

The History and Politics of Eugenics

A Brief History of the Eugenics Movement

The first stages of plant and animal-breeding mark the end of the hunter-gatherer period of human evolution. As far as written testimony is concerned, Plato's Republic provides an early theoretical treatise on eugenics.

Once Darwin's 1859 Origin of Species had established both the mechanism of evolution and man's place in nature's greater scheme of things, it was inevitable that people would want to engage in what was then referred to as "racial" improvement. They would, at the same time, worry about the genetic consequences of eliminating natural selection in the modern world. Darwin himself became a true Social Darwinist, bemoaning the fact that:

We do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment.... Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man.⁸⁹

It was Darwin's cousin, Sir Francis Galton, who in his 1883 book Inquiries into Human Faculty coined the word "eugenics". Even earlier he had done pioneering work in his Hereditary Genius (1869) and English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture (1874). Galton was also one of the first to recognize the importance of twin studies. He also proved to be correct (unlike his more famous cousin) in rejecting the Lamarckianism of the age, which held that acquired characteristics could be passed on to offspring.

In 1907, the Eugenics Education Society was founded in London, and eugenics enjoyed broad support among the British elite, including that of Havelock Ellis, C. P. Snow, H.G. Wells, and George Bernard Shaw. The last wrote that "there is now no reasonable excuse for refusing to face the fact that nothing but a eugenics religion can save our civilization from the fate that has overtaken all previous civilizations."⁹⁰ The movement was also strong in the United States. In the 1870s, Richard Dugdale published his famous study of the Juke family, unearthing 709 members of a single family with criminal pasts.

By the 1880s, custodial care was widely introduced to prevent the feeble-minded from reproducing, and by the end of the century, there were cases of sterilization of the feeble-minded. 1910 saw the founding of the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, on Long Island. Alexander Graham Bell, who was wed to a deaf woman and was concerned about the interbreeding of the deaf, feared that such selective mating could lead to the creation of a deaf population. He became a prominent member of the American eugenics movement.

The influence of the eugenics movement did not derive from the number of its members. Both in Great Britain and in the United States adherents numbered only a few thousand. Rather, the influence of the movement was explained by the wealth and influence of an elite and, unfortunately, an often elitist group.

After 1910, eugenics societies were founded in various American cities, and a number of Americans attended the First International Eugenics Congress in London in 1912. The Second and Third were held in New York, in 1921 and 1932, respectively.

When World War I broke out, eugenicists helped the U.S. Army develop intelligence testing, and they proselytized widely after the war. In the 1920s, they played a major role in tripling the number of institutionalized feeble-minded and in vastly increasing extra-institutional care.⁹¹ As for sterilization, contrary to popular belief, eugenicists were split down the middle on the issue. Neither the National Committee for Mental Hygiene nor the Committee on Provision for the Feeble-minded supported sterilization.⁹² Part of the reason for the reluctance was that eugenicists were a straight-laced lot, who were afraid that sterilization could lead to a loosening of sexual mores. Neither, for that matter, were they particularly eager to see eugenics tarred with the polygamist brush.

By 1931, 30 states had passed a sterilization law at one time or another. Even so, the number of actual sterilizations was modest on a national scale. By 1958, these amounted to only 60,926.⁹³ In comparison, twenty million sterilizations were performed in India between 1958 and 1980, and in China some thirty million women and ten million men were sterilized between 1979 and 1984. An undetermined number of these were coerced.⁹⁴ German submarine warfare had temporarily braked free immigration to the United States during

World War I. In 1924, Congress was strongly influenced by eugenic considerations in framing immigration law, so that immigration flows were made to reflect the ethnic makeup of the country as a whole. On July 1, 1929, national origin quotas were established as the basis of American immigration policy.

The subsequent history of eugenics is presented in the next four subchapters. We can note here only the enormous current interest in the topic. A search of the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC, or "Worldcat") on the World Wide Web revealed some 3,200 published books on the topic. 84 of them preceded Galton's 1883 coinage of the word:

OCLC Search for Books on Eugenics

before		1940-19	
1883		49	
1883-188		1950-19	
9		59	
1890-189	84	1960-19	243
9	14	69	128
	23	1970-19	138
1900-190	124	79	146
9	536	1980-19	230
1910-191	419	89	396
9	569	1990-19	369
1920-192		99	
9		2000-20	
1930-193		04	
9			

If visual and sound recordings are added to the 2000-2004 book search, the number comes to 498 –greater than the annual average for books during the peak period of 1910-1919. Given the revolutionary progress of the science of genetics, it is a safe bet that this trend represents a rising curve. There is also a flood of articles on eugenics circulating over the Internet –a medium nonexistent in 1910-1919. An April 2005 Internet search for eugenics using Google produced 532,000 items as opposed to 231,000 as of April 2004. Thus, the popular view of eugenics as a bygone historical phenomenon is patently incorrect.

[Return](#)

Germany

Eugenics is now popularly presented as the ideology of Holocaust and, as such, is an object of intense vilification. Leo Strauss, the philosopher and Zionist member of the Jewish Academy, coined the maxim "reductio ad Hitlerum": Hitler believed in eugenics. X believes in eugenics. Therefore X is a Nazi.⁹⁵ It is impossible to discuss the eugenic platform without treating the history of eugenics in Germany. To do so we must begin farther back in time than the period of 1933 to 1945. During the late nineteenth century the upper classes in Germany –and not only in Germany –turned to Social Darwinism as a justification for the disproportionate wealth which they had accumulated.

Thus it was no surprise that in 1893 Alexander Tille promoted the idea that a people which has been raised in the consciousness of competition as a mechanism for achieving progress "will be difficult to convert to Socialist daydreams."⁹⁶ Aside from economic class, race was a much abused theme. The subject of degeneration in animals had been raised by the French naturalist Georges Buffon (1707-1778) in 1766, and as early as the 1820s the topic had drawn broad public attention. The French Count Joseph de Gobineau (1816-1882) developed the notion still further, applying it to humans and postulating the existence of an "Aryan" race that supposedly formed the basis of "Nordic" populations.

The last remaining Aryan groups were seen by him as inhabiting Northern Germany and England. According to Gobineau, the interbreeding of Nordic types with other groups would lead to degeneration. Gobineau was best

received in Germany.

In 1895, the German amateur anthropologist Otto Ammon preached a gospel of interbreeding “the pure original type with somewhat dark long-skulled types and roundskulled types with somewhat lighter pigment. All intermediate mixed forms do not count among the great successes, but are given over to the struggle for existence, for they were created only as inevitable byproducts in producing the better.”⁹⁷ A relatively small group of German physicians, some of whom were related to each other by marriage, picked up on Galton’s eugenics and degeneration –but from a leftist point of view. The founder of German eugenics, Alfred Ploetz (1860-1940), was a socialist. In 1891, Wilhelm Schallmayer (1857-1919) published a brochure on species decline, but, while Galton’s interests related largely to intellectual abilities, Schallmayer was captivated by the idea of physical degeneration.

Schallmayer maintained that Darwin, having discovered the causal nature of evolution, thus rendered that process manageable. Schallmayer was opposed to Gobineau’s racial theories. Alfred Grotjahn (1869-1931) concurred that there was a danger of genetic decline and saw the theory of degeneracy as an important step in the process of “medicalizing” the problem. The theses of the German Society for Racial Hygiene, adopted in 1914, stood in marked contrast to Gobineau’s views and made no mention of either class or race. (The phrase “racial hygiene” was coined by Ploetz in 1895 as an alternate name for eugenics. Its use was unfortunate in that it often came to be misinterpreted as referring to individual races rather than to the human race as a whole.)

The theses called for family-friendly housing; elimination of factors that might hinder members of certain male professions from having children; raising the taxes on alcohol and tobacco; legal regulation of medically required abortions; combating what was then viewed as the hereditary transmission of gonorrhea, syphilis, tuberculosis, and diseases acquired in the course of practicing a profession; mandatory exchange of health certificates prior to marriage; and the awarding of prizes for literary and art works in which family life was praised. Young people were asked to be ready to sacrifice for the communal good.⁹⁸ By the end of the 1920s eugenics had moved beyond the small group of specialists to become a topic of national discussion.

The Society’s 1931/32 theses again stressed the importance of inheritance, warned of degeneration, and stressed the importance of the family, calling for a heightened birthrate and the provision of tax relief for families. Lengthy periods of professional training were recognized as undermining fertility, genetic counseling was recommended, childbearing by persons whose children were likely to suffer from genetic illness was to be discouraged, and young people were to be instructed as to their eugenic obligations to their children.⁹⁹ Once again, no mention was made of race.

Nineteenth-century Social Darwinists had viewed war as an invigorating process that weeded out the weak, just as economic competition sorted out a population into classes according to fitness. As World War I dragged on, eugenicists came to judge it “counter-selectionary.”

Prior to the end of World War I there had been a real fear in Germany of overpopulation. The population of the German empire had grown from 45 million in 1880 to 67 million by the end of the First World War. Only in 1918-1919 did the number of deaths exceed the number of births.¹⁰⁰ The new fear of under population made it more difficult to propagandize negative eugenics, but “racial hygienists” attacked the Malthusians on the grounds that precisely the more desirable elements of the population were most likely to heed their calls for restraint and that this ill-advised altruism would prove to be dysgenic. They were also concerned that population decline would pose an existential threat to the “Nordic race.” Within the context of theories of racial superiority, racial interbreeding was seen as a sort of suicide of those of the “superior” race. Nevertheless this was not what originally concerned Adolf Hitler. In 1920, he put forward a list of 25 points, none of which dealt with eugenics.

