a paper at the Second Int. Cong.



of Eugenics in 1921 on "Racial Differences in Musical Ability."

Taught at University of Iowa from 1897-1937; dean of the graduate college, 1908-36. His father was a Lutheran lay preacher. Adolphus College in Minnesota was closely associated with the Swedish community. He published Elementary Experiments in Psychology (1908) which was used by graduate students. He is best known for his methods of testing musical ability - the Seashore Measures of Musical Talent. In 1919 he published, The Psychology of Musical Talent. He had a strong interest in gifted children and advocated separate classes for the gifted, and for six years he headed a NRC project to disseminate this idea. Seashore was pres. of the Am. Psychological Assn. in 1911 and v.p. of the Psychology section of the AAAS in 1926-27. Between 1920-1921 he served as Chairman of the Division of Anthropology and Psychology of the NRC. Seashore was raised a conservative Lutheran but in his adult career joined a Congregational Church.

♣ \*Florence Brown SHERBON (1869-1944) b. Washington Co., IA; child care specialist. Ed. Ph.B. U., Iowa, 92, A.M., M.D., 04. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Sherbon was an extremely active member of the AES. She authored a regular column for Eugenics between 1928 and 1931. She was active in the Committee on Popular Education, one of the Society's most active committees as well as a

member of the Committee on Exhibits which arranged exhibits at State and County fairs.

After a short stint teaching high school and working as a nurse attendant, Sherbon became superintendent of the State Hospital in Iowa City (1900) and between 1904-15, superintendent of the Victoria Sanatorium in Colfax, Iowa. She moved on to the U. of Kansas where she took over the physical ed. department and was appointed chief of child hygiene for the state Bd. of Health (1919-20). In 1921 she was appointed professor of child care at the University of Kansas. She was a member of the Kansas Mental Hygiene Assn. and the state Tuberculosis Assn. She was author of numerous health care books probably the most well-known being the Mother's Manual (1920).

♠ \*Aaron Franklin SHULL (1881-1961) b. Miami Co., OH; zoologist specialized in genetics and evolution. Ed. A.B., U. of Mich., 08; Ph.D. Columbia, 11. Advisory council, 1927-35.

His father was a lay minister. Shull was stimulated to work in the field of heredity by T. H. Morgan and E. B. Wilson at Columbia. His best known work is in the field of sex determination. He taught at the U. of Michigan from 1911 to 1951. He was a prolific writer of textbooks and monographs. Among his best known texts are Heredity (1926); Evolution 1936 and Principles in Animal Biology (1919) which was one of the most popular general biology texts of its

day. His elder brother, G. H. Shull, a geneticist at Princeton, editor and founder of Genetics, was an avid eugenicist.

♠ \*William Freeman SNOW (1874-1950) b. Quincy, IL; public health administrator. Ed. Stanford, B.A., 96, M.A., 97; M.D. Cooper Medical College, 00. Post-graduate study at Johns Hopkins, 01-02. Advisory council, 1923-40.

He was appointed asst. prof. of Hygiene at Stanford in 1902. In 1909 he became executive officer in the California State Board of Health and in 1912 pres. of the State Provincial Health Authorities. Member of the California State Commission on Lunacy, 1910-14.

In 1914 Snow moved to New York where he became one of the founders and first chief executive of the Am. Social Hygiene Assn. He remained chairman of the Board of the ASHA until his death in 1950. During the War Woodrow Wilson appointed him to the National Council of Defense. He later served as lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Surgeon General's office and was stationed in France. (Hugh Cumming, AES Advisory Council member was Surgeon General). He was in charge of venereal disease prevention. During this period Snow developed both a national and an international reputation as an authority on public health matters.

From 1920 to 1926 he lectured on public hygiene at Johns Hopkins. During 1924-26 he was chairman of the League

of Nations Committee to Study the Traffic in Women and Children. He lectured on health education at Columbia from 1928-40 and on preventive medicine at NYU from 1930-36. He was editor of the California Public Health Bulletin from 1909 to 1914 and the J. of Social Hygiene from 1914 to 1919. He was pres. of the National Health Council from 1927 to 1934. Snow was a Republican.

♣ Robert James SPRAGUE (1868-1929) b. Frankford, ME; economist, sociologist, educator. Ed. Boston U. A.B., 97; A.M., 99, Ph.D., 01; post graduate work in Europe, 98, 03; M.A. Harvard, 00. Advisory council, 1925-28.

Sprague taught at Knox College, and U. of Maine between 1901 and 1911. He was head of Humanities and professor of economics and sociology at MA. Ag. College in Amherst, 1911-20; Dean of Rollins College, Winter Park. Sprague was one of the first to do studies of family size and class. His early work on the family size of women college graduates received wide attention. He believed America was producing a disproportionate number of inferior breeds. During his years at Winter Park, Florida he served as chairman of the Florida Eugenics Committee. He was a Congregationalist.

♣ Charles Rupert STOCKARD (1879-1939) b. Washington Co., MS; biologist, anatomist. Ed. Miss. Ag. Coll., B.S., 99; M.S., 01; Ph.D. Columbia, 06; M.D. Würzburg, 22. Stockard was an active member of the advisory council, 1923-35.

Stockard was an outspoken advocate of eugenics and eugenic sterilization. He was a member of the AES Committee on Research which was chaired by C.B. Davenport. He was also an active member of the Galton Society attending meetings regularly, presenting papers and serving on the Galton Society Committee on the Reclassification of Hominidae. He also worked with advisory council colleagues, Davenport, Laughlin, Cole, Barker, and Wissler on the NRC Committee on Human Heredity.

Stockard taught various aspects of zoology at Columbia from 1905 to 1911. He was a student of T.H. Morgan at Columbia. Morgan set Stockard to work on embryonic development treating fish eggs with toxic chemicals to produce mutations. One of Stockard's mutations, a cyclops fish, attracted wide attention. After receiving his Ph.D. he taught histology at Cornell Medical College in New York and spent his summers at Woods Hole, MA. Stockard developed a method of timing ovulation by histological examination of the cells of the vagina. He published over 150 articles on a wide range of topics. His work is both technical and popular. In 1931 he published The Physical Basis of Personality. He was managing editor of the Am. J. of Anatomy from 1921 to 1938. He was pres. of the Am. Society of Zoologists (1925) and Am. Society of Anatomists (1928-30). He was a trustee of the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, MA.

♣ (Theodore) Lothrop STODDARD (1883-1950) b. Brookline, MA; author, publicist. Ed. Harvard, A.B., 05; A.M., 10; Ph.D., 14; J.B. Boston U., 08. The Stoddard lineage extended back to seventeenth century Massachusetts. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Stoddard was also a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. and the Galton Society. He testified before the House Immigration Committee in 1924 and was chairman of the Publicity Committee for the Second International Congress of Eugenics. He was one of the most outspoken advocates of Nordic supremacy and an admirer of Adolf Hitler.

In 1918, after publishing, Present-Day Europe (1917) and Stakes of War (1918) Stoddard became foreign affairs editor for World's Work. In the 1920's Stoddard's books on the race issue won him renown. His most popular books were The Rising Tide of Color Against White-World-Supremacy (1920) and The Revolt Against Civilization (1922). Less popular but equally important in revealing his eugenic ideas were Racial Realities in Europe (1924) and Into the Darkness (1940) about Nazi Germany. Stoddard was invited to testify before Congress on the immigration issue and his work was praised by President Hoover. Stoddard was a Unitarian and a Republican.

♣ Francis Bertody SUMNER (1874-1945) b. Pomfret, CT; zoologist. Ed. B.S., U. of Minn., 94; Ph.D., Columbia, 01. Advisory council, 1927-35.

Sumners associations were typical of those academics interested in eugenics. He was a member of the Am. Genetics Society, Euthanasia Society of America, Am. Birth Control League, and the Save the Redwoods League. He opposed open immigration and firmly believed America's class structure was dependent upon hereditary mental and physical differences.

He taught at City College, New York from 1899-1906. Sumner was a naturalist. He spent his summers at the U.S. Bureau of fisheries at Woods Hole, MA. From 1903 to 1911 he was director of the laboratory. Between 1909 and 1910 he studied at Naples. In 1913 he became a member of the staff of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. He taught at the U. of California, La Jolla from 1913 to his retirement in 1944. He was Chairman of Section F of the AAAS in 1938 and pres. of the Western Society of Naturalists (1921-22).

♣ Wilbur Willis SWINGLE (1891-1975) b. Warensburg, MO; zoologist. Ed. U. of Kansas, B.A., M.A.; Ph.D. Princeton, 20. Taught at Kansas 1915-18, Yale, 1920-26 and Iowa 1926-29. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Swingle taught at Princeton for over thirty years. Swingle was an endocrinologist. He authored over two hundred published research papers and was cited in 1959 for his contribution to the field. He was a Protestant and a Republican.

↑ Lewis Madison TERMAN (1877-1956) b. on a farm in in Johnson County, IN; psychologist. Ed. A.B., Indiana, 02, A.M., 03; fellow Clark, 03-05, Ph. D. 05. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Terman was a major figure in the eugenics movement. He served on the AES committee on psychometry along with Thorndike and Yerkes. He was also a member of the Eugenic Research Assn.

Terman was a Republican and had two children. He served as President of the Am. Psychological Assn. in 1923, the National Academy of Sciences (shortly after the APA election), and the Am. Social Hygiene Assn. in 1917. During the 1920s he was co-author of the Stanford Achievement Tests. In 1930s he was engaged in testing the differences in mental ability between men and women. At the time of his death, at Stanford, he was engaged in writing volume five of the Genetic Studies of Genius which he had begun in 1925.

Terman was afflicted with a poor constitution associated with Tuberculosis, from which he suffered most of his life. He spent a good deal of this career studying genius and one of his goals was to support the work of Francis Galton, who had argued that genius usually is associated with a strong and vigorous body. Galton, himself was infertile, probably the result of venereal disease he picked up in Northern Africa. There was a belief that



genius might be genetically associated with insanity, weakness, and general degeneration.

He is best known for his revision of the Binet test and his testing program for the U.S. Army during World War I. He was author of numerous important books in psychology including The Stanford Revision of the Binet Scale (1916). Genetic Studies of Genius Volumes I, II and III (1916-1930). But he also wrote some less well known works which were of interest to eugenicists such as The Hygiene of School Children (1914), Sex and Personality (1936), and Marital Happiness (1938).

The Eugenical News supplies a wealth of information about Terman. He submits articles explaining his work and other important eugenicist often comment extensively on his work. Terman was also closely associated with E.S. Gosney's Human Betterment Foundation. He served on the advisory board for the Foundation's study of eugenical sterilization in California.