To best comprehend the role of eugenics under the National Socialist government, and not limit my examination of German eugenics to a narrow context, I approached the topic by first selecting one hundred books dealing with the Weimar and Nazi periods which contain indexes covering not only proper names but topics as well. I made no attempt to preselect other than choosing volumes that deal with the period. All hundred books are listed in Appendix 2. It is an experiment that anyone with an afternoon to spare and access to a serious library can easily replicate, selecting whichever books he or she might like. The authors of these books range from Nazi ideologues to recognized Western scholars. Ninety-six of these

indexes did not contain the word “eugenics.” The four volumes whose indexes listed eugenics contained only a handful of mentions. Even the indexes to Mein Kampf and Hitler’s speeches do not list eugenics as a topic, although they contain numerous references to race. Obviously, eugenics was not the powerful ideological motor it is made out to be.

Still, Hitler had heard of eugenics and eventually came to view it –approvingly –as being of a single piece with his ideas of Social Darwinism and a mystical “Nordic” or “Aryan” race, much in the spirit of Gobineau (whose name is never mentioned in Mein Kampf). This was a case of explicit tribalism buttressed with superstitions and mysticism, eventually even producing expeditions to the Himalayas in search of roots, and the prominent use of Germanic pagan symbols and runes. While Hitler may have been a dyed-in-the-wool hereditarian, he was also an anti-universalist who saw the production of a pure Nordic stock as the ultimate goal of genetic selection. Rather than view the development of humanity as one of cooperation, he held to a doctrine of competition. Abilities displayed by other peoples were for him negative phenomena which threatened the group he proposed to champion. This anti-universalist system of values represented a system of values that was anti-eugenic in the most fundamental sense.

A number of German eugenicists held views opposed to the government’s vision of “racial hygiene.” Hans Nachtshiem, a proponent of voluntary sterilization and Germany’s leading geneticist after the conclusion of World War II, consistently rejected the Nazis’ ideas of race. Even Fritz Lenz, who was perhaps the most influential German eugenicist during the Nazi period, spoke out against anti-Semitism. The biologist and eugenicist, Professor Walter Scheidt, denounced the unscientific nature of “racial biology” as taught at German universities.

Still another proponent of eugenics, the Viennese physician Julius Bauer rejected Nazi concepts of race as “fantasies plucked from the air” and complained bitterly as to the harm they were doing the cause. A fellow Austrian physician and supporter of eugenics, Felix Tietze, condemned the Nazi law on “Protection of the Blood.” The biologist and eugenicist Juliux Schaxel protested the exploitation of eugenics by the Nazis and actually emigrated to the Soviet Union. Rainer Fetscher and the former Catholic priest Hermann Muckerman were dismissed from their positions because their worldview contradicted that of the Nazis, and Fetscher ended up being shot by the SS when he attempted to make contact with the Red Army.¹⁰¹ Eugenicists in other countries explicitly rejected Hitler’s anti-Semitism and racism.

At the International Eugenics Conference held in Edinburgh in 1939 British and American geneticists criticized the racist orientation of eugenics in Germany.¹⁰² That same year prominent eugenicists in the United States and England issued a statement explicitly rejecting “race prejudices and the unscientific doctrine that good or bad genes are the monopoly of particular peoples” (see Appendix 1).

But the National Socialist government took control of scientific institutions and funded a number of chairs of “Racial Hygiene” in German universities, so that eugenicists abruptly found themselves face to face with the temptation to leave behind the pack of daydreaming social reformers and begin to implement eugenic reform.

One geneticist who became an ideologue of Nazi crimes was Otto von Verschuer. His essay, “The Racial Biology of Jews,” appeared in Hamburg in 1938 as one of nearly fifty articles, published in six volumes, under the title Forschungen zur Judenfrage (Studies on the Jewish Question). The research had been subsidized by the National Socialist government. The article purports to treat physical differences between Central-European Jews and Germans. Verschuer points out the astonishing phenomenon that an ethnic group could preserve itself for two thousand years without a territory. He then goes on, quite correctly, to point out that the differences he describes are not absolutely applicable to either group but are a matter of relative frequency within the two groups.

Taking a great deal of trouble to impart a scientific tone to the text, including such characteristics as, for example, fingerprints, blood types, or vulnerability to specific diseases –all of which pose fully legitimate questions for the physical anthropologist – he nevertheless presents a pathological document of ethnic hatred disguised as science. The Jews, we learn from Verschuer, have hooked noses, fleshy lips, ruddy light-yellow, dull-colored skin, and kinky hair. They have a slinking gait and a “racial scent.” Verschuer then moves on to “pathological racial traits.” He does concede high intellect and a relatively low birth rate, but by the end of the article his hatred becomes blatant:

I believe that only people of a certain type feel attracted by Judaism and could decide on

conversion to it, people in particular who felt related to Judaism on the basis of their intellectual and psychological makeup. (It may only seldom have been physical reasons.) In this sense, the element which was absorbed in Jewry was not "foreign." Verschuer then goes on to conclude that there is an absolute necessity for Germans and Jews to remain separated. It was a position identical to that laid out in *Mein Kampf*, whose author states that "the most lofty human right and obligation is to preserve the purity of the blood." Once that primary task has been accomplished Verschuer then insists on combating childbearing by "syphilitics, persons suffering from tuberculosis, persons suffering from genetic disabilities, cripples, and cretins."¹⁰³

That is, he is first and foremost concerned with the prevention of interbreeding with other groups, and only after that with disability, heritable or nonheritable. Although nowhere in the article does Verschuer use the word "eugenics," he saw his argument as being fundamentally "eugenic." It is, after all, so convenient for someone consumed with hatred to claim his arguments are the product of scientific reasoning and not emotion. True, he does not call for an extermination of the Jews, but the train of his logic is very close to doing precisely that. Verschuer was a mentor for Joseph Mengele, who was keenly interested in twins research.

There is probably nothing in the universe that cannot be twisted, distorted, and used for evil. The danger of the misuse of science will always be with us. It is even more disheartening to see that this product of either a sick mind or shameless opportunism has been translated and distributed by a translator who displays a Ph.D. after his name.

Verschuer's *Manual on Eugenics and Human Heredity* was published in French translation in German-occupied Paris in 1943. His signature on the preface is dated summer 1941. Much of the book contains the facts of heredity, as known at the time, a statistical distribution of variance, and so on, and is simply a popularized textbook on human genetics. In it he writes that the prominent eugenicists Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer, and Fritz Lenz all read the manuscript and made suggestions.¹⁰⁴

Obviously, to make the document acceptable to them, he avoided the insidious anti-Semitism of the earlier essay, maintaining that "Galton's eugenics and Ploetz's racial hygiene were in complete agreement with regard to both content and goal."¹⁰⁵ He also praised Gobineau's *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*. Darwin, Mendel, and Karl Pearson were also praised as pioneers of eugenic thinking.

There are three basic charges associated with eugenics under National Socialism: a) the July 1933 sterilization law; b) the September 1939 national euthanasia program; and c) the persecution of Jews and gypsies and their mass murder toward the end of the war. Let us examine each in order:

A bill was drafted in 1932 by the Prussian Governmental Council – before Hitler's accession to power – to lay the groundwork for selective sterilization in cases of heritable diseases. Although sterilization had been discussed for twenty years, the legislation took the leading German eugenicists by surprise, who were critical of it as counterproductive and inefficient with regard to genetic improvement.¹⁰⁶

On July 14, 1933, the legislation was passed by the German parliament, entering into force in 1934, but now it permitted sterilization against the wishes of the individual concerned, specifically for the surgical sterilization of persons whose offspring would have a high probability of suffering from physical or mental illness, of hereditary feeble-mindedness, schizophrenia, manic-depressive syndrome, hereditary epilepsy, Huntington's disease, hereditary blindness, deafness, or severe physical defects, as well as severe alcoholism.¹⁰⁷ No mention was made of race. From 1934 to 1939 an estimated 300,000 to 350,000 persons were sterilized.¹⁰⁸ Most sterilizations were for feeble-mindedness, followed by schizophrenia. ¹⁰⁹ At the time, sterilizations were also being practiced in a number of European countries and the United States, although on a smaller scale.

Eugenic considerations did not play a significant role in the debate. Rather, German legislators misguidedly saw sterilization as a cheap alternative to welfare.¹¹⁰ The Catholic Church was opposed to sterilization, but the Evangelical Church supported it.¹¹¹ The debate over euthanasia was launched by Karl Binding and Alfred Hoche's 1920 book *Legalizing the Destruction of Life Not Worth Living*. The authors, a lawyer and a physician, put forward a strictly economic argument. While there may have been some peripheral eugenic case to be made for the sterilization legislation, the euthanasia question had nothing whatever to do with eugenics, since persons who were already institutionally segregated and in many cases sterilized could not have had any procreation.

To their credit, German eugenicists vehemently attacked euthanasia proposals. In 1926, the eugenicist Karl H. Bauer, for example, stated that if selection were used as a principle for killing people, "then we all have to die";

the eugenicist Hans Luxenburger, in 1931, called for “the unconditional respect of the life of a human individual”; in 1933, the eugenicist Lothar Loeffler argued not only against euthanasia, but also against eugenically indicated pregnancy terminations:

“we justifiably reject euthanasia and the destruction of life not worth living.” 112

Hitler, however, regarded the institutionalized as “useless eaters” who were taking up the time of hospital personnel and occupying bed space to no worthwhile purpose.¹¹³ When, in September 1939, he issued a secret order initiating a national euthanasia program, he did so strictly to free up as many as 800,000 hospital beds for expected war casualties.¹¹⁴

The murder of huge numbers of Jews is an undeniable fact, but it is not accurate to regard the eugenics movement as the ideological engine of this Holocaust. It is true that Hitler, partly under the influence of a manual on human heredity and eugenics written by Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer, and Fritz Lenz, supported eugenics,¹¹⁵ but he did not hate the Jews because he had been taught by eugenicists to classify them as intellectually inferior. On the contrary, he regarded them as powerful competitors of the blue-eyed, blond race he proposed to champion. The Jews were blamed for Germany’s defeat in World War I and for the humiliations of the Versailles treaty. When it became apparent that a new defeat awaited Germany as a consequence of World War II, vengeance became the order of the day.

As for the gypsies and Slavs, the former were to be exterminated and the latter could be exploited as slaves captured from an inferior tribe. The mass murders of Jews, gypsies, and many Slavs during the late war period took place in absolute secrecy. The community of German eugenicists did not call for a holocaust. Nevertheless, it is equally undeniable that there were German eugenicists who allowed themselves to be co-opted by the regime and who helped to create a climate of legitimization of policies of hatred for other ethnic groups. By giving themselves over to ethnic partisanship rather than universalism, they harmed not only the specific victims of Nazi atrocities but their own system of values and beliefs.

Intellectual history is replete with instances of idealism taking disastrous turns. Christianity and socialism must forever bear their respective crosses of Inquisition and Gulag. Eugenics is not the ideology of Holocaust, but in one specific country a small group of its adherents, a group that had already shrunk even further in the changing climate of contemporary genetics, was guilty of complicity. Nevertheless, this was not the driving force behind National Socialism that it is popularly made out to be. Rather, eugenics was an argument that could be conveniently twisted by the Nazi government over the explicit objections of the movement’s leaders.

[Return](#)

Left and Right

Remember,
every step to the right
begins with the left foot.

Aleksandr Galich
(Ginzburg)

While there was a definite association between Social Darwinism and laissez-faire capitalism, the debate on eugenics actually cut across class and political lines throughout Europe and America, and it is historically incorrect to associate the movement exclusively with the political right. To no small degree it grew to prominence as part of a search for an exit from the excesses of unbridled nineteenth-century capitalism. Even when Herbert Spencer, in England, and William Graham Sumner, in the United States, began defending the period’s gross social inequalities, the left was not about to renounce natural selection, and proponents of socialism saw no inherent contradiction between the two schools of thought.

Marx and Engels were themselves enthusiastic Darwinists, feeling that the theories of evolution and communism were mutually complementary sciences that dealt with related but different topics – biology and social interaction. Vladimir Lenin himself derided the claim that people are equal in ability. ¹¹⁶ Galton’s chief pupil and the leader of Britain’s eugenics movement, Karl Pearson, was a Fabian socialist, as was Sidney Webb, who contributed an essay on eugenics to the influential 1890 Fabian Essays. Geneticists in the early Soviet state attempted, unsuccessfully, to model the socialist experiment along eugenic lines.

There was an influential “Weimar Eugenics” prior to Hitler’s ascent to power in Germany, where eugenics and socialism were viewed as mutually complimentary –a symbiosis that is still difficult for today’s left to accept.¹¹⁷ The “father” of German eugenics, Karl Ploetz, was a socialist who even spent four years in the United States exploring the possibility of establishing a socialist pan-Germanic colony there. The Austrian feminist and socialist journalist Oda Olberg, who went into exile during the Nazi period, was keenly interested in the ideas of Wilhelm Schallmayer, who attempted to achieve a fusion of eugenics and socialism and vigorously opposed all forms of racism. Another of Schallmayer’s fans was Eduard David, one of the leaders of Social Democrat Revisionism.

Max Levien, head of the Munich chapter of the German Communist Party, wrote that eugenics would play a role in the development of humanity as a function of technical progress.¹¹⁸ Alfred Grotjahn favored efforts, within a socialist framework, to reduce the birthrate of the genetically disadvantaged, and the influential socialist theoretician Karl Kautsky took degeneration for granted. There was even a considerable eugenics faction in the Social Democrat Party. In the heyday of eugenics, the geneticist H. J. Muller argued that the privileges of capitalist society too often promoted persons of limited ability and that society “needed to produce more Lenins and Newtons.”¹¹⁹ Another confirmed Marxist, the distinguished geneticist J. B. S. Haldane, commented in 1949 in the *Daily Worker* that “The formula of Communism: ‘from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs’ would be nonsense, if abilities were equal.”¹²⁰ The geneticist Eden Paul summed up the view of many on the left:

“Unless the socialist is a eugenicist as well, the socialist state will speedily perish from racial degradation.”¹²¹

The traditional breakdown between left and right can be fundamentally rephrased as “redistributive” and “competitive,” respectively. Logically, egalitarianism is consistent with the competitive point of view. If we are really all “equal,” we should for consistency’s sake favor a “best man wins” approach. If, on the other hand, inequality is genetically preprogrammed, then fairness demands that redistribution become the order of the day, first of material goods, and –with time –of genes. Eugenicists point out that if a material good can, by definition, be redistributed only by confiscating from one person to give to another, genetic redistribution does not suffer from this zero-sum limitation.

Holocausts were supposed to have been the creations of hereditarians, not egalitarians, but the left has generally discredited itself no less than the right with its mass murders. And then, too, there was the ubiquitous economic collapse of socialist economies, the self-serving tyranny of their bureaucracies, and the poverty into which they had managed to drive their own populations. It is not a good time for leftist ideology, and self-examination is definitely on the agenda –on the most fundamental level.

As the second millennium came to a close, Yale University Press published a tiny volume by the bioethicist Peter Singer, who attempted to bridge the gap between leftist political thought and Darwinism. Singer propounds a socialism based on championing the rights of the downtrodden. He points out that the 400 richest people in the world possess a combined net worth greater than the bottom 45%. He takes up their cause, arguing that it was the political right that had attempted to co-opt Darwinism, while the left made the mistake of accepting the right’s assumptions. “It seems implausible,” Singer maintains, “that Darwinism gives us the laws of evolution for natural history but stops at the dawn of human history.”¹²²

In principle, Singer is correct in maintaining that a “Darwinian left” can again arise, although traditional Marxists who regard their founding father as a prophet-like figure whose views have forever determined what is left and what is right will undoubtedly point out his famous dictum that “social being determines consciousness.” And Marx was, it should be mentioned, hostile to Malthusian thinking, which has often gone hand in hand with eugenics and the right-todie movement.

The notorious nature/nurture debate has been grossly exaggerated by sophisticates who in reality are far less “egalitarian” and “environmentalist” than they would have their naïve followers believe. The true conflict rages between interventionism and a laissez-faire approach. If one imagines a continuum with hereditary factors at one end and upbringing at the other, there are three basic possible positions which one can take:

- genetic determinism explains the diversity between individuals and groups, with environmental factors playing a trivial role
- environmental conditioning overwhelms any genetic predispositions
- hereditary factors and environmental conditioning interact

In reality, unalloyed genetic determinism is partly a memory of nineteenth-century social Darwinism and partly an invention of egalitarian environmentalists, who attribute such views to their opponents in an attempt to

discredit them. As for the all-nurture school, it remains a lovely fantasy (would it were true!), which all but the most radical egalitarians have abandoned. There is only one tenable view of nature/nurture –that of interaction, not mutual exclusion. Legitimate differences of opinion relate only to the relative importance of the one factor vis à vis the other.

Egalitarians have erected a multiplicity of arguments:

- a. Modern man represents a tabula rasa, a clean slate upon which environment can write any text.
- b. There are no significant intergroup differences.
- c. While differing levels of individual skills may exist on an intragroup basis, there is no such thing as general intelligence.
- d. IQ tests do not test intelligence but only the ability to take tests.
- e. The heritability of intelligence is zero.

Even if one concedes that the fertility patterns of modern society are dysgenic, evolution does not always follow Darwin’s gradualist model, in which minor alterations lead over time to major evolutionary changes. Rather a “punctuated equilibrium” governs lengthy periods of genetic stasis. This seemingly scientific argument, applied, for example, to crustaceans, is a true Trojan horse really intended to be dragged into the gates of the human city.

The foregoing are essentially delaying tactics, but they have created in the public mind an assumption of genetic exclusionism –the assumption that humankind has emancipated itself from subsequent evolution.

Ultimately science cannot be stopped by historical events, however tragic they may be. University of Massachusetts political scientist Diane Paul has summed up the current intellectual climate quite well:

Virtually all of the Left geneticists whose views were formed in the first three decades of the century died believing in a link between biological and social progress. Their students, coming to intellectual maturity in a radically different social climate, either did not agree or, in a social climate inhospitable to determinism, were unwilling to defend that position. The appearance of sociobiology probably signifies a fading of the bitter memories surrounding the events of the 1940s. As those memories recede, it would not be surprising to witness the reemergence of a doctrine that was never defeated in the scientific arena but rather submerged by political and social events. From the late 1940s to the early 1970s, it has been, perhaps, a viewpoint latent among scientists only requiring another change in the social climate to prompt its expression. 123

Biologist Lawrence Wright, basing his assessment on the University of Minnesota twin studies, concludes that The prevailing view of human nature at the end of the century resembles in many ways the view we had at the beginning.124 Because of the heated nature of the debate, the ideological lines of the various participants often appear fuzzy to the observer, and, on occasion, even to the participants. Below are laid out four basic positions, two of which are egalitarian – “naïve egalitarianism” and “sophisticated antiinterventionism.” The reason for the latter distinction is that sophisticated egalitarians are in some respects in greater agreement with eugenicists than with naïve egalitarians. Naïve egalitarians may claim to be adamantly opposed to eugenics but are able to define the concept only vaguely or perhaps not at all. Basically, sophisticated egalitarians are leery of reveling or discussing their own true views for fear of a possible misuse of genetic knowledge.