♦ Robert James TERRY (1871-1966) b. St. Louis, MO; physician; professor of anatomy at Washington University in St. Louis. Ed. Cornell, 90-92; Mo. Medical College, M.D., 95; Edingurgh, 98; A.B. Washington, 01; Freiberg, 03. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Terry was a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. and the Am. Genetics Assn. He served as an anthropologist at

Barnes Hospital and Children Hospital in St. Louis. He was an associate editor of the American Journal of Physical Anthropology. Terry was a Democrat, Unitarian, and father of three children. He was the author of Introduction to the Study of Human Anatomy (1929). The Eugenical News had high praise for the Introduction which referred readers to Bibliographia Eugenia as the source of references to the literature of hereditary traits. Terry was Chairman of Section H of the AAAS in 1927. He wrote papers on anatomy, wild life conservation, anthropology and eugenics.

♠ Edward L(ee) THORNDIKE (1874-1949) b. Williamsburg, MA; descended from John Thorndike who came to the colonies in 1629 from England and settled in Salem; psychologist. Ed. A.B., Wesleyan, 95; A.B., Harvard, 96, 97; Ph.D., Columbia, 98. Advisory council, 1923-35

Thorndike served as Chairman of the Committee on Psychometry. He also served as a member of the committee on Formal Education. Both these committees were quite active and membership on them indicates that Thorndike was an active member of the AES. Thorndike also active in the Galton Society and served on NRC's Committee on Family Records which developed methods for eugenical family record keeping. Part of his work on this committee and within the Galton was working for inclusion of racial descent in the U.S. Census data.

Thorndike was a Republican, Methodist, and father of five children. He was a major figure in both the history of psychology and eugenics. Thorndike spent most of his career at Columbia University (1899-1940, emeritus after 40). He was President of the AAAS in 1934 and the Am. Psychological Assn. in 1912. He was the author of numerous important book in psychology including widely used textbooks. He was considered one of the leading authorities on mental testing of his day.

♣ Victor Clarence VAUGHAN (1851-1929) b. Mt. Airy, MO; bacteriologist. The grandson of Sampson and Mary Vaughan who came to the U.S. from Wales in 1812, settling near Durham, N.C. He prepared for college under private tutors. Ed. B.S., Mt. Pleasant College, (Mo.) 72; M.S. Michigan, 75, Ph.D., 76, M.D., 78. Vaughan did post-graduate work under Robert Koch at the University of Berlin. Advisory council, 1923 to his death in 1929.

Vaughan joined the faculty of the University of Michigan in 1875 as assistant professor of chemistry. He taught various aspects of organic chemistry and medicine until 1887 when he founded the hygienic laboratory at Michigan. He served as director of the laboratory until 1909. In 1891 in appointed dean of the department of medicine and surgery serving in both capacities until he retired in 1921. Between 1883 and 1919 he was also pres. of the Michigan Board of Health. From 1919 to 1927 he served

as a member of the governing board of the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation and for several years was a member of the advisory committee of the U.S. public health service. After retiring from the U. of Michigan, Vaughan served as chairman of the division of medical science of the NRC. In 1922 he became the first editor of Hygenia, a popular health magazine published by the AMA. He was pres. of the AMA, 1914-15, the Assoc. of Am. Physicians, 1909-10, and the National Tuberculosis Assn., 1919-20. Vaughan was considered one of the foremost bacteriologist of his time who made major contributions to the field of public health.

♠ Sephen Sargent VISHER (1887-1967) geographer, b. Chicago, IL; the son of the reverend John Visser. His grandparents came to America from the Netherlands in 1846 and settled in Holland, Michigan. Ed. B.S., U. of Chicago, 09, M.S., 10, and Ph.D. 1914. Advisory council, 1930-35.

Visser taught at Indiana University from 1919 to 1958. He was a close associate of Ellsworth Huntington and coauthored a number of articles and books with Huntington. He was interested in both eugenics and conservation of natural resources. He was a member of the First Baptist Church of Bloomington, Indiana. He was married twice and had five children.

♣ August VOLLMER (1876-1955) b. New Orleans, LA; criminologist. He was without a high school diploma and received no college education. Advisory council, 1925-35.

A Republican and Unitarian, Vollmer was police chief of Berkeley, California between 1905 and 1932. He shot himself at the age of 79. He was known as the father of modern police science. He helped organize the police departments in L.A. and San Diego. He was a professor of police administration at various colleges including the U. of Chicago and University of California. He was the author of a number of books on criminology such as The Criminal (1949). Vollmer was the first to institute a finger print identification unit to a police department. In 1918 he began to introduce mental testing of police recruits. Over the years he was loaned to such cities as Chicago, Detroit, Kansas City, San Diego, and Havana, Cuba to study and reorganize their police systems. He served as the pres. for the International Assn. of Chiefs of Police. He had no children. The period 1905 to 1932 is called, "The Era of August Vollmer," by Gene and Elaine Carte in Police Reform in the United States: the Era of August Vollmer (1975).

♣ Herbert Eugene WALTER (1867-1945) b. Burke, VT; biologist. Ed. A.B., Bates College, 92; A.M., Brown, 93; studied several summers at Woods Hole, 92-05; U. of Freiburg, 94, 03; Ph.D. Harvard, 06. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Walter He was a member of the Eugenics Research Assn., Am. Genetics Assn., and the Am. Museum of Natural History. He was a Republican and Unitarian. He Taught Comparative anatomy at Brown between 1906 and 1937. He was also an instructor in field zoology at Cold Spring Harbor, 06-17 and assistant director of Cold Spring, 1917-26. For many years he taught a standard course on genetics at Brown and authored a standard textbook which the Eugenical News called, "the best of its type."

Walter taught a ten lecture special evening course on eugenics from 1929 on. Lecture topics included, "Weeding the Human Garden" and "Racial Poisons." Walter had an exhibit at the Third International Congress of Eugenics and by 1935 he "realized his ambition" to teach a full semester course on eugenics.

♠ Robert DeCoursey WARD (1867-1931) b. Boston, MA; Climatologist. The son of Henry and Anna (Saltonstall) Ward. His paternal roots go back to seventeenth century Maryland. The Saltonstall family on his mother's side go back to Puritan New England. Ed. B.A., 89, M.A., (93), Harvard. Advisory council, 1923 to his death in 1934.

Ward served on the important Committee on Selective Immigration. Ward was also a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. He was an Episcopalian and was one of the founders of the Immigration Restriction League in 1894.

Ward taught Climatology at Harvard for most of his career. He was also a member of the administrative board of Harvard. He studied the impact of the tropics on the white race and published these results in two book, Climate Considered Especially in Relation to Man (1908) and The Climate of the United States (1925). He was editor of the American Meteorological Journal (92-96) and edited the notes on meteorology in Science between 1896-1908. Ward was President of the Am. Assn. of Geographers in 1917 and the Am. Meteorological Society in 1920.

♠ William Henry WELCH (1850-1934) b. Norfolk, CT; pathologist. A descendant of Philip Welch who was stolen from his home in Northern Ireland in 1654 and sold to a shipmaster who brought him to Ipswich, Mass. Ed. B.A., Yale, 70; M.D. College of Physicians, Columbia, 75; extensive post-graduate work in Europe. Advisory council, 1923-30.

Welch was quite active in the eugenics movement. He was a founding member along with Alexander Graham Bell and Charles Davenport of the Eugenics Record Office. Welch served on the original committee of Scientific advisors to the ERO from 1912 to 1918. He was interested enough in world population problems to travel to Geneva for the organizing meeting of the International Population Union.

Welch became known as one of America's leading advocates of the newer bacteriology of the Koch school.

Among his students were Simon Flexner and Walter Reed. Welch was one of the guiding lights of the Johns Hopkins Medical School. He served as dean from 1893 to 1898 and as chairman of the department of pathology between 1889 and 1916. He was also Director of the School of Hygiene and Public Health between 1916-26; professor of the history of medicine between 1926 and 30; emeritus after 1930. He was President of the State Board of Health between 1898-22. Founder and President of the B. of Directors of the Rockefeller Inst. for Med. Research in 1901. He was member of the International Health Board and trustee of the Carnegie Inst. of Washington 1906-34). He was one of the organizers of the NRC in 1916. He was pres. of the AAAS in 1906; the Am. Medical Assn. in 1910; National Tuberculosis Assn., 1910; Am. Social Hygiene Assn., 1916-19, and Honorary President of the National Committee on Mental Hygiene. Welch was without doubt one of the major figures in American science. He was a pioneer in medicine and public health. On his 80th birthday in 1930 eminent men came from all over the world to honor him in Washington with President Hoover as the principle speaker. Welch never married.

♣ William Morton WHEELER (1865-1937) b. Milwaukee, WI; zoologist, Bussey Institution, Harvard. The Wheeler's came to the colonies from England in the 18th century settling in Eastern Massachusetts. Ed. Wheeler's early education was at the Englemann German Academy and the German-American Normal School. Clark University, Ph.D., 1892. He spent a year in



post-graduate work in Wurtzburg and Liège. In 1893 he spent a year at the Naples zoological station. Advisory council, 1923-30.

The Eugenical News followed his research with interest and found his book, Emergent Evolution and the Development of Societies (1928) of particular interest to eugenists.

He was curator of the Am. Museum of Natural History in New York from 1903-08 and between 1909-37 he was a research associate of the museum. In 1908 he became Professor of Economic Entomology at Harvard where he remained until his retirement in 1934. He was Dean of the Bussey from 1915 to 1929. Wheeler was regarded as the foremost authority in the world on ants and social insects.

♠ Albert Edward WIGGAM (1871-1957) b. Austin, IN; author. Wiggam's grandfather came to America from Ireland about 1820 and settled in Scott County, Indiana. His father was a farmer and lay preacher. Ed. B.S., Moore's Hill College, 93; M.A. Hanover College, 03. Advisory council and board, 1928-40.

Wiggam was one of the best known popular science writers of his day. He was an important eugenic propagandist. He was a journalist, editorial writer, and editor for various newspapers and magazines. He was a member of the AES Advisory Council from 1928-35 and a member of the AES Board from 1935-40. He served on the important

Committee on Popular Education which helped organize fitter family contests and shows at county fairs.

Wiggam was a dedicated eugenicist. He belonged to the Am. Genetics Assn., Eugenics Research Assn., and was on the editorial board of Eugenics magazine. He authored a number of very popular eugenics textbooks including The New Decalogue of Science (1923), The Fruit of the Family Tree (1924) and The Next Age of Man (1927). In 1922 both he and his wife were elected to the Executive Committee of the Eugenics Research Assn. He was a charter member of the AES in 1923 and in 1927 he was a member of the nominating committee to chose three directors for the AES. He served on this nominating committee in 1929 as well. Wiggam was also a member of the joint committee on policy of the Eugenical News during the period when it was published jointly be the AES and ERA.