The following chart has a certain artificiality to it, since people do not fit into neat, distinct groups. National Socialism, for example, attempted to erect a eugenic superstructure over a Social Darwinist base.

	Eugenics	Social Darwinism	Naïve Egalitarianism	Sophisticated Anti-Interventionism
Universalist/Tribalist	Universalist	Tribalist	Universalist	Mixed
Human evolution	Admit	Admit	Mixed admission/denial	Admit
Natural selection of	Oppose	Favor	Oppose	Oppose

humans				
Artificial selection of humans	Favor	Mixed favor/oppose	Oppose	Oppose
Current intragroup diversity	Admit	Admit	Either deny or admit but denigrate	Privately admit but publicly denigrate
Current intergroup diversity	Admit	Admit	Deny	Privately admit but publicly deny
Intragroup selection	Feasible and desirable	Feasible and desirable	Neither feasible nor desirable	Feasible but too dangerous
Intergroup selection	Feasible but not desirable	Feasible and desirable	Neither feasible nor desirable	Feasible but not desirable
Future intragroup diversity	Admit	Admit	Mixed admission/denial	Privately admit but publicly denigrate
Future intergroup diversity	Feasible and desirable	Feasible but not desirable	Deny (not feasible)	Feasible and Desirable, but not essential
Long-term group coexistence	Desirable	Not desirable	Desirable	Desirable

Small as the group of individuals concerned over the future genetic composition of humankind may be, a single ideological spark in this area has the potential to engender an all-consuming conflagration, so that hostility all too often squeezes out rational discussion. Aside from conflicting ideologies, a huge range of sophistication also exists within the various camps. The following is a simplified breakdown by group:

Social Darwinists. Although they were major players in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth, they have lost their viability as a distinct group. Selection by mortality has been overwhelmed by selection through fertility, although epidemics such as AIDS and modern warfare may one day reverse this equation, possibly sooner than we think.

Nevertheless, Social Darwinism still exists as a “residual” philosophy embedded in the very core of the ideologies of certain groups.

The “Nordic” or “Aryan” idea. Driven underground as much by the Holocaust memorial movement (in which the author of this book played a modest role), which was launched after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, this group has been reduced to arguing for white survival rather than for white supremacy. The average woman in Europe now bears only 1.4 children, whereas 2.1 are needed just to maintain a population. According to the Population Reference Bureau’s 2003 Population Data Sheet, the population of Europe will drop from 11.5% of the global population to 7.2% by 2050, despite projected strong in-migration. Equally ominous to these theoreticians are the genetic consequences of racial interbreeding inevitable in the “global village.” This group’s loyalties are drawn along ethnic lines, not class. They can be termed tribalists.

Sophisticated anti-interventionists. This is a group which opposes intervention in the human germ line, and some of its members are opposed to intervention even in the germ lines of animals and plants. The anti-interventionists were traumatized by the German slaughter of Jews and by the lip service paid by the National Socialists to eugenics, and this circumstance has shaped their views accordingly. Strangely enough, the private position of this group has much in common with that of the eugenicists. There is a considerable gap between the group’s core beliefs and the views which it proselytizes. It wields influence vastly incommensurate with its size. Some sophisticated anti-interventionists are actually tribalists.

Naïve environmental egalitarians are people who have not given much thought to population and who have

accepted the mass-consumption egalitarian gospel disseminated by the anti-interventionists. The goal of any propaganda campaign is to achieve a “disconnect” from practical experience in the targeted population, and in the case of naïve egalitarians this goal has been admirably achieved. They accept that intelligence is strictly the result of education and that altruistic behavior or the lack of it is exclusively the result of upbringing. Millions of them reject even the theory of evolution.

Universalist eugenics is described in this book in some detail, so that a description at this point would be repetitive. Suffice it to say that eugenicists see themselves as a lobby for future generations.

Neo-Malthusians. As many nations pass through the demographic transition, this group is losing much of the credence it enjoyed only recently. Most demographic forecasts now predict a leveling off of global population growth, but the Malthusians argue that the population may well be too large already to be self-sustaining and that rapid population growth is still alarming in many areas of the planet. Most eugenicists tend to be Malthusians, but the reverse is not necessarily true.

Anti-Malthusians. This group maintains that human capital is itself the greatest resource and that fears of exceeding the planet’s “carrying capacity” are grossly exaggerated and misplaced. In theory, eugenicists could conceivably be anti-Malthusians, but this has not been the case historically. Disengaged scholars and scientists. These include geneticists, demographers, anthropologists, archeologists, sociologists, psychologists –in a word any discipline devoted entirely or in part to the study of man. This group is painfully aware of the unwritten rules of censorship with regard to qualitative studies, so that members of the scholarly and scientific community often seek refuge from ideological storms by occupying themselves with noncontroversial questions.

A geneticist, for example, may devote himself to studying specific gene sequences and studiously avoid the discussion of all social implications. It is like a mechanic who repairs a carburetor with no thought as to where the automobile is to go. Some members of this particular group can be ideologized to a greater degree than nonmembers, and they can on occasion permit their personal views to influence their studies, concealing the fact not only from the public, but even from themselves. On the other hand, a large percentage remain oblivious to the philosophical and political implications of their field of study.

The Jews

Don't do what I do, do what I tell you.

Everyone's father

The popular impression is that the eugenics movement was a racist, anti-Semitic Nazi ideology inspired by Anglo-American elites. In point of fact, eugenics also managed to establish strong bridgeheads in Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Norway, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey.¹²⁵ Jews played a modest but active role in the early eugenics movement. In 1916, Rabbi Max Reichler published an article entitled "Jewish Eugenics," in which he attempted to demonstrate that Jewish religious customs were eugenic in thrust.

A decade and a half later Ellsworth Huntington, in his book *Tomorrow's Children*, which was published in conjunction with the directors of the American Eugenics Society, echoed Reichler's arguments, praising the Jews as being of uniquely superior stock and explaining their achievements by a systematic adherence to the basic principles of Jewish religious law, which he also viewed as being fundamentally eugenic in nature.¹²⁶ In the Weimar Republic many Jewish socialists actively campaigned for eugenics, using the Socialist newspaper *Vorwärts* as their chief tribune.¹²⁷ Max Levien, head of the first Munich Soviet, and Julius Moses, a member of the German Socialist Party, believed strongly in eugenics. A partial list of prominent German-Jewish eugenicists would include the geneticists Richard Goldschmidt, Heinrich Poll, and Curt Stern, the statistician Wilhelm Weinberg (coauthor of the Hardy-Weinberg Law), the mathematician Felix Bernstein, and the physicians Alfred Blaschko, Benno Chajes, Magnus Hirschfeld, Georg Löwenstein, Max Marcuse, Max Hirsch, and Albert Moll.¹²⁸

The German League for Improvement of the People and the Study of Heredity was even attacked by the Nazi publisher Julius F. Lehmann as targeted subversion on the part of Berlin Jews.¹²⁹ Löwenstein was a member of an underground resisting the National Socialist government, and Chajes, Goldschmidt, Hirschfeld, and Poll emigrated. In America, when the revolutionary anarchist editor of the *American Journal of Eugenics*, Moses Harman, died in 1910, Emma Goldman's magazine *Mother Earth* took over distribution. In 1933, the eugenicist and University of California professor of zoology Samuel Jackson Holmes noted the significant number of Jews in the eugenics movement and praised their "native endowment of brains," while at the same time lamenting the racial bias suffered by the Jews, which caused many of their intellectuals to be wary of nonegalitarian worldviews.¹³⁰

The American Eugenics Society itself counted Rabbi Louis Mann as one of its directors, in 1935. One of the most prominent eugenicists was the American Herman Muller, whose mother was Jewish and who received the Nobel Prize in medicine, in 1946, for his work on genetic mutation rates. A communist, Muller spent 1933-1937 as a senior geneticist at the University of Moscow, when he wrote a letter to Stalin proposing that the Soviet Union adopt eugenics as an official policy. It was the eve of the Great Purges, and Stalin definitely disapproved of the idea, at which point Muller judged it wisest to leave for Scotland and then returned to the United States. It was in the middle of his Moscow sojourn that Muller's eugenics treatise *Out of the Night* appeared in the United States. In 1932, Muller had spent a year in Germany and he was outraged by Nazi concepts and policies concerning race.

According to the National Library in Jerusalem, from the 1920s through the 1950s, some 200 Hebrew-language Parents' manuals were published. These publications contained a coherent worldview, of which eugenics formed an integral part, subjecting Jewish mothers to an unremitting program of education, indoctrination and regulation. During the British mandate, Jewish physicians in Palestine actively promoted eugenics. Dr. Joseph Meir, for whom the hospital in Kfar Sava is named, wrote in 1934:

Who should be allowed to raise children? Seeking the right answer to this question, eugenics is the science that tries to refine the human race and keep it from decaying. This science is still young, but it has enormous advantages.... Is it not our duty to insure that our children will be healthy, both physically and mentally? For us, eugenics in general, and mainly the careful prevention of hereditary illnesses, has a much higher value than in other nations. Doctors, athletes, and politicians should spread the idea widely: Do not have children unless you are sure that they will be healthy, both mentally and physically.¹³¹

One researcher at Ben-Gurion University working on the topic "eugenicist Zionists," came across a card file with notes written by the editors of a collection of Meir's writings, published in Israel in the mid-1950s where the editors call the article "problematic and dangerous" and comment that "Now, after Nazi eugenics, it is

dangerous to publish this article.”¹³² In point of fact, knowledge of Jewish support for eugenics in pre-1948 Palestine was suppressed for many years.¹³³ Dr. Max Nordau, the son of an Orthodox rabbi, was converted to Zionism by Theodore Herzl and became prominent in the movement. Nordau's ideas, which including vigorously propagandizing eugenics, became so popular in the Jewish community that Nordau Clubs were created even in the United States.

Dr. Arthur Ruppin, the head of the World Zionist Organization office in Palestine, wrote in his book *The Sociology of the Jews* that “in order to preserve the purity of our race, such Jews [showing signs of genetic defects] must refrain from having children.”¹³⁴

In Israel today many eugenic practices have become widely accepted. According to Meira Weiss of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, In Israel, the Zionists' eugenics turned into a selective prenatal policy backed by state-of-the-art genetic technology. ¹³⁵

There are now more fertility clinics per capita there than in any other country in the world (four times the number per capita in the United States). Abortion is subsidized if the fetus is suspected to be physically or mentally malformed.¹³⁶ In cases where the husband's sperm is not viable, donors fill out extensive health histories. The State supplies the sperm, which is screened for Tay-Sachs. Women over thirtyfive routinely consent to amniocentesis tests and abort if genetic defects are discovered. Thus, the government is actively pursuing eugenics, although the chief motivation appears to be as least as much quantitative as qualitative. Surrogacy was legalized in 1996¹³⁷, but only for married women. It too is paid for by the State. Jewish religious law does not delegitimize the children of unmarried women, thus making it possible to combine Jewish legal principles with modern legal practices. In vitro fertilization and embryo transfer are preferred by some rabbis as a form of fertility treatment that does not violate the literal Halakhic precepts against adultery¹³⁸.

Curiously, some rabbis refuse to condemn the use of non-Jewish sperm, since masturbation by non-Jews is not of explicit rabbinic concern, and also because Jewishness is passed exclusively through the mother. Children born to different Jewish mothers using the same sperm donor may even marry, since “they share no substance.” Other rabbis, however, consider the use of non-Jewish sperm an abomination. ¹³⁹

The Israeli attitude toward cloning differs considerably from that prevalent in most other countries. Although human reproductive cloning is currently not permitted because the technology is not yet considered safe, the Chief Rabbinate of Israel sees no inherent religious interdiction in reproductive cloning as a form of treatment for infertility and even sees an advantage over sperm donation, which by using anonymous donors might subsequently lead to a marriage between brother and sister.¹⁴⁰ In 1998, although more than eight decades had passed since the appearance of Reichler's 1916 essay, Noam J. Zohar, a professor of philosophy at Bar-Ilan University in Israel, responded to Reichler. Noting that Reichler's emphatically pro-eugenics views were “shared... by more than a few Judaic circles today,” Zohar wrote that A program of individualized eugenics... would seem to be consonant with an attitude that was, at the very least, tacitly endorsed by traditional Judaic teachings.

Should it make a difference if the means for producing fine offspring are no longer determined by moralized speculation but instead by evidence-based genetic science? It seems to me that, insofar as the goal itself is acceptable, the change in the means for its advancement need pose no obstacle to its pursuit. This is so of course provided that the new means are not morally objectionable. To work out a Judaic response to the sort of new eugenics now looming on our horizon it will be necessary to evaluate the various specific means that might serve a modern individualized eugenics. I hope that some of the groundwork for that has been laid in this examination of traditional Judaic voices.¹⁴¹

[Return](#)

The Suppression of Eugenics

Democracy demands that all of its citizens begin the race even.
Egalitarianism insists that they all finish even.

Roger Price

“The Great Rob Revolution”

Although the attack on eugenics had been launched in the late 1920s,¹⁴² eugenics survived even the embrace of Nazi Germany, and in 1963 the Ciba Foundation convened a conference in London under the title "Man and His Future," at which three distinguished biologists and Nobel Prize laureates (Herman Muller, Joshua Lederberg, and Francis Crick) all spoke strongly in its favor. Despite this upbeat note, eugenics was about to undergo a total rout. Outraged by pictures of police dogs attacking civil rights protesters in the South, the public found discussions of genetic racial differences intolerable. In 1974, a large group of black students descended upon the office of Professor Sandra Scarr in the Institute of Child Development of the University of Minnesota:

One graduate student in education said he was going to kill us if we continued to do research on black children. Another paced up and down in front of us calling, "honkie, honkie, honkie."

When Arthur Jensen of the University of California at Berkeley visited the Institute in 1976, he and Scarr were spat upon by a phalanx of radical students, some of whom physically attacked the speakers and those who had invited him. Not only were Jensen's lectures regularly broken up, he also received bomb threats, and he had to be put under constant guard.¹⁴³ In March 1977, the National Academy of Sciences sponsored a forum in Washington, D.C., on research with recombinant DNA. As the first session began, protestors began marching down the aisles waving placards and charts.¹⁴⁴ Hans Eysenck at a lecture to have been delivered at the London School of Economics was first prevented from speaking by the chanting of "No Free Speech for Fascists!" and then physically attacked and had to be rescued from the stage, his eyeglasses broken and blood streaming from his face.

When his book *The IQ Argument* appeared in the United States, wholesalers and booksellers were threatened with arson and violence, and the book became almost impossible to obtain.¹⁴⁵ The above scenes, and many others like them, were triggered by assertions of mean IQs differing between racial groups, specifically between whites and blacks. No one seemed to notice that the issue was essentially irrelevant to the cause of a universalist eugenics advocated for all groups, without exception.

The second chief factor in the suppression of eugenics was the launching of the Holocaust memorial movement subsequent to the 1967 Arab/Israeli war. So effective was the campaign that polls show that many more Americans can identify the Holocaust than Pearl Harbor or the atomic bombing of Japan.¹⁴⁶ Those who are familiar with the term "eugenics" now associate it with "Holocaust" and "racism." The general public is totally unaware that on September 16, 1939, the leaders of the eugenics movement in the United States and England explicitly rejected the racist doctrines of the Nazi government (see Appendix 1), as did many German eugenicists.

An enormous, albeit fully understandable, confusion has taken place within the Jewish community, and this confusion is fraught with significance for Jews today. According to the National Jewish Population Survey, Jews in America entered into a precipitous decline in numbers in the decade 1990-2000, reflecting a pattern typical of high-IQ groups.¹⁴⁷ Half of Jewish women aged 30-34 have no children, and nearly half of American Jews are 45 or older.¹⁴⁸ This is literally a matter of survival.

Beginning in the early 1980s, publications on eugenics enjoyed a considerable upswing, including a huge number of articles in the published literature and later over the Internet, but even so the majority of these publications are still either hostile or, at best, guarded. One relatively recent example is William H. Tucker's *The Science and Politics of Racial Research* (1994). While claiming to support freedom of scientific inquiry, Tucker dismisses "the trivial scientific value of IQ heritabilities," maintains that scientific rights of research "might be qualified by the rights of others," muses whether certain research topics should be pursued at all, advocates denying government funding to racial research, proposes applying the Nuremberg Code to researchers, states that the subjects of psychological research "can be wronged without being harmed" and that they should be informed of the nature of the research in case they find the results of the research unflattering. He goes on to quote the phrases "those miserable 15 IQ points" and "Are you using such gifts as you possess for or against the people?"¹⁴⁹ Tucker can best be seen as a moderate in the egalitarian camp.

Missa and Susanne's 1999 book *De l'eugénisme d'État à l'eugénisme privé* (From State Eugenics to Private Eugenics) is a collection of articles authored by a group of Belgian and French scholars and scientists, some of whom are hostile to eugenics while others are actually supportive. Even so, eugenics in various places is described as "utopian" and "unrealistic." Its goals are "unachievable," and it represents "a collection of false ideas" which are "contradictory" and "disproven by research." The very mention of the term can call up "unconditional condemnation for a shameful practice."

Other phrases include:

- “opprobrium,”
- “the horrors of classical eugenics,”
- “the danger of a eugenic drift,”
- “American charlatans,”
- “a dangerous trend,”
- “the threat of eugenics,”
- “fear,”
- “risk,”
- “menace,”
- “peril,”
- “insidious,”
- “rampant,”
- “radical,”
- “immoral,”
- “elitist,”
- “the demon of eugenics,”
- “the temptation of eugenics,”
- “the worrisome Trojan horse of eugenics,”
- “the specter of eugenics,”
- “Nazi atrocities,”
- “gas chambers,”
- “racism,”
- “ethnic discrimination,”
- “the slippery slope of eugenics,”
- “detestable reputation,”
- “barbaric,”
- “fear,”
- “warning,”
- “fatal,”
- “vigilant resistance to this tendency,”
- “genetic discrimination,”
- “sterilizations and lobotomies,”
- “creeping determinism,”
- “genetic reductionism,”
- “reduces culture to nature,”
- “the cult of the body,” “totalitarian,”
- “utilitarian drift,”
- “inhumane,”
- “a mad idea,”
- “materialist reductionism,”
- “biologism,”
- “geneticism,”
- “existential or metaphysical horror,”
- “vehement, categorical, and definitive condemnation,”
- “universal and absolute condemnation,”
- “absolutely evil,”
- “worse than murder,”
- “Thou shalt not clone!”