In 1935 he began writing a syndicated column which appeared in numerous newspapers including the New York Evening Post. He wrote often on eugenical issues. In 1939 he authored a six page article, "Giving Publicity to Eugenics" which appeared in the Eugenical News. Wiggam's religious affiliation is not mentioned in his biographies. He was Republican and died without issue.

♠ Ray Lyman WILBUR (1875-1949) b. Boonsboro, IA.; physician, pres. of Stanford, secretary of the Interior. The great-grandson of Ezra Wilbur and the father of five children.

Ed. Leland Stanford Junior University (later Stanford), B.A., 96, M.A., 97; M.D., Cooper Medical College, 99. Post graduate work in Frankfurt, London, Munich, and Vienna, 03-04 and 09-10. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Wilbur was a member of the Eugenics Research Assn. The Eugenical News reported that Wilbur led the opening session of the Am. Health Congress in 1926. The discussion topic was "Is Public Health Improving the Race."

Wilbur practiced medicine in Palo Alto for several years while teaching physiology at Cooper Medical College (later part of Stanford). He became dean of the Stanford School of Medicine in 1911 and in 1916 was elected pres. of Stanford, succeeding advisory council member, David Starr Jordan. He held that office until 1943. Between 1940 and his death he was chancellor of the university. During World War II, Wilbur worked with Herbert Hoover and was appointed chief of conservation of the U.S. Food Administration. Later during Hoover's presidency Wilbur was appointed Secretary of the Interior. Thus, Wilbur had close ties with the Republican Party. Wilbur instituted Federal oil conservation policies during his administration and served on the Federal Oil Conservation Board from 1929 to 1933. He also reorganized the Bureau of Indian Affairs. On the state level he served as a member of the California State Park Commission.

Wilbur was involved in social reform for the control of syphilis, the reduction of illiteracy, and other social hygiene programs. With the defeat of Hoover in 1933, Wilbur returned to Stanford. In 1929 he organized the National Advisory Committee on Education to recommend federal policy in regards to education. The Committee recommended federal aid, particularly for the Negro.

From 1930 to 1940 he served as a Trustee of the Rockefeller General Education Board. From 1923 to 1940 he served as a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. He also was pres. of the Am. Social Hygiene Assn. between 1936 and 1948. He served as Chairman of the White House Conference on Child Care and Protection (1929-31). Wilbur served as chairman of the Institute for Pacific Relations and he chaired a committee of the Institute to survey race relations on the Pacific Coast. He was sponsor of the Japanese-American Citizens League and the Chinese Mass Educational Movement. Wilbur was pres. of the Assn. of Am. Medical Colleges (24), California Academy of Medicine (17-18).

▲ Harris Hawthorne WILDER (1864-1928) b. Bangor, ME; zoologist. Descendant of old New England Stock, his original paternal American ancestor was Thomas Wilder who settled in Charleston, Mass. in 1640. Ed. B.A., Amherst College, 86; Ph.D., Freiburg, 91. Advisory council, 1923.

A fellow of the Galton Society, Wilder taught at Smith College from 1892 to his death. He authored a number of books of interest to eugenicists such as, A Laboratory Manual for Anthropometry (1920) and The Pedigree of the Human Race (1926).

▲ Walter Francis WILCOX (1861-1964) b. Reading, MA; statistician. Ed. A.B. Amherst, 84, a.M., 88, LL.D., 06; LL.B., Columbia, 87, Ph.D. 91. Wilcox was charter member of the AES and a member of the advisory council, 1923-35.

Wilcox was particularly interested in the area of "differential fertility" and at the Second International Congress of Eugenics he presented a paper titled, "The Distribution and Increase of Negroes in the United States."

He was a Professor of economics and statistics at Cornell University, 1891-1931; Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, 1902-07. Chief statistician 12th U.S. Census; special agent for the U.S. Census, 1902-1931. President of the Am. Economic Assn., 1915; President of the Am. Statistical Assn., 1912. Wilcox was v.p. for the International Statistics Institute from 1923 to 1947. He regularly attended the international meetings of the Institute which convened each year in a major city such as London, Berlin, Tokyo, Madrid, and Mexico. He was also the President of the Section on Demography of the International Congress on Hygiene and Demography held in Washington in

1912. He was Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Am. Economic Assn.

Wilcox was active in Raymond Pearls International Union for the Scientific Study of Population Problems and was a leading figure in two huge international studies of human migration over the last century. Wilcox represented the National Bureau of Economic Research and the Am. Social Science Council on the League of Nations ongoing study of international migrations. The survey was being conducted under the Leagues International Labor Office. The project consisted on assembling data as far back as possible on migration patterns. The preliminary studies showed the phenomenal influence of European expansion and indicated the end of the barriers between racial groups. The question now was to determine the impact of this change.

♠ Milton Charles WINTERNITZ (1885-1959) pathologist; b. Baltimore. Ed. A.B., Johns Hopkins, 03; M.D., 07. AES Board, 1935-39.

Winternitz taught pathology at Johns Hopkins and Yale between 1917 and 1950.; dean of the Yale Medical School, 1920-35; associate director of the Institute for Human Relations at Yale, 1931-50. He was chairman of the division of medical sciences of the NRC, 1950-53. Member of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene and the Birth Control League.

♠ Clark WISSLER (1870-1947) b. Wayne County, IN; anthropologist, curator of the Am. Museum of Natural

History. His father was a public school superintendent and newspaper publisher. Ed. A.B., 97, A.M., 99, Indiana University. In 1899 went to Columbia University to teach anthropology and psychology. He received a Ph.D. from Columbia in 1901. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Wissler was an extremely active and dedicated eugenicist. He was the chairman of the AES subcommittee on Anthropology, a member of the Executive Committee and the Nominating Committee of the Eugenics Research Assn., and an active member of the Galton Society. He served on the Committee on Exhibits for the Second and Third International Congresses of Eugenics. He also was Secretary of Section III for both those Congresses. Section three dealt with "Human Racial Differences." He served on the Committee on Family Records of the NRC. This committee was organized out of work done by the ERA to set up standards for eugenical family research. The Committee consisted entirely of AES Advisory Council members.

He became curator of Anthropology for the Am. Museum of Natural History in 1905. In 1924 he became a Professor of Anthropology at Yale's Institute for Human Relations where he conducted research concerning the impact of race crossing race crossing. In 1925 at the instigation of the Galton Society Wissler and Edwin R. Embree, of the Rockefeller Foundation, traveled to Australasia and Hawaii to explore the possibilities of anthropological research in these

regions. Wissler was President of the Am. Anthropological Assn. (1919-21), New York Academy of Sciences (30-31), Am. Ethological Society (15-16). Hoover appointed him a member of the advisory board of the National Park Service.

♣ Frederick Adams WOODS (1873-1939) b. Boston. MA; biologist, author. Son of Solomon Woods, a prominent manufacturer. His first American ancestor was Samuel Woods and original landed proprietor of Groton, Mass. who married Alice Rushton in 1659. Ed. MIT, 90-94, nd; M.D., Harvard, 1898. Advisory council, 1923-35.

Woods was a dedicated eugenicist. He participated in two committees of the AES: the Committee on Research Problems in Eugenics and the Committee on the History and Survey of the Eugenics Movement. He was an editor of the J. of Heredity (1918-19) and Chairman of the Am. Genetics Assn.'s Committee on Research on Eugenics (1914-23). He was a member of the Eugenics Research Assn., the Galton Society, and v.p. of the International Congress for Studies Regarding Population Problems held in Rome in 1931.

He began teaching histology at Harvard in 1898. Between 1903 and 1923 he taught biology at MIT. He was a specialist in royal families of Europe. He published Mental and Moral Heredity in Royalty (1906). In 1924 he married the the Baroness Maria Therese de Lebzelter-Collenbach of Austria. In 1910 he published, "The Laws of Diminishing Environmental Influence" in Science. The article stated



that environment has diminishing effects the higher up the evolutionary ladder one goes. In 1921 he published a study of correlations between facial features and intelligence in the Journal of heredity. As early as the First International Congress of Eugenics, Woods outlined his theory that universal use of birth control would replace death control as an evolutionary process.

♠ Robert Simpson WOODWARD (1849-1924) b. Rochester, MI; astronomer, geographer, engineer, administrator. The son of Peninah Woodward, a farmer of New England stock. Ed. He graduated with a degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Michigan in 1872 and went to work on the U.S. Lake Survey. Advisory council, 1923.

In 1884 he was appointed astronomer on the U.S. Geological Survey and later its chief geographer. In 1904 he was chosen pres. of the Carnegie Institution of Washington and served in that post until 1920. Woodward was pres. of the AAAS in 1900. From 1884 to his death he was an editor of Science, and in 1888-89, of the Annals of Mathematics. With Mansfield Merriman he edited Higher Mathematics (1896) a college text. He wrote the chapters on probability and theory of errors.

♠ Sewall WRIGHT (1889-??) b. Melrose, MA; population geneticist. The son of Phillip Green and Elizabeth Quincy Sewall. His family came to America in the 17th century. Judge Samuel Sewall (1652-1729) was a judge at the Salem

witch trials of the 1690s. Ed. B.S., Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill., 1911; M.S., U. of Illinois, 1912; Sc.D. Harvard, 1915. Advisory council, 1925-35 and served on the Committee on Research Problems in Eugenics which was chaired by Charles Davenport.

Wright worked for the U.S. Department of Ag. 1915-25; assoc. prof. of zoology, U. of Chicago, 1926-55. President of the Genetic Society of America, 1934; Am. Soc. Zoologist, 1944 (treas. 1929-32). Sewall Wright is generally regarded as one of America's leading population geneticists. He presented a paper on the heritability of tuberculosis at the Second International Congress of Eugenics and at the 1921 meeting of the National Tuberculosis Assn.

♣ Robert Means YERKES (1876-1956) b. Breadysville, PA; psychologist. The son of Silas Yerkes, a farmer and descendant of Anthony Yerkes, a native of Holland who settled in Germantown, Pa., in 1700. Ed. Harvard, A.B., 1898, A.M., 1899. and Ph.D. in 1902. Advisory council, 1925-35.

Yerkes was quite active in the eugenics movement. He was a member of the AES Committee on Psychometry; the Galton Society, and the Eugenics Record Office. He was a member of the ERO Committee on the Genetic Basis of Human Behavior. Yerkes army testing work was used as a major source of proof that Southern and Eastern Europeans were intellectually inferior to Northwestern Europeans. He signed Memorial on

Immigration which called for restriction of all non-white immigrants.

Yerkes began teaching at Harvard in 1902. In 1917 he was called to Washington to serve as chief of the Division of Psychology, Office of the Surgeon General and chairman of the committee of psychology of the then newly created NRC. He supervised the introduction of mental measurement tests in thirty-five army training camps to 1.727 million recruits in 1919. His work in developing and testing in World War I is generally recognized as the most important event in the advance of I.Q. testing in the United States.