- “radical evil,”
- “absolutely bad, absolutely contrary to good,”
- “perversion,”
- “intrinsically evil,”
- “intrinsically and necessarily negative with regard to the autonomy of others,”
- “instrumentalization and objectivization of others,”
- “the genetic impoverishment of cloning.”¹⁵⁰

The campaign has been remarkably effective in achieving its goals. In 1969, *Eugenics Quarterly*, successor to *Eugenic News*, was renamed the *Annals of Human Genetics*. The following year, shortly after the first isolation of a DNA fragment which constituted a single identifiable gene, the young scientists involved in the project decided they would not continue their work on DNA. The reason, they reported, was that such work would eventually be put to evil uses by the large corporations and governments that control science.¹⁵¹

Borrowing a phrase from the Soviet purges, egalitarians denounced eugenics as a “pseudo-science,” so that the American Eugenics Society was forced to change its name, in 1973, to the Society for the Study of Social Biology. In 1990, the College Board changed the name of the SAT from Scholastic Aptitude Test to Scholastic Assessment Test. In 1996, it dropped the words altogether and declared that the initials no longer stood for anything whatsoever. The eugenicists themselves all ran for cover, reclassifying themselves as “population scientists,” “human geneticists,” “anthropologists,” “demographers,” and “genetic counselors.”

[Return](#)

Possible Abuse of Genetics

I am myself indifferent honest;
but yet I could accuse me of such things
that it were better my mother had not borne me.

Hamlet

Ultimately, the most serious argument militating against eugenics is its possible abuse. Unquestionably, the danger is real. It would not take much work to come up with a lengthy list of past abuses. The baby can always be drowned in the bath water. We as a species have much in our past for which we can now experience only shame.

We are just now deciphering the blueprints according to which we ourselves were constructed; we could make terrible mistakes. Or we could lose too much diversity. And as not very distant history teaches us, eugenics could be misused to justify the elimination of peoples judged “inferior” or simply hated for whatever reason. For that matter, who can possibly predict what new evils the fertile human brain is capable of in some unknown future? It is indeed frightening. Sophisticated egalitarians, who are not really egalitarians at all but simply concerned thinkers who fear the man in the street most of all, are right to experience misgivings.

The potential abuse of genetics is not limited to distorting the human genome. It is already possible to begin modifying animals to enhance their intelligence to allow them to perform tasks currently performed by people, or even to create animal-human hybrids.¹⁵² A ready market will always exist for cheap, low-skilled workers, so that this is a real danger. Currently people feel they have the right to regard their fellow travelers on this planet as objects of consumption, so that there is not even a discussion of this frightening prospect. But imagine the moral dilemma that would face us had to deal with animals whose abilities overlapped the lower range of the human population.

[Return](#)

Euthanasia

There is a close relationship between eugenics and the right-to-die movement. Both are philosophies of life which place value on the quality of life, not just on life per se. Whereas life expectancy in England lagged

behind fecundity until about 1830, the average life span in modern industrial economies now extends decades beyond the fertility span.

A simple visit to a nursing home provides convincing proof that there is a huge population (about to double, thanks to the baby boomers) of helpless, despairing elderly who are literally undergoing torture, day after day, month after month, year after year. Anyone who denies this obvious fact has only to change places with them – not for years, but for a few hours – to realize the tragic reality of the situation of many of them.

As we entered the third millennium, the most popular way chosen by these victims to escape their torture was to blow their brains out – a path considerably more popular among elderly men (27.7 per 100,000) than women (1.9 per 100,000).¹⁵⁴

[Return](#)

Religion

Take note, theologians, that in your desire to make matters of faith out of propositions relating to the fixity of Sun and Earth you run the risk of eventually having to condemn as heretics those who would declare the Earth to stand still and the Sun to change position.

Galileo

“The Dialogue”

There are eugenicists who believe in God, eugenicists who are agnostic, and eugenicists who are atheists. Religious belief claims to operate in a different dimension than does eugenics, although there have always been those who viewed knowledge as a replacement for religion. The Russian language, for example, amalgamates the intellectual and spiritual under a single term: *dukhovnyi*.

In one crucial aspect, however, the scientific study of human psychology is antithetical to religion. No matter what their ideologies or methods, scientists are all in hot pursuit of the holy grail of causality. This is, after all, what science is all about.

[Return](#)

Population Management

There are two basic views of humankind:

- a) that we have been created in the image of *God* and thus are so perfect that any improvement is unthinkable
- b) that, while our species possesses great positive features as well as negative, enhancement is essential, and –at the very least –prevention of genetic decline is an absolute moral imperative

In many ways eugenics prescribes for humankind the same goals as for non-human species: a healthy population probably limited in size so as not to upset nature’s intricate balance of species and environment. Nevertheless, the specifics of human population administration are not identical either in goals or methodology to non-human population management techniques.

A “drain the pond and restock” methodology is not only morally objectionable with regard to people, its feasibility is also questionable. Blatantly coercive measures can even be counter-productive when they engender resistance to eugenic reform. For eugenics as a movement to escape the temptation of utopian fantasy, it must be oriented toward the realistically achievable.

In dealing with non-domesticated animal populations, simple viability is the goal, health being defined as the capability to survive and reproduce within an environment. By contrast, human health criteria also include intelligence and altruism. As for methodology, only relative minor impingements on the wellbeing of the current human population can be tolerated, since it they and only they who can implement eugenic reform. For example, whereas wildlife managers take for granted that a balance between prey and predators is a “healthy”

thing, no such Spencerian “survival of the fittest” is appropriate for humans. Despite the grand continuity of belief retained by modern eugenics from the earlier tradition, on this point realistic modern eugenics departs radically from that preached a hundred years ago.

Although individual eugenic efforts are already in full swing, they are submerged in the great demographic currents, and thus global eugenic reform is a task for society as a whole. The strength of the government relative to that of the governed population determines the limits to governmental intervention (and abuse). The weaker the government, the smaller the potential for rational population management. There is also a role to be played by non-governmental organizations, whose freedom can be less fettered than that of governments. History is replete with instances of forced population management, the most infamous method of which is genocide. But other compulsory methods have also been employed. For example, the government of Indira Ghandi implemented a policy of compulsory sterilizations and vasectomies.

And, although India ultimately came to reject this policy, the nation's current population is many millions smaller than it would have been without it. Nevertheless, China's semi compulsory one-child policy has proven far more efficacious, and India with a Total Fertility Rate of 3.1 will soon surpass China (TFR: 1.7) as the world's most populous nation. It is estimated that by 2000 the Chinese population was already a quarter billion less than it would have been without the one-child policy. On the other hand, there are situations where emergency methods may well present the only means of averting major catastrophe. Bangladesh and Haiti come to mind, but the political will even to raise the topic is totally absent. Global society is living a fatal lie.

Shifting our focus from quantitative to qualitative questions, the debate over voluntary versus compulsory methods has thus far amounted largely to pandering to the whims of current generations. Indeed, the very phrase “reproductive rights” itself represents a bias. Do people have the “right” to give birth to babies who in all probability will grow up feeble minded or who are likely to suffer from devastating genetic illnesses? On the one side of the equation may be a single person with a genetic IQ so low that simply coping in society is well nigh impossible and, on the other, the millions of disadvantaged offspring whom he and/or she may ultimately engender over the generations.

Forced sterilizations of persons with genetically predetermined low IQ and major genetic illnesses should be reinstated. This is an unpopular statement, but it has to be said. Our current refusal to take into account the right of future generations to health and intelligence is a cowardly betrayal of our own children. Can it be that we are so selfish as to want to breed a genetically disadvantaged class of servants to perform our menial tasks for us?

The grand demographic trend is toward below replacement fertility rates, and while compulsion has its place, the good news is that energetic voluntary measures ought usually to be sufficient to permit women of reproductive age to realize their goal of smaller families. Clearly, voluntary methods are generally preferable to compulsory, although the line between voluntarism and coercion can often be vague.

One voluntary method involves the use of ultrasound to determine the sex of the fetus. In developing countries the desire for a male offspring is often strong enough to induce parents to abort females. Ultimately the number of males in a population is reproductively insignificant, since only females can bear children, and a tiny male population is capable of impregnating a huge female population. Thus, population management has to be female-oriented.

The Chinese infant sex ratio was normal in the 1960s and 1970s (roughly 106 boys for every 100 girls), but when the one-child policy was introduced in the 1980s, the figure became far more skewed in favor of boys; by 2002 China's fifth national census revealed a sex ratio at birth of approximately 116.86 males per 100 females, having increased to 108.5 in 1982 and 110.9 in 1987. (Admittedly, there is also a question of underreporting of female births on the part of couples eager to receive permission to have another child in the hope that it will be a son.) As early as 2000 the number of men in China was already estimated to exceed that of women by sixty million.

The situation is much the same in India, where the 1991 census indicated approximately 35-45 million missing women, when ultrasound was far less available than it is now. In a ten-year study of babies born in Delhi hospitals in the period 1993-2003, the number of female births was 542 per 1,000 boys if the first child was a girl. If the first two children were girls, the ratio was only 219-1,000. Unfortunately, although the desire for sons

is greatest among rural populations, high-IQ families possess greater access to modern medicine, including ultrasound, so that this practice appears to have been dysgenic thus far. But made easily available to low-IQ families, or if such families were even financially rewarded, it could become strongly eugenic in nature, simultaneously attacking both quantitative and qualitative demographic problems. (The historic link between eugenics and Malthusian thought should be emphasized.)

A sea change is already underway; by 2005 many clinics offered ultrasound for as little as 500 rupees (\$11.50). It goes without saying that this is a tragic turn of events for those men who do not find a mate for themselves, but it is a far lesser evil than dysgenic overpopulation. Moreover, heightened competition for females would disproportionately reward high-IQ males.

(For this same reason polygamy should be universally decriminalized. The legal enforcement of monogamy is a dysgenic intrusion into personal freedom. No scientific breeder would even consider it.)

Another voluntary method is a vigorous promotion of contraceptive methods among low-IQ families. While education is not about to cancel out the sex drive of young people, it can go a long way toward reducing the birth rate. Reversible sterilization should be actively promoted.

The current debate between “pro-choice” and “pro-life” fails utterly to take into account the consequences of abortion for genetic selection. Abortion should be actively promoted, since it often serves as the last and even only resort for many low-IQ mothers who fail to practice contraception. Welfare policies need to be radically reexamined. Rather than simply pay low-IQ women more for each child, financial support should be made dependent on consent to undergo sterilization. Society should put more emphasis on greater tax credits for families with children, nurseries, day-care centers, etc.

This would promote fertility among high-IQ women, who otherwise are tempted either not to have children at all, or to have too few, sacrificing their unborn children before the altar of career advancement. The goals of the feminist movement are in and of themselves legitimate and fair, but wed to the anti-scientific worldview of radical egalitarianism, they will devastate our species.

Eugenic family planning services are the greatest gift that the advanced countries can offer the Third World. In a global society, parochial fixation on any one country is a pathology that human society can ill afford. What is needed is tough love. Such a policy would promote the interests of any ethnic group, all of which suffer when their least intelligent members serve as the breeding pool while the most intelligent encounter strong disincentives to fertility.

In different countries a different mix of governmental and non-governmental activism is appropriate. Useful measures would include paying low-IQ women to accept embryo transfer. Sperm banks need to be encouraged to attach the greatest importance to intelligence, and the promotion of these institutions should be covered out of tax monies. And the technology should be developed to create an artificial womb or, alternatively, make inter-species embryo transplants a reality, rapidly increasing the number of high-IQ individuals. Religious belief will always be with us, and eugenics must not be presented as scientific in an anti-religious sense.

At the same time there is a huge potential for excess if eugenics were to become a core belief of the masses. Genetic research needs to be promoted without regard to cost. Who can say what enormous potential awaits us in the future as a result of germ-line intervention? On the immigration front, the importation of low-IQ groups to perform unskilled labor at low wages must be recognized as a threat to the host population’s long-term viability. Panmixia also represents a loss in genetic diversity. All populations represent unique entities, and the loss of such uniqueness is everyone’s loss. Nevertheless, given the realities of improved transportation and communication, inbreeding can only increase in the future.

[Return](#)

Feasibility

Nature has packed away this long brain
Like a sword into scabbard.

She has forgotten those whose grave is green, Whose breath is red, whose laugh is supple.

Osip Mandelstam

“Lamarck”

When an ideal is recognized as unachievable, it is dismissed as “utopian.” If real sacrifice is required on the part of the currently living, whose altruism extends downward for only a generation or two and who for the most part are indifferent to culture and civilization, is eugenics not simply a fantasy?

To evaluate the feasibility of reestablishing the eugenics movement as a viable social force, we must first take a hard look at political systems and move beyond the populist jingoism which is as eternal as it is ubiquitous. In a dictatorship, power is patently invested in one person, whereas in “democracies” the pyramidal power structure is more opaque:

Level A: lobbies and (largely anonymous) oligarchs.

Level B: politicians.

Level C: prominent government staffers and media.

Level D: the general population.

What is crucial in this scheme of things is that the relationship of Levels B and C to Level A is, to a significant degree, that of employee to employer. To be elected, politicians need money for polling and advertising/propaganda, while the media (also owned by Level A) entertain the general population with competitions in which the differences between the competitors is minimal. Once “elected,” politicians then implement the will of those who provided the financing, while losing politicians are “parked” in profitable ceremonial positions to ready themselves for the next round. To be sure, there are sophisticates within the general population who are not duped as to the nature of the system, but they can be intimidated, co-opted, or even permitted to voice discontent. Since they pose no threat to the system, their protests are used as a demonstration of “freedom of speech.” The bottom line is that all human social structures are oligarchic in nature, and the implementation of a viable eugenics policy is dependent on a relatively tiny elite.

Eugenics is not an either/or proposition. Many of the decisions being taken on a governmental level are already fraught with genetic consequences – family planning programs, legalized and subsidized abortions, immigration criteria, tax credits for having children, mandated paid parental leave, genetic research, cloning, fertility assistance, and so on. Eugenicians argue that it is only reasonable that the decision makers take into account the eugenic or dysgenic consequences of governmental actions.

The world is divided into independent nations. Given the necessary funding, it would be possible in at least some of them to set up massive positive-eugenic breeding programs which would not necessarily depend on human birth mothers. The resistance to such changes is understandably intense, considering that even artificial insemination continues to be resisted in some quarters.

One obvious factor that will promote the eugenic agenda is the undeniable desire of parents to have healthy, intelligent children. Genetic screening of embryos will obviously encompass a greater and greater range of detectable traits, and thus the bar will be raised from simply eliminating disastrous diseases to attempting to produce children who enjoy genetic advantages that are currently available to a smaller percentage of the population. Germ-line therapy, unlike both the traditional methods of positive and negative eugenics, will make it possible for people to have their own children –but children who will be more healthy and intelligent than they would have been without genetic intervention. This method will entirely bypass the intergenerational conflict of interests which works to the disadvantage of the helpless unborn. As discussed above, public opinion is extremely malleable.

Advertising and political propaganda come down to cost. But if any individual country were to aggressively pursue a national eugenics policy while being militarily weak, or if any ethnic group were to follow such a course of action, nonparticipating countries/groups would sense a competitive threat to their offspring and would be sorely tempted to launch a preemptive strike so as to avoid the necessity of introducing a eugenics policy themselves.

[Return](#)

Radical Intervention

We know what we are, but not what we may be.

Hamlet

While we are still at an extremely early stage in our understanding of human genetics, it is entirely foreseeable that future knowledge will permit us to go beyond simple genetic tinkering to replace this or that disease-engendering gene or enhance some desirable ability or personality trait. We will be able to go much further and alter the genetic constitution in the most radical fashion. As pointed out by the bioethicist and theologian Joseph Fletcher as early as 1973, the creation of persons whose genome is partly borrowed from other species is entirely possible.¹⁵⁵

Recent writing now discusses the “fungibility” of DNA, the consequent malleability of life, the fact that human nature is not fixed, the possibility that at some future point different groups of human beings may follow divergent paths of development through the use of genetic technology –perhaps as different from one another as men and women are now, the collapse of interspecies barriers, the possibility of not simply discovering genes but creating them. Should we really attempt to preserve human nature or should we attempt to change it?¹⁵⁶ John H. Campbell, a biologist at the University of California, is among those who advocate radical interventionism.

He writes that

Geneticists are laying open our heredity like the circuit board of a radio.... We shall be able to redesign our biological selves at will.... In point of fact, it is hard to imagine how a system of inheritance could be more ideal for engineering than ours is.¹⁵⁷ Reasoning that the majority of humankind will not voluntarily accept qualitative population-management policies, Campbell points out that any attempt to raise the IQ of the whole human race would be tediously slow. He further points out that the general thrust of early eugenics was not so much species improvement as the prevention of decline.

Campbell's eugenics, therefore, advocates the abandonment of *Homo sapiens* as a “relic” or “living fossil” and the application of genetic technologies to intrude upon the genome, probably writing novel genes from scratch using a DNA synthesizer. Such eugenics would be practiced by elite groups, whose achievements would so quickly and radically outdistance the usual tempo of evolution that within ten generation the new groups will have advanced beyond our current form to the same degree that we transcend apes.

Campbell anticipates the creation of new species according to the punctuated equilibrium scenario discussed earlier. Practitioners of the new eugenics would view themselves as intermediaries of evolution rather than as finished products. Freed from the “drag” of an outdated species that is already in decline, they could evolve in intelligence in a geometrical increase –forever. Our current intellect, Campbell projects, is probably unable even to comprehend the mental attributes that descendants will struggle to conceive. He then goes on to advocate an old idea –eugenic religions. Not accidentally, one of the sites circulating Campbell's article is that of “Prometheism.” Lastly, he points out that some appropriate genetic technologies are already available:

Private autoevolution is not a possibility for a distant future nor is it a science fiction. It is with us now, albeit at an early enough phase to have escaped most people's attention.... The most significant legacy of our age will not be nuclear power, computers, political achievements or a static ethics for a “sustainable” society. It will be the closure of our rational intellect around our evolution. The statues of the 21st century will celebrate the fathers of *Homo autocatalyticus* who brought evolution under its own reason. The world waits to see whose faces will adorn them. ¹⁵⁸

Campbell's projection of rapid, small-group-directed evolution is at once heartening and depressing. Greater, even open-ended, intelligence is awesome to contemplate. On the other hand, how sad we must be for those “living fossils” who constitute the mass of humanity –humanity, at least, as we know it today.