He was chairman of the Committee on Human Migration, which he organized in 1922. He was also chairman of the Committee on Research Problems in Sex from 1921 to 1947. He helped organize the Science Service in Washington which was dedicated to popularizing science. In 1924 he went to Yale to teach psychology. He remained at Yale for the rest of his career, organizing the Laboratory of Primate Biology to study chimpanzees in Orange Park, Florida in 1929. He wrote many books on animal behavior and mental measurement including An Introduction to Psychology, 1911. He was pres. of the Am. Psychological Assn., 1916-17; Am. Society of Naturalists, 1938.

## Bibliography

\*\*\*\*\*

## Manuscript Collections

\*\*\*\*\*

American Eugenics Society Papers, American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, PA).

Minutes of the American Eugenics Society, 1925-1975.  
Located at the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, PA).

Minutes of the Eugenics Committee of the U.S.A., 1922-1925.  
Located at the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, PA).

Minutes of the Executive Session of the Second International Congress of Eugenics are Part of the AES Papers, American Philosophical Society Library (Philadelphia, PA).

Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center (Tarrytown, NY).

Carnegie Institution of Washington: Papers of the Department of Genetics and Eugenics Record Office, Carnegie Institution (Washington, D.C.).

Charles B. Davenport Papers, American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, PA).

Harry Laughlin Papers, Northeast Missouri State University (Kirksville MO).

Herbert Spenser Jennings Papers, American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, PA).

Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center (Tarrytown, NY).

Pamphlets and Reports of the American Eugenics Society.

Report of the President of the American Eugenics Society, Inc. (New Haven, 26 June 1926) 40 pp.

Research Problems in Eugenics: A Report of the Committee on Research (New Haven, 1926) 3 pp.

A Eugenics Catechism (New Haven, 1926) 10 pp.

The American Eugenics Society (New Haven, 1927) 16 pp.

Organized Eugenics (New Haven 1930) 31 pp.

Eugenics at Work (New Haven 1931) 4 pp.

What I Think About Eugenics (New Haven, nd, circa 1930-31) 8 pp.

American Eugenics: Being the Proceedings at the Annual Meeting and Round Table Conference of the American Eugenics Society (New York, 7 May 1936) 67 pp.

The Development of Eugenic Policies: Scientific Background for a New Orientation of Eugenics. Prepared for the participants at the 1937 and 1938 conferences on eugenics in relation to nursing, medicine, education and family life. (New York, 1937) 23 pp.

Report of the Conference on the Relation of Eugenics to the Fields of Recreation, Nursing, Education and Medicine (New York, 14 May 1937) 38 pp.

Practical Eugenics: Aims and Methods of the American Eugenics Society (New York, 1938) 24 pp.

A Eugenics Program for the United States (New York, nd, circa 1939) 23 pp.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Government Publications

\*\*\*\*\*

Acts of the Assembly of the State of Virginia. "An ACT to provide for the sexual sterilization of inmates of State institutions in certain cases" (Richmond, 1924) pp. 569-571.

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Admission of Aliens in Excess of Percentage Quota for June. Hearings, 67th Congress, 1st session, 1921.

Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot. Hearings 67th Congress, 3rd session, 1923.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.  
Biological Aspects of Immigration. Hearings, 66th  
 Congress, 2nd session, 1920.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Europe  
 as an Emmigratr-Exporting Nationa and the United  
 States as an Immigrant-receiving Nation. Hearings,  
 68th Congress, 1st session, 1924.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.  
Immigration. Hearings, 67th Congress, 2nd session,  
 1921-1922.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.  
Modified Percentage Plans for Restriction of  
 Immigration. Hearings, 66th Congress 2nd session,  
 1920.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.  
Proposed Changes in Naturalization Laws:  
 Resitration and Americanization of Aliens.  
Hearings, on H.R. 3911, 66th Congress, 1st  
 session, 1919.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.  
Restriction of Immigration. Hearings, on H.R. 5,  
 H.R. 101, and H.R. 561, 68th Congress, 1st  
 session, 1923-1924.

Senate. Committee on Immigration Emergency  
Immigration Legislation 67th Congress, 3rd  
 session, 1921.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Primary Sources

\*\*\*\*\*

ALLEN, William H. Modern Philanthropy: A Study of Efficient  
 Appealing and Giving. With Foreward by Mary  
 Harriman. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company,  
 1912).

ALLEN, William. "The Relationship of Eugenics to Public  
 Health," Eugenical News 21 #4 (July-August 1936)  
 pp. 73-75.

BARR, Martin W. "The Imperative Demand for Legislation to  
 Arrest the Rapid Increase of Degeneracy," The  
 Alienist and Neurologist 34 #4 (November 1913) pp.  
 3-11.

- BAUER, Erwin; Eugen Fischer, Fritz Lens, Menschliche Erblchkeitslehre (Munchen: Lehmanns Verlag, 1927) translated into English by Eden and Cedar Paul as Human Heredity (New York: Macmillan, 1931).
- BINDER, Rudolph M. "Germany's Population Policy," Eugenical News 23 #6 (November-December 1938) pp. 113-116.
- BINDING, Karl and Alfred Hoche. Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens: Ihr Mass und ihre Form (Leipzig: F. Meiner, 1920). Translated into English as The Release of the Destruction of Life Devoid of Value by Robert L. Sassone (Santa Ana: Privately published, 1975).
- BLACKER, C.P. Eugenics, Galton and After (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1952).
- BORING, E.G. A History of Experimental Psychology (Appelton, New York, 1950)
- BRIGHAM, Carl C. A Study of American Intelligence (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1923).
- BRUEHL, Charles P. Birth Control and Eugenics In the Light of Fundamental Ethical Principles (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1928).
- "Intelligence Tests of Immigrant Groups," Psychological Review 37 (March 1930) pp. 158-165.
- CAMPBELL, Clarence G. "The German Racial Policy," Eugenical News 21 #2 (March-April 1936) pp. 25-29.
- CARREL, Alexis. Man, The Unknown (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1935, 1936).
- CASTLE, William Ernest. Genetics and Eugenics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916).
- "Race Mixture and Physical Disharmonies," Science 71 (June 13, 1930) pp. 603-606.
- CHESTERTON, G.K. Eugenics and Other Evils (London: Cassell & Co., 1922).
- COMMONS, John R. "Natural Selection, Social Selection, and Heredity," The Arena 18 (July 1897) pp. 90-97.
- Races and Immigrants in America (New York: The Macmillan, 1920).

CONKLIN, Edwin Grant. Heredity and Environment in the Development of Man (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915).

"Some Biological Aspects of Immigration," Schribner's Magazine, 69 (March, 1921), pp. 352-359.

"The Future of America: A Biological Forecast," Harpers Magazine 156 (April 1928) pp. 529-539.

"Some Recent Criticisms of Eugenics," Paper read at the Galton Society, April 6, 1928. Eugenical News 8 #5 (May 1928).

COOK, Robert. "A Year of German Sterilization," J. of Heredity 26 #12 (December 1935) pp. 485-489.

COOLIDGE, Calvin. "Whose Country Is This?" Good Housekeeping Magazine 72 (February 1921) pp. 13-14 ff.

CREEL, George. "Close the Gates!: The Way to Shut a Door Is to Shut It." Collier's 69 (6 May 1922) pp. 9-10 ff.

DAHLBERG, Gunnar. Race, Reason, and Rubbish Trans. from the Swedish by Lancelot Hogben. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942).

DARROW, Clarence. "The Eugenics Cult" The American Mercury 8 #30 (June 1926) pp. 129-137.

DARWIN, Leonard. "The Methods of Eugenics." Scientific Monthly 13 (21 August 1921) pp. 186-7.

DAVENPORT, Charles, Heredity in Relation to Eugenics, (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1911).

"The Effects of Race Intermingling," Proceeding of the American Philosophical Society 56 (1917) pp. 364-368.

EAST, Edward M. and D. F. Jones. Inbreeding and Outbreeding (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1919).

Mankind at the Crossroads (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924).

Heredity and Human Affairs, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927).

Eugenical News



"Eugenical Sterilization in Germany," Eugenical News 18 #5 (September-October 1933) pp. 89-96.

"Eugenics as Romance," editorial in the New York Times (25 September 1921) section II, p. 2.

Eugenics, Genetics and the Family (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1923)

"Eugenics in Germany," a summary of information transmitted to the Eugenics Record Office by Dr. Eugen Fischer, director of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie. Eugenical News 19 #2 (March-April 1934) pp. 40-43.

"Eugenics in Germany: Motion Picture Showing How Germany is Presenting and Attacking Her Problems in Applied Eugenics," Eugenical News 22 #4 (July-August 1937) pp. 65-66.

Eugenics in Race and State (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1923).

FAIRCHILD, Henry Pratt. Greek Immigration to the United States (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911).

Immigration: A World Movement and its American Significance (New York: Macmillan, 1913; 2nd edition, 1919).

Outline of Applied Sociology (New York: Macmillan, 1916).

"After-War Immigration Crisis: Two Bills Before Congress -- Needs of Laborers vs. Desirability of Restrictions," New York Times (12 October 1919) section III, p. 6.

Elements of Social Science; an introduction to the study of life and society (New York: Macmillan, 1924).

The Melting Pot Mistake (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1926).

The Foundations of Social Life (New York: John Wiley; London: Chapman & Hall, 1927)

General Sociology (New York: John Wiley; London: Chapman & Hall, 1934)

Main Street: The American Town, Past and Present (New York: The Greystone Press, 1941).

(ed.) Dictionary of Sociology (New York: Philosophical Library, 1944).

Race and Nationality (New York: Ronald Press, 1947).

"The Findings of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont," Eugenical News 12 #8 (August 1927) p. 106.

First International Eugenics Congress. Scientific Papers and appendices. (London: The Eugenics Education Society, 1912-13).

FRICK, Wilhelm. "German Population and Race Politics," Address before the first meeting of the Expert Council for Population and Race-Politics Held in Berlin, 28 June 1933. Translated by A. Hellman for the Eugenical News 19 #2 (March-April 1934) pp. 33-38.

GALTON, Francis. Hereditary Genius: An Inquiry into Its Laws and Consequences (London: Macmillan, 1869).

English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture (London, 1874).

Inquiries Into Human Faculty (London: Macmillan, 1883).

Memories of My Life (London: Methuen & Co., 1908).

"Hereditary Talent and Character," Macmillan's Magazine 12 (London, 1865) pp. 157-66; 318-27.

GARIS, Roy L. Immigration Restriction: A Study of the Opposition to the Regulation of Immigration to the United States. (New York: The Macmillan, 1927).

GIDDINGS, Franklin Henry. The Principles of Sociology; an analysis of the phenomena of association and of social organization 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan 1896).