The reader will recall that eugenics does not limit itself to the present population but defines society as the entire human community over time; the movement perceives itself as the fourth leg of the table upon which that community rests. (The three other legs are a supply of natural resources; a clean, biodiverse environment; and a human population no larger than the planet can comfortably sustain on an indefinite basis.) This means that we are dealing with what eugenicists consider to be non-negotiable issues. Such conditions are viewed as either essential to survival or intrinsically linked to the very meaning of existence. All other considerations – political parties, for example, or even the welfare of today's population –are perceived as flowing from and subordinate to these two.

What this means is that if the eugenics platform is to have any chance of success it will have to adopt a posture of non-partisanship and link itself to neither the political right nor the left. At the same time, for strategic

considerations, the movement cannot afford embroilment in inter-group conflict or even inter-group comparisons. While these areas may constitute legitimate concerns for the political scientist, the sociologist, or the human biologist, history has demonstrated that their pursuit within the eugenic agenda can be counterproductive and even disastrous. Scholars and scientists wishing to promote the eugenics agenda will have to search for commonalities with other thinkers rather than enter into conflict with them. Ideological separation will require a self-discipline that no one will readily embrace. To be honest, some of these topics can be of eugenic significance. At the very least, they can intersect with eugenic considerations. Presently, such self-control is not even being attempted. A post-human or even a non-human evolutionary path to intelligence – as opposed to a general uplifting of the whole population – therefore appears more and more likely.

Legal barriers are already being erected in a frantic attempt to prevent a resurgence of eugenics, but to believe that such measures can be completely effective is a hopeless fantasy. Campbell's logic is inescapable. The rejection of traditional within-species eugenics – despite all the posturing of society – will inevitably lead to the scenario he describes. The invention of writing created a global human mind, in which knowledge is passed on and accumulated over generations. In the process, individual people specialize in specific fields, and no one today would be tempted to speak of “universal geniuses.” There is simply too much to know. While the human brain has been millions of years in the making, computers, which have been in development really for only about a century, are already beating the best human players at chess. “Hal” may not yet have been born but he is even now kicking in his binary womb.

Carbon-based technology has its limitations. The individual human brain is limited by its size, by the amount of time available for learning, and by the speed at which it can process information. A computer can be created of any size with limitless memory and limitless programming. As for speed, current technology is already processing information in picoseconds (trillionths of a second), whereas the human brain is capable of mere microseconds.¹⁵⁹ The human mind is itself a machine, and its quirks, self-consciousness, and adaptability will all eventually be explained, even though we are only beginning to unlock its secrets. Currently a noisy debate is ongoing as to whether computer brain power can surpass human, but really it is a question of when rather than whether. The two societies projected by H.G. Wells in *The Time Machine*, one producing material goods and the other, childlike, consuming them, is probably going to arrive sooner than we think and the childlike creatures will be us.

This soon-to-be reality relegates to eugenics a far more modest role than would otherwise be imaginable. Any effort to improve the human brain is targeted at an instrument which is inherently limited in its capacity. The machine brain, on the other hand, will be something like God. Allotted only a thousand months or so of existence, we individuals are as ephemeral as chaff in the wind, but the fate of thought, of culture, of life itself has been thrust upon us, and we can either fritter away the patrimony of millions of generations in the gratification of individualistic and tribal instincts or we can stride forward to fulfill our fate, shouldering our responsibilities to a future world and linking hands in the great chain of generations.

Conclusion

A father's responsibility

Deuteronomy 6:1-9

As the collective human brain ponders both its own origins and its future, the eugenics platform reemerges as timeless, for the issues it deals with are independent of both historical advocacy and repudiation by individuals.

The left-right political continuum has been set according to issues of importance to currently living constituencies, whose interests are largely peripheral and even instrumental to the eugenics platform, where neither the expanded (longitudinal) definition of humankind nor the teleology of existence fit into the accepted spectrum.

The conflict of interests between us and future generations represents a moral confrontation, but politics can best be summarized as the formation of alliances based on mutual advantage. Which are the constituencies that will agree to partner with future generations when no quid pro quo is possible? Do such constituencies even exist?

What You Can Do For Future Generations

1. Tell your friends about this book and forward to them the website at which the book can be downloaded free of charge: www.whatwemaybe.org
2. If you are a native speaker of a language other than English and wish to volunteer to translate this book into your native tongue, please contact Dr. Glad at: JohnPGlad@Yahoo.com
3. If you are a teacher dealing with any of the following areas, assign the book to your students: academic freedom, anthropology, bioethics, biology, biopolitics, cloning, crime, demographics, ecology, egalitarianism, environmentalism, ethics, eugenics, euthanasia, evolution, fertility, futurology, generational equity, genetics, history, the holocaust, human rights, migration/emigration,/immigration), philosophy, political science, population studies, religion, sociobiology, sociology, testing, welfare.

Appendix 1

Social Biology and Population Improvement

The following document, which appeared in *Nature*, September 16, 1939, was a joint statement issued by America's and Britain's most prominent biologists (some of them Nobel Prize laureates), and was widely referred to as the "Eugenics Manifesto." The Second World War had already begun, and the authors explicitly decried antagonism between races and theories according to which certain good or bad genes are the monopoly of certain peoples. The document is published here in its entirety.

In response to a request from Science Service, of Washington, D.C., for a reply to the question "How could the world's population be improved most effectively genetically?", addressed to a number of scientific workers, the subjoined statement was prepared, and signed by those whose names appear at the end.

The question "How could the world's population be improved most effectively genetically?" raises far broader problems than the purely biological ones, problems which the biologist unavoidably encounters as soon as he tries to get the principles of his own special field put into practice. For the effective genetic improvement of mankind is dependent upon major changes in social conditions, and correlative changes in human attitudes. In the first place, there can be no valid basis for estimating and comparing the intrinsic worth of different individuals, without economic and social conditions which provide approximately equal opportunities for all members of society instead of stratifying them from birth into classes with widely different privileges.

The second major hindrance to genetic improvement lies in the economic and political conditions which foster antagonism between different peoples, nations and 'races'. The removal of race prejudices and of the unscientific doctrine that Appendix 1 113 good or bad genes are the monopoly of particular peoples or of persons with features of a given kind will not be possible, however, before the conditions which make for war and economic exploitation have been eliminated. This requires some effective sort of federation of the whole world, based on the common interests of all its peoples.

Thirdly, it cannot be expected that the raising of children will be influenced actively by considerations of the worth of future generations unless parents in general have a very considerable economic security and unless they are extended such adequate economic, medical, education and other aids in the bearing and rearing of each additional child that the having of more children does not overburden either of them. As the woman is more especially affected by childbearing and rearing, she must be given special protection to ensure that her reproductive duties do not interfere too greatly with her opportunities to participate in the life and work of the community at large. These objects cannot be achieved unless there is an organization of production primarily for the benefit of consumer and worker, unless the conditions of employment are adapted to the needs of parents and especially of mothers, and unless dwellings, towns and community services generally are reshaped with the good of children as one of their main objectives.

A fourth prerequisite for effective genetic improvement is the legalization, the universal dissemination, and the further development through scientific investigation, of ever more efficacious means of birth control, both negative and positive, that can be put into effect at all states of the reproductive process –as by voluntary temporary or permanent sterilization, contraception, abortion (as a third line of defence), control of fertility and of the sexual cycle, artificial insemination, etc. Along with all this the development of social consciousness and responsibility in regard to the production of children is required, and this cannot be expected to be operative unless the above-mentioned economic and social conditions for its fulfillment are present, and unless the superstitious attitude towards sex and reproduction now prevalent has been replaced by a scientific and social attitude. This will result in its being regarded as an honour and a privilege, if not a duty, for a mother, married or unmarried, for a couple, to have the best children possible, both in respect of their upbringing and of their genetic endowment, even where the latter would mean an artificial –though always voluntary –control over the process of parenthood.

Before people in general, or the State which is supposed to represent them, can be relied upon to adopt rational policies for the guidance of their reproduction, there will have to be, fifthly, a far wider spread of knowledge of biological principles and of recognition of the truth that both environment and heredity constitute dominating and inescapable complementary factors in human wellbeing, but factors both of which are under

the potential control of man and admit of unlimited but interdependent progress. Betterment of environmental conditions enhances the opportunities for genetic betterment in the ways above indicated. But it must be also understood that the effect of the bettered environment is not a direct one on the germ cells and that the Lamarckian doctrine is fallacious, according to which the children of parents who have had better opportunities for physical and mental development inherit these improvements biologically, and according to which, in consequence, the dominant classes and people would have become genetically superior to the underprivileged ones.

The intrinsic (genetic) characteristics of any generation can be better than those of the preceding generation only as a result of some kind of selection, that is, by those persons of the preceding generation who had a better genetic equipment have produced more offspring, on the whole, than the rest, either through conscious choice, or as an automatic result of the way in which they lived. Under modern civilized conditions such selection is far less likely to be automatic than under primitive conditions, hence some kind of conscious guidance of selection is called for to make this possible, however, the population must first appreciate the force of the above principles, and the social value which a wisely guided selection would have.

Sixthly, conscious selection requires, in addition, an agreed direction or directions for selection to take, and these directions cannot be social ones, that is, for the good of mankind at large, unless social motives predominate in society. This in turn implies its socialized organization. The most important genetic objectives, from