The Elements of Sociology; a text-book for colleges and schools (London: Macmillan, 1898).

A Theory of Social Causation (New York: Macmillan, 1904)

Studies in the Theory of Human Society (New York: Macmillan, 1922).

The Scientific Study of Human Society (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1924).

Civilization and Society; an account of the development and behavior of human society  
Arranged and edited by Howard Odum. (New York: Henry Holt, 1932).

GODDARD, Henry Herbert. The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness (New York: Macmillan, 1912).

Feeblem-Mindedness: Its Causes and Consequences  
(New York: Macmillan, 1912).

GOETHE, C.M. "Patriotism and Racial Standards," Eugenical News 21 #4 (July-August 1936) pp. 65-69.

"Eugenics and Geography," Eugenical News 22 #3 (May-June 1937) p. 47.

"Extinction of the Inca Highcastes," Presidential Address before the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Eugenics Research Association. Eugenical News 22 #4 (July-August 1937) pp. 51-57.

GOULD, Charles Winthrop. America. A Family Affair (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920; rev. ed., 1922).

GRANT, Madison. The Passing of the Great Race (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916; second edition, revised and amplified, 1918)

"The Racial Transformation of America," North American Review 219 (March 1924) pp. 343-352.

"Restriction of Immigration: Racial Aspects," J. of the National Institute of Social Sciences 7 (1921) pp. 44-54.

and Charles Steward Davison. (eds.) The Alien in Our Midst or "Selling Our Birthright for a Mess of Pottage": The Written Views of a Number of Americans (Present and Former) on Immigration and Its Results (New York: The Galton Publishing Company, 1930).

GUYER, Michael Frederic. Being Well Born (Indianapolis: Bobs-Merrill, 1916).

Animal Biology (New York: Harper, 1931; 5th rev. ed., 1964).

HALDANE, J.B.S. Heredity and Politics (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1938).

HALL, Prescott F. Immigration and Its Effects on the United States (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1906).

Eugenics, Ethics and Immigration IRL Publication #51. (Boston: Immigration Restriction League, 1909).

HANSEN, Klaus. "The Norwegian Sterilization Law of 1934 and Its Results," Eugenical News 21 #6 (November-December 1936) pp. 129-30.

HOGBEN, Lancelot. Nature and Nurture (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1933).

HOLMES, Oliver Wendell. Buck v. Bell Supreme Court Reporter 47 (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., October 1926) pp. 584-585.

HOLMES, Samuel J. The Trend of the Race: A Study of the Present Tendencies in the Biological Development of Civilized Mankind (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921).

Studies in Evolution and Eugenics (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1923).

An Introduction to General Biology: Life and Evolution (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1926).

"Perils of the Mexican Invasion," North American Review 227 (May 1929) pp. 613-623.

"The Increasing Growth-Rate of the Negro Population," American J. of Sociology 42 (May-June 1937) pp. 202-214.

HUNTINGTON, Ellsworth. Tomorrow's Children: The Goal of Eugenics (Camden: The American Eugenics Society, 1935).

JENNINGS, Herbert Spencer. "'Undesirable Aliens': A Biologist's Examination of the Evidence before Congress," The Survey 51 #6 (December 1923) pp. 309-312.

"Proportions of Defectives from the Northwest and From the Southeast of Europe," Science 59 #1524 (March 14, 1924) pp. 256-257.

Prometheus or Biology and the Advancement of Man (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1925).

The Biological Basis of Human Behavior (New York: W.W. Norton, 1930).

"Jewish Refugees From Germany," Eugenical News 19 #2 (March-April 1934) p. 44.

"Jewish Physicians in Berlin," Eugenical News 19 #4 (July-August 1934) p. 126.

KAPLAN, Ira I. "Sterilization by Irradiation," paper read before the Section on Gynecology and Obstetrics, New York Academy of Medicine, November 24, 1936. Published in American J. of Obstetrics and Gynecology 34 (September 1934) pp. 507-512.

KENNEDY, Foster. "The Problem of Social Control of the Congenital Defective: Education, Sterilization, Euthanasia," The American Journal of Psychiatry 99 (July 1942) pp. 13-16.

"Sterilization and Eugenics," paper read before the Section on Gynecology and Obstetrics, New York Academy of Medicine, November 24, 1936. Published in American J. of Obstetrics and Gynecology 34 (September 1934) pp. 519-520.

"KKK - Farce and Menace" St. Louis Post-Dispatch 9/18/21.

KOPP, Marie E. "The German Program of Marriage Promotion Through State Loan," Eugenical News 21 #6 (November-December 1936) pp. 121-129.

"Eugenic Sterilization Laws in Europe," Paper read before the Section on Obstetrics and Gynecology, New York Academy of Medicine, November 24, 1936. Published in American J. of Obstetrics and Gynecology 34 (September 1934) pp. 499-504.

"Legal and Medical Aspects of Eugenic Sterilization in Germany," American Sociological Review 1 #5 (October 1936) pp. 761-770.

LANDMAN, J.H. Human Sterilization: The History of the Sexual Sterilization Movement (New York: Macmillan, 1932).

LAPOUGE, G.V. "La race chez les populations melangees," Eugenics in Race and State II (Baltimore, 1923) p. 1. A transcript of the speech in English can be found in the New York Times 9/28/21 p. 11.

LAUGHLIN, Harry Hamilton. Eugenical Sterilization in the United States (Chicago: Psychopathic Laboratory of

the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1922). Rev. ed.,:  
(New Haven: American Eugenics Society, 1926).

LORIMER, FRANK and Frederick Osborn. Dynamics of Population  
(New York: Macmillan, 1934).

"Lessons from a Eugenical Survey of Vermont," Eugenical News  
12 #3 (March 1927) p. 29.

"Marriage in Germany," Eugenical News 19 #3 (May-June 1934)  
pp. 78-79.

MARSHALL, Louis. Louis Marshall, Champion of Liberty:  
Selected Papers and Addresses edited by Charles  
Reznikoff. 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The Jewish  
Publication Society of America, 1957).

MCDUGALL, William. Is America Safe for Democracy? (New  
York: Charles Schibner's Sons, 1921).

MJOEN, Jon Alfred. "Harmonic and Disharmonic Race  
Crossings," in Eugenics in Race and State II:  
Scientific Papers of the Second International  
Congress of Eugenics (Baltimore: Williams &  
Wilkins, 1923) pp. 41-61.

MULLER, Herman J. Review: "Human Heredity, by Erwin Baur,  
Eugen Fischer and Fritz Lenz. Translated from the  
German by Eden and Cedar Paul." Birth Control  
Review (January 1933).

----- Out of the Night: A Biologist's View of the Future  
(London: Victor Gollancz, 1936).

"The Geneticist's Manifesto," J. of Heredity 30 #9  
(September 1939). pp. 371-373.

MYERSON, Abraham. The Inheritance of Mental Disease  
(Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins, 1925).

et. al. Eugenical Sterilization: A Reorientation to  
the Problem. By the Committee of the American  
Neurological Association for the Investigation of  
Eugenical Sterilization (New York: Macmillan,  
1936).

"New German Etymology for Eugenics," Eugenical News 19 #4  
(July-August 1934) pp. 125-6.

NORTON, Marion S. "Selective Sterilization in Primer Form,"  
(Princeton: Sterilization League of New Jersey,  
1937).

OSBORN, Frederick. Preface to Eugenics (New York, Harper & Bros. 1940; rev. 1951).

----- "Implications of the New Studies in Population and Psychology for the Development of Eugenic Philosophy," Eugenical News 22 #6 (November-December 1937) pp. 104-106.

"The American Concept of Eugenics," Eugenical News 24 #1 (March 1939) p. 2.

"The Basis of Eugenic Selection," Eugenical News 21 #4 (July-August 1936) pp. 69-73.

The Future of Human Heredity: An Introduction to Eugenics in Modern Society. Forward by Theodosius Dobzhansky. (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1968).

with Carl Jay Bajema. "The Eugenic Hypothesis," Social Biology 19 #4 (1972) pp. 337-349.

OSBORN, H.F. "Address of Welcome," Eugenics, Genetics and the Family: Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, (Baltimore, Williams & Wilkins, 1923) pp. 1-5.

PERKINS, Henry. "Hereditary factors in rural communities," Eugenics 3 #8 (August 1930) pp. 287-292. Published as a pamphlet by the Galton Publishing Company, New Haven, 1930.

PLOETZ, Alfred. "A Letter From Dr. Ploetz," Eugenical News 19 #4 (July-August 1934) p. 129.

POPENOE, Paul and Roswell H. Johnson. Applied Eugenics (New York: Macmillan, 1918; rev. ed., 1918 & 1933).

"The German Sterilization Law," J. of Heredity 25 #7 (July 1934) pp. 257-260.

Problems in Eugenics. Papers Communicated at the First International Eugenics Congress. (London: Eugenics Education Society, 1912).

RACE BETTERMENT FOUNDATION. Official Proceedings: Volume I, Proceedings of the First National Conference on Race Betterment, January 8-12, 1914. Volume II, Second National Conference on Race Betterment, 1915: Held in San Francisco California. Volume III, Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Race Betterment January 2-6, 1928, (Battle Creek: The Race Betterment Foundation, 1914, 1915, 1928).

"Report of the Subcommittee on the Ultimate Program to be Developed by the Eugenics Society of the United States," Eugenical News 8 #8 (August 1923) pp. 73-80.

RIPLEY, William Z. The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study (New York: D. Appelton & Co., 1899; rev. edition, 1923).

ROBERTS, Kenneth. Why Europe Leaves Home (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1922).

ROOSEVELT, Theodore. "Race Decadence," Outlook 97 (April 18, 1911) pp. 766 ff.

ROSS, Edward A. Social Control; a survey of the foundations of order (New York & London: Macmillan, 1901).

Foundations of Sociology (New York & London, Macmillan, 1905; 5th edition, Macmillan, 1919).

Sin and Society; an analysis of latter day iniquity (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1907).

"Western Civilization and the Birth Rate," American Economic Association Publications Series 3, vol. 8, pp. 76-112 (New York, 1907).

The Old World in the New (New York: The Century Company, 1914).

Principals of Sociology (New York: Century, 1920).

The Outlines of Sociology (New York & London: Century Company, 1923).

Standing Room Only? (New York & London: Century, 1927).

Seventy Years of It; an autobiography ((New York & London: Appelton-Century, 1936).

SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF EUGENICS. Scientific Papers. Volume I: Eugenics, Genetics and the Family. Volume II: Eugenics in Race and State (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1923).

STODDARD, Lothrop. The Rising Tide of Color Against White-Supremacy (New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1920).



The Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Uner-Man (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922).

Racial Realities in Europe (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924).

Into the Darkness: Nazi Germany Today (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1940).

THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF EUGENICS. A Decade of Progress in Eugenics: Scientific Papers of the Congress (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1934).

THOMALIA, C. "The Sterilization Law in Germany," translated from the German by Alice Hellmer for the Eugenical News 19 #6 (November-December 1934) pp. 137-142.

WARD, Lester F. "Eugenics, Euthenics, and Eudemics," The Journal of Sociology 8 #6 (May 1913) pp. 737-754.

WHITNEY, Leon F. The Case for Sterilization (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1934).

WILDER, Harris. A Laboratory Manual of Anthropometry (Philadelphia: P. Blakiston's Son, 1920).

The Pedigree of the Human Race (New York: Henry Holt, 1926).

YERKES, Robert M. (ed.) Psychological Examining in the U.S. Army Memoir XV, National Academy of Sciences. (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1921).

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Secondary Sources

\*\*\*\*\*

ALDRICH, Mark. "Capital Theory and Racism: From Laissez-Faire to the Eugenics Movement in the Career of Irving Fisher," Review of Radical Political Economics 7 #3 (Fall 1975) pp. 33-42.

ALEXANDER, Leo. "Medical Science Under Dictatorship," The New England Journal of Medicine 241 #2 (July 14, 1949) pp. 39-47.

ALLAN, Garland E. "Genetics, Eugenics and Class Struggle," Genetics 79 (1975) pp. 29-45.

"Genetics, Eugenics and Society: Internalists and Externalists in Contemporary History of Science," Social Studies of Science 6 (1976) pp. 105-22.

"Old Wine in New Bottles: From Eugenics to Population Control, As Represented in the Work of Raymond Pearl," unpublished manuscript (1978) 78 pages.

"The Work of Raymond Pearl: From Eugenics to Population Control," Science for the People (July-August 1980) pp. 22-28.

"The Misuse of Biological Hierarchies: The American Eugenics Movement, 1900-1940," History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 5 #2 (1983) pp. 105-128.

"The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An Essay in Institutional History," Osiris 2nd series 2 (1986) pp. 225-264.

ANDERSON, James. "Secondary School History Textbooks and the Treatment of Black History," in Darlene Clark Hine, (ed.). The State of Afro-American History: Past, Present, and Future (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986) pp. 253-274.

"August Vollmer, Suicide on Coast," New York Times (November 5, 1955) p. 40.

BAJEMA, Carl L. (ed.) Eugenics: Then and Now (Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross, Stroudsburg, PA., 1976).

BILLIG, Michael. Psychology, Racism and Fascism (Birmingham: A.F. & R. Publications, 1979).

L'Internationale Rasciste: de la psychologie à la 'science' des races (Paris: Maspero; German edition: Die Rassistische Internationale, Frankfurt: Neue Kritik, 1981).

BIRD, Randy and Garland Allen. "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #3: The Papers of Harry Hamilton Laughlin," Mendel Newsletter #17 (June, 1979) pp. 5-10.

"The Papers of Harry Hamilton Laughlin," J. of the History of Biology 14 #2 (Fall 1981) pp. 339-353.

- BLOCH, H. "The Berlin Correspondence in the JAMA during the Hitler Regime," J. of the History of Medicine 47 (1973) pp. 297-305.
- BOCK, Gisella. Zwangssterilization im National sozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik. Schriften des Zentralinstitut fur sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung den Freier Universitat Berlin (Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen, 1986).
- "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany: Motherhood, Compulsory Sterilization, and the State," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 8 #31 (1983) pp. 400-421; slightly revised and republished in When Biology Became Destiny: Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany edited by Renate Bridenthal, et. al. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984) pp. 271-296.
- BOOKER, Betty. "Eugenics Influence Linked to Birth Control Movement," Richmond Times Dispatch (April 13, 1980).
- BOOSTROM, Ronald L. "Criminality, Crime Control and the Rise of the Corporate State," Paper prepared for the Annual Conference of Midwest Sociological Society, April 15, 1977; Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- BOWLER, Peter J. "E.W. MacBride's Lamarkian Eugenics and its Implications for the Social Contruction of Scientific Knowledge," Annals of Science 41 (1984) pp. 245-260.
- BRIDENTHAL, Renate; Anita Grossman and Marion Kaplan. (eds.) When Biology Became Destiny: Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984).
- BUSS, Allan R. "Galton and the Birth of Differential Psychology and Eugenics: Social, Political, and Economic Forces," J. of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 12 (1976) pp. 47-58.
- BUTTERFIELD, Herbert. The Whig Interpretation of History (New York: Scribner, 1951; reprinted 1965).
- CARTE, Gene and Elaine. Police Reform in the United States: The Era of August Vollmer, 1905-1932 (Berkley: University of California Press, 1975).
- CHASE, Allan. The Legacy Of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980).

- CHALMERS, David. Hooded Americanism: The History of the Ku Klux Klan (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965 & 1981)
- CHAMBERLIN, J. Edward and Sander L. Gilman eds. Degeneration: The Dark Side of Progress (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
- CONE, Donna M. "The Case of Carrie Buck: Eugenic Sterilization Realized," Paper read at the Cheiron Society Meetings (June 9, 1977).
- COWAN, Ruth Schwartz. "Sir Francis Galton and the Study of Heredity in the Nineteenth Century," (Ann Arbor: Ph.D. dissertation, 1969).
- Francis Galton's Statistical Ideas: The Influence of Eugenics," Isis, 63 (1972) pp. 509-28.
- "Francis Galton's Contribution to Genetics," J. of the History of Biology, 5 (Fall 1972) pp. 387-412.
- "Nature and Nurture: The Interplay of Biology and Politics in the Work of Francis Galton," Studies in the History of Biology I (1977) pp. 133-207.
- CRAVENS, Hamilton. The Triumph of Evolution: American Scientists and the Heredity-Environment Controversy, 1900-1941 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978).
- CRONBACH, Lee J. "Five Decades of Public Controversy Over Mental Testing," American Psychologist (January 1975) pp. 1-14.
- CROW, James F. "Eugenics: Must It be a Dirty Word?" Contemporary Psychology 33 #1 (1988) pp. 10-12.
- CYNKAR, Robert J. "'Felt Necessities' v. Fundamental Values?" Columbia Law Review 81 (1981) pp. 1418-1461.
- DIVINE, Robert A. American Immigration Policy, 1924-1952 (Princeton: Yale University Press, 1957).
- DOBZHANSKY, Theodosius. "The Genetic Predestination" Columbia Today (March 1976) pp. 28-35.
- DUDZIAK, Mary L. "Oliver Wendell Holmes as a Eugenic Reformer: Rhetoric in the Writing of Constitutional Law," Iowa Law Review 71 #3 (March 1986) pp. 833-867.

- FARRALL, Lyndsay A. "The History of Eugenics: A Bibliographical Review," Annals of Science 36 (1979) pp. 111-123.
- FORREST, Derek W. Francis Galton: The Life and Work of a Victorian Genius (New York, 1974).
- FREEDEN, Michael. "Eugenics and Progressive Thought: A Study in Ideological Affinity," The Historical Journal 22 #3 (1979) pp. 645-671.
- GASMAN, Daniel. The Scientific Origins of National Socialism (New York: Elsevier, 1971).
- GELB, Steven A. "From Moral Imbecility of Maladaptive Behavior: The Social Construction of Educable Mental Retardation," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 18, 1986.
- "Myths, Morons, Psychologists: The Kallikak Family Revisted," The Review of Education 11 #4 (Fall, 1985) pp. 255-259.
- "Henry H. Goddard and the Immigrants, 1910-1917: The Studies and Their Social Context," J. of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 22 (October 1986) pp. 324-332.
- with Garland Allen, Andrew Futterman and Barry Mehler. "Rewriting Mental Testing History: The View from the American Psychologists," Sage Race Relations Abstracts (May 1986) pp. 18-31.
- GLASS, Bently. "Geneticists Embattled: Their Stand Against Rampant Eugenics and Racism in America During the 1920s and 1930s," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 130 #1 (1986) pp. 130-154.
- GOLDSTEIN, Richard H and Patrick Breslin. "Technicians of Torture: How Physicians become Agents of State Terror," The Sciences (March-April 1986) pp. 14-19.
- GORDON, Linda. Woman's Body, Woman's Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America (New York: Grossman, 1976).
- "Birth Control and the Eugenists," Science for the People (March-April 1977) pp. 8-15.

- GOSSETT, Thomas F. Race: The History of An Idea in America (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, '1963).
- GOULD, Steven Jay. "Science and Jewish Immigration," Natural History (December 1980) pp. 14-19.
- "Carrie Buck's Daughter," Natural History 7 (1984) pp. 14-18.
- GRAHAM, Loren. "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s," American Historical Review 82 (1977) p. 1133-1164.
- "The Return of Genetics: A New Revolution in Soviet Science," The Washington Post (October 7, 1985) pp. 23-24.
- GROSSMAN, David. "Professors and Public Service, 1885-1925: A Chapter in the Professionalization of the Social Sciences," (, St. Louis: Washington University, Ph.D. dissertation, 1973).
- "Philanthropy and Social Science: The Rockefeller Foundation and Economists, 1913-1929," unpublished paper, no date.
- GWYNN, Stephen Lucious. (ed.) The Letters and Friendships of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1929).
- HALLER, Mark Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought, (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press: 1963
- HALLIDAY, R.J. "Social Darwinism: A Definition," Victorian Studies 14 (June 1971) pp. 389-405.
- HARMSEN, Hans. "The German Sterilization Act of 1933: 'Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses'" Eugenics Review 46 #4 (1955) pp. 227-232.
- HARWOOD, Jonathan. "Heredity, Environment, and the Legitimation of Social Policy," in B. Barnes and S. Shapin (eds.) Natural Order: Historical Studies in Scientific Culture (London & Beverly Hills: SAGE, 1979).
- "Nature, Nurture and Politics: A Critique of the Conventional Wisdom," in J.V. Smith and D. Hamilton (eds.) The Meritocratic Intellect: Studies in the History of Educational Research (Aberdeen, 1980).

"American Academic Opinion and Social Change: recent development in the nature-nurture controversy," Oxford Review of Education 8 #1, (1982) pp. 41-67.

"The IQ in History," review essay in Social Studies of Science 13 (London: SAGE, August 1983) pp. 465-477.

HELLMAN, Geoffrey. Bankers, Bones & Beetles: The First Century of The American Museum of Natural History (Garden City: The Natural History Press, 1969).

HIGHAM, John. Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1924 (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1955; paperback revised edition, New York: Atheneum, 1963).

HILBERG, Raul, The Destruction of European Jewry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967; revised and reprinted New York: Holmes & Meier, 1985).

HIRSCH, Jerry. "Behavior-genetic analysis and its biosocial consequences." In N.J. Block & G. Dworkin (Eds.), The IQ Controversy (New York: Pantheon, 1976) pp. 156-178.

HOFSTADER, Richard. Social Darwinism in American Thought (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944; paperback rev. ed. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).

HUBBARD, Ruth. "'Fetal Rights' and the New Eugenics," Science for the People (March-April 1984) pp. 7-29.

HUMPHREYS, Lloyd, "Intelligence and Public Policy," Speech delivered at the conclusion of the conference on "Intelligence: Measurement, Theory and Public Policy," in honor of Lloyd Humphreys retirement. May 2, 1985).

JENKINS, Philip. "Eugenics, Crime and Ideology: The Case of Progressive Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania History 51 #1 (January 1984) pp. 64-78.

JONES, Greta. "Eugenics and Social Policy Between the Wars," The Historical Journal 25 #3 (1982) pp. 717-728.

JUDSON, Horace F. "Gene Genie" review of In the Name of Eugenics by Daniel J. Kevles in The New Republic (August 1985) pp. 28-34.

- KALIKOW, Theodora J. "Konrad Lorenz's Ethological Theory: Explanation and Ideology, 1938-1943," Journal of the History of Biology 16 #1 (Spring 1983) pp. 39-73.
- KEVLES, Daniel. In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity (New York: Knopf, 1985).
- "Genetics in the United States and Great Britain, 1890-1930: A Review with Speculations," Isis 71 #258 (September 1980) pp. 441-455.
- KIMMELMAN, Barbara A. "The American Breeders' Association: Genetics and Eugenics in an Agricultural Context, 1903-1913," Social Studies of Science 13 (May 1983) pp. 163-204.
- LIFTON, Robert Jay. "Medicalized Killing in Auschwitz," Psychiatry 45 (November 1982) pp. 283-297.
- The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide (New York: Basic Books, 1986).
- LOMBARDO, Paul A. "Three Generations, No Imbeciles: New Light on Buck v. Bell," New York University Law Review 60 (April 1985) pp. 30-62.
- LOVE, Rosaleen. "'Alice in Eugenics-Land': Feminism and Eugenics in the Scientific Careers of Alice Lee and Ethel Elderton," Annals of Science 36 (1979) pp. 145-158.
- LOWE, Roy A. "Eugenicists, Doctors and the Quest for National Efficiency: an Educational Crusade, 1900-1939," History of Education 8 #4 (1979) pp. 293-306.
- "Eugenics and Education: A Note on the Origins of the Intelligence testing Movement in England," Educational Studies 6 #1 (March 1980) pp. 1-8.
- LUDMERER, Kenneth. "Genetics, Eugenics, and the Immigration Act of 1924," Bulletin of the History of Medicine, 46 (1972) p.73.
- Genetics and American Society Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 1972.
- MACKENZIE, Donald. "Eugenics in Britain," Social Studies of Science 6 (1976) 499-532



- "Statistical Theory and Social Interests: A Case-Study," Social Studies of Science 8 (London and Beverly Hills: SAGE, 1978) pp. 35-83.
- "Karl Pearson and the Professional Middle Class," Annals of Science 36 (1979) pp. 125-143.
- MCLAREN, Angus. "The Creation of a Haven for 'Human Thoroughbreds': The Sterilization of the Feeble-Minded and the Mentally Ill in British Columbia," Canadian Historical Review 67 #2 (1986) pp. 127-150.
- MEHLER, Barry and Garland Allen. "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #1: Inventory of the American Eugenics Society Papers," The Mendel Newsletter Archival Sources in the History of Genetics #14 (June 1977) pp. 9-14.
- MEHLER, Barry. "Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers," The Mendel Newsletter: Archival Sources in the History of Genetics #16 (November 1978) pp. 8-11.
- MITSCHERLICH, Alexander and F. Mielke. Medizin Ohne Menschlichkeit (Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1949) translated into English by James Cluegh and published under the title The Death Doctors (London: Elek Books, 1962).
- Doctors of Infamy: The Story of the Nazi Medical Crimes (New York: Henry Schuman, 1949).
- MAZUMDAR, Pauline M. H. "Eugenists and the Residuum: The Problem of the Urban Poor," Bulletin of the History of Medicine 54 (1980) pp. 204-215.
- MOHL, Raymond A. "The Saturday Evening Post and the 'Mexican Invasion'," Journal of Mexican History 3 (1973) pp. 131-138.
- MOSSE, George L. Towards the Final Solution: A History of European Racism (New York: Howard Fertig, 1978).
- MÜLLER-HILL, Benno. Tödliche Wissenschaft: Die Aussonderung von Juden, Zigeunern und Geisteskranken 1933-1945, (Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 1985).
- NAGEL, Gunter. George Vacher de Lapouge (1854-1936): Ein Beitrag Zur Geschichte der Sozialdarwinismus in Frank Reich (Freiberg: Hans Ferdinand Schutz Verlag, 1975).

- NOAKES, Jeremy. "Nazism and Eugenics: The Background to the Nazi Sterilization Law of 14 July 1933," in R.J. Bullen, H. Pogge von Strandmann and A.B. Polonsky, Ideas into Politics: Aspects of European History 1880-1950 (London and Sydney: Croon Helm; New Jersey: Barnes & Noble, 1984).
- NORTON, Bernard "Karl Pearson and Statistics: The Social Origins of Scientific Innovation," Social Studies of Science 8 (1978) pp. 3-34.
- "Charles Spearman and the General Factor in Intelligence: Genesis and the Interpretation in the Light of Sociopersonal considerations," Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 15 (1979) pp. 142-154.
- "Fisher's Entrance into Evolutionary Science: The Role of Eugenics," in Marjorie Grene, (ed.) Dimensions of Darwinism: Themes and Counterthemes in Twentieth-Century Evolutionary Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- OLBY, Robert. "Review Symposium" of Daniel J. Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics, ISIS 77 #287 (June 1986) pp. 311-14.
- OSBORN, Frederick H. "History of the American Eugenics Society," Social Biology 21 #2 (Summer 1974) pp. 115-126.
- "Population" in Warren Weaver, U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History, Structure, Management, and Record (New York 1967) pp. 365-375.
- OREN, Dan A. Joining the Club: A History of Jews at Yale (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
- PARKER, Alfred E. Crime Fighter: August Vollmer (New York: Macmillan, 1961).
- PAUL, Diane B. "Eugenics and the Left," Journal of the History of Ideas 45 (October-December 1984) pp. 597-90.
- "Genetics Textbooks and the Genetics of Intelligence," unpublished draft manuscript, no date, circa 1984.
- PICKENS, Donald P. Eugenics and the Progressives (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1968).
- "The Sterilization Movement: The Search For Purity in Mind and State," Phylon 28 (1969) pp. 78-94.

- POGLIANO, Claudio. "Scienza e stirpe: Eugenica in Italia (1912-1939) Passato e Presente 5 (1984) pp. 61-79.
- POLIAKOV, Léon. The Aryan Myth: A History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe translated by Edmund Howard (New York: Basic Books, 1974).
- PROCTOR, Robert. "The Road to the Holocaust: Nazi Science and Medicine," Science for the People 14 #2 (March-April 1982) pp. 15-20.
- Medicine Under the Nazis (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988)
- PROVINE, William. Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing Science 182 (1973) pp. 790-796.
- The Origins of Theoretical Population Genetics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971).
- Sewell Wright and Evolutionary Biology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).
- RAY, L. J. "Eugenics, Mental Deficiency and Fabian Socialism between the Wars," Oxford Review of Education 9 #3 (1983) pp. 213-222.
- REED, Sheldon C. "The Local Eugenics Society," The American Journal of Human Genetics 9 #1 (March 1957) pp. 1-8.
- REILLY, Phillip. "Involuntary Sterilization of Institutionalized Persons in the United States: 1899-1942," (Princeton: Yale University, M.D. Thesis, 1981).
- Genetics, Law, and Social Policy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977).
- RIEDL, Joachim. "Labor Auschwitz: Von der Datensammlung über Aussonderung zum Massenmord: der Sündenfall einer politisierten Wissenschaft," Die Zeit #40 (October 4, 1985) pp. 13 ff.
- ROBERTSON, Gary. "I'm Not Mad, Just Brokenhearted," Richmond Times-Dispatch. (23 Feb. 1980).
- ROBITSCHER, Jonas. comp. and ed. Eugenical Sterilization (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1973).
- ROLL-HANSEN, Nils. "Eugenics Before World War II: The Case of Norway," History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 2 (1981) pp. 269-98.

- ROSEN, George. Preventive Medicine in the United States, 1900-1975 (New York: Science History Publications, 1975).
- ROSS, Eric B. "The 'Deceptively Simple' Racism of Clark Wissler," American Anthropologist 87 (1985) pp. 390-392.
- SAMELSON, Franz. "Putting Psychology on the Map: Ideology and Intelligence Testing," in Psychology in Social Context edited by Allan Buss (New York: Irvington Publishers, 1979) pp. 103-159.
- SCHNEIDER, William. "Toward the Improvement of the Human Race: The History of Eugenics in France," Journal of Modern History 54 (June 1982) pp. 268-91.
- SEARLE, G.R. "Eugenics and Politics in Britain in the 1930s," Annals of Science 36 (1979) pp. 159-169.
- SELDEN, Steven. "Education Policy and Biological Science: Genetics, Eugenics, and the College Textbook, c. 1908-1931," Teachers College Record 87 #1 (Fall, 1985) pp. 35-52.
- "Confronting Tacit Social Values and Explicit Political Ideology in the Science Curriculum: The Response and Responsibility of Today's Educator," in The Social Responsibility of Educators (Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, in press).
- SIGERIST, Henry Ernest. Civilization and Disease (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1944; reprinted University of Chicago Press, 1965).
- SHAPIRO, Thomas M. Population Control Politics: Women, Sterilization and Reproductive Choice (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1985).
- SHERMAN, A.J. "Cowardice versus Democracy," a review of Dan Oren's Joining the Club: A History of Jews at Yale in Times Literary Supplement (8 August 1986).
- SILBERMAN, Charles E. A Certain People: American Jews and Their Lives Today (New York: Summit Books, 1985).
- SMITH, J. David. Minds Made Feeble: The Myth and Legacy of the Kallikaks (Rockville: Aspen Publications, 1985).

- SMITH, George P. "Eugenics and Family Planning: Exploring the Yin and the Yang," University of Tasmania Law Review 8 #1 (1984) pp.4-24.
- SNYDERMAN, Mark and R.J. Herrnstein, "Intelligence Tests and the Immigration Act of 1924," American Psychologist (September 1983) pp. 986-994.
- SOLOMON, Barbara Miller. Ancestors and Immigrants: A Changing New England Tradition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956).
- STEPAN, Nancy. "Biology and Degeneration: Races and Proper Places," J. Edward Chamberlain and Sander L. Gilman (eds.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985). pp. 97-120.
- SUZUKI, Zenji. "Genetics and the Eugenics Movement in Japan," Japanese Studies in the History of Science 14 (1975) 157-164.
- THOMPSON, Larry V. "Lebensborn and the Eugenics Policy of the Reichsführer-SS," Central European History 4 (1971) pp. 54-77.
- THOMPSON, Robert. The Pelican History of Psychology (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
- TUKUBA, H and Suzuki, Z., "The Reaction of Yukichi Fukuzawa to Eugenics," Igakushi Kenkyu (Historical Study of Medicine) 24 (1967) pp. 1225-9
- VECOLI, Rudolph. "Sterilization: A Progressive Measure?" Wisconsin Magazine of History 43 (1960) pp. 190-202.
- WEAVER, Warren, U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History, Structure, Management, and Record (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).
- WEINDLING, Paul. "Die Preussische Medizinalverwaltung und die 'Rassenhygiene'" Zeitschrift für Sozialreform 30 (1984) pp. 675-687.
- "Race, Blood and Politics," Times Higher Educational Supplement 19 (19 July 1985) p. 13
- "Weimar Eugenics: The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics in Social Context," Annals of Science 42 (1985), 303-318.
- WEISS, Shelia Faith. "The Rational Management of National Efficiency: Wilhelm Schallmayer and the Origins of

German Eugenics," Paper read at the History of Science Convention, Philadelphia, 29 October 1982.

"Race and Class in Fritz Lenz's Eugenics," Paper presented at the International Congress of the History of Science, Berkeley, California (August 1985).

"Wilhelm Schallmayer and the Logic of German Eugenics," Isis 77 (1986) pp. 33-46.

WIEBE, Robert. Search for Order (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967).

WILLIAMS, Randall (ed.) "The Ku Klux Klan: A History of Racism and Violence," (Montgomery: Southern Poverty Law Center, 1981).

WILSON, James Q. and Richard J. Herrnstein in Crime and Human Nature (New York: Simon and Schuster 1985).

WOLFENSBERGER, Wolf. "The Extermination of Handicapped People in World War II Germany," Mental Retardation 19 (1981) pp. 1-7.

WRIGHT, Sewall. Evolution and the Genetics of Populations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).

## Vita

## BARRY ALAN MEHLER

**Personal Data:**

Date of Birth: March 18, 1947  
Place of Birth: Brooklyn, New York  
Family: Married to Jennifer Mehler. One child: Isaac Alan born May 21, 1983.

**Education:**

Ph.D. University of Illinois. Champaign-Urbana, Illinois.  
May 1988. Dissertation: "The American Eugenics Society:  
1921-1940" Thesis advisor: Richard Burkhardt Jr.

Major field: History of Science.  
Minor fields: American History 1830-1960;  
Modern European History; Behavior-Genetics.

N.D. Washington University. St. Louis, Mo. Ph.D. program  
1973-75. Major: American Social and Intellectual History.  
Minor fields: American Colonial History, Modern Europe.

M.A. City College of the City University of New York. M.A.,  
1972. Major Field: Modern American History; Minor Field:  
Modern European History. Course work with John Cox  
(Reconstruction) and Edward Pessen (Jacksonian). Thesis:  
John R. Commons. Thesis advisor, Irwin Yellowitz.

B.A. Yeshiva University. New York, N.Y. 1970 (History).

**Academic Experience:**

Research Assistant IBM EXCEL project. Computer Assisted  
Educational Programs in Historical Demography and  
Database Systems. University of Illinois, Supercomputer  
Applications for the Social Sciences. Project director:  
Orville Vernon Burton. 1986 - present.

Graduate Assistant for the Program in Science, Technology,  
and Society. Software evaluation and computer networking.  
Summer, 1984.

Trainee, National Institute of Mental Health:  
Institutional Racism Training Program, 1981-1985  
University of Illinois  
Project Director: Jerry Hirsch.

Research Associate in the History of Science, 1976-1980.  
(Faculty level appointment).  
Dept. of Biology

Washington University  
St. Louis, Mo.

Instructor in History, 1977  
Washington University  
St. Louis, Mo.

### **Grants and Awards:**

University of Illinois  
Babcock Fellowship in History, 1985-1986.  
National Institute of Mental Health Traineeship, 1981-1985.  
Joseph Ward Swain Prize for the best publication by a  
graduate student in the Department of History, 1984.  
Rockefeller Foundation Grant-in-Aid, 1977.  
National Science Foundation Research Fellowship, 1976-1980.

### **Teaching Experience:**

Summer Session, 1985: T.A. Survey of American History.  
Instructor, Frederic C. Jaher.

Summer Session, 1984: I taught two courses for the  
University of Illinois Computer Service Office.

1. Computing for Social Scientists and Historians: An introduction to the use of computers by social scientists. The course included discussion and demonstration of word processing, simple statistical programs, information retrieval, modem programs, interfacing micro and mainframe computers, data management, note taking, library searches and bibliography preparation.
2. Using a Database Management Package: An introduction to microcomputer database management emphasizing the fundamentals of using database software.

Survey of Western Civilization, 1982: T.A. for John McKay.

Washington University Research Associate in the History of Science, 1976-1980. As part of my work with Professor Garland Allen I participated in teaching several undergraduate and graduate level courses in the history of genetics and eugenics.

Instructor in History, Washington University, Spring 1977. I organized a course for the Jewish Studies Program entitled: The Jewish Experience in America from 1880 to 1975.

Washington University Teaching Assistant, 1973-1975. I was a teaching assistant for the following courses: American



Foreign Policy, American Labor History, Modern Jewish History, Survey of American History.

Missouri Arts Council, 1975-1976. Working with the St. Louis Public Schools organizing exhibits, cultural programs (dance and music) as well as lectures and workshops for elementary school children.

Teaching Assistant, City College, 1970-1971. Survey of American History.

### **Publications:**

"Civil Rights for the Right," Scheduled for publication in The Nation (May 1988).

"Eliminating the Inferior: American and Nazi Sterilization Programs," Science for the People 19 #6 (November/December 1987) pp. 14-18. Reprinted in Martyrdom and Resistance, the journal of Holocaust survivors (Jan.-Feb. 1988).

"Eugenics has a long racist history," co-authored with Jerry Hirsch, Contemporary Psychology 31 #8 (August 1986) p. 633.

"Rewriting Mental Testing History: The View From the American Psychologist," co-authored with S. Gelb, G. Allen and A. Futterman, Sage Race Relations Abstracts (May 1986) pp. 18-31.

"The New Eugenics: Academic Racism in the U.S. Today," Science for the People (May 1983). Reprinted in "Biology As Destiny" a special educational supplement of Science for the People (January 1984); revised and reprinted in Israel Horizon's magazine (January 1984); translated and reprinted in Jean Belkhir (Ed.) Egalite Sociale, Diversite Biologique (Science Libre, Paris 1985) pp. 73-91.

"Social Reform," A review of the Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers. Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter (Spring 1982).

"Genetics and Intelligence," in The Ku Klux Klan: A History of Racism and Violence (Southern Poverty Law Center, Montgomery 1981).

"Madge Thurlow Macklin: Pioneer in Medical Genetics," Notable American Women (Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1980).

"Sources in the Study of Eugenics #2: The Bureau of Social Hygiene Papers" Mendel Newsletter (November 1978).

"Sources in the Study of Eugenics #1: Inventory of the American Eugenics Society Papers" Mendel Newsletter (June 1977). Cited in Population Control Politics by Tom Shapiro (Philadelphia 1985).

Papers and public lectures.

"Loosing Ground: I.Q. Testers Perceptions of Fertility Differentials with Respect to Intelligence, 1920-1985." Paper presented at the History of Science Society Meeting, October 30, 1987.

"A Comparison of American and Nazi Sterilization Programs, 1933-1940," Paper presented at the Regional Meeting of Phi Alpha Theta, University of Illinois, Champaign, March 28, 1987.

"Racism in America," Focus 580, WILL (University of Illinois Public Radio), Urbana, IL., January 27, 1987.

"The Theory and Practice of Genocide: Nazi Medical Experiments in Eugenics," Paper presented at Hillel Foundation, Urbana, Ill. December 3, 1986.

University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, "The Specter of the New Eugenics," November 17, 1986.

"Understanding LaRouche," Focus 580, WILL radio, Urbana, IL., April 9, 1986.

"The American Eugenics Society and the Immigration Act of 1924: The Case of H.S. Jennings," Mid-America American Studies Conference, Urbana, April 14, 1985.

"The New Eugenics," Focus 580, WILL Radio, Urbana, IL, September 7, 1984.

"Computer Database Management Systems and the Future of the Historical Profession," American History Group, University of Illinois, March 23, 1984.

"Diseased Minds: The Medical Profession and Eugenics," Paper presented before the Program in History of Medicine, Champaign, May 1982.

"The American Eugenics Society: A Case Study in Scientific Racism" Paper presented at the 12th Annual Cheiron Society meeting (June 19, 1980). Co-authored with E. Fine.

### Selected Reviews:

Theodore M. Porter, *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820-1900* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1986) and Stephen M. Stigler, *The History of Statistics: The Measurement of Uncertainty before 1900* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1986). *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* (accepted).

Michael M. Sokal, ed. *Psychological Testing and American Society, 1890-1930* (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1987) (Scheduled for publication in the *Journal of Social History*, December 1988).

Jasnid Momeni, *Demography of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the United States: An Annotated Bibliography with Review Essay* (Greenwood Press, Westport 1984). (Scheduled for publication in *Social Biology*, Winter 1988).

*In The Name of Eugenics* by Daniel Kevles, *Journal of Social History* 20 #3 (March 1987) pp. 616-19.

*Crime and Human Nature* by James Q. Wilson and Richard J. Herrnstein, *Science for the People* (May/June 1985) pp. 26-27.

*Walter Benjamin: Story of a Friendship* by G. Scholem, *St. Louis Jewish Light* (April 4, 1984).

*Darwinism and Human Affairs* by R. Alexander, *Social Biology* 31 #1/2 (1983) pp. 178-180.

*Social Darwinism: Science and myth in Anglo-American Thought* by R. Bannister, *Social Biology* 27 #4 (Winter 1980).

*Beast and Man* by Mary Midgley, *American Scientist* 67 #3 (May/June 1979).

### References:

From the University of Illinois, Department of History.  
Address for all the following: University of Illinois,  
Department of History, 309 Gregory Hall, 810 South Wright  
St., Urbana, IL 61801.

Richard W. Burkhardt Jr.  
Orville Vernon Burton  
John McKay

Evan Melhado  
Frederic C. Jaher  
Robert McColley

Garland E. Allen, Department of Biology, Washington  
University, St. Louis, MO 63130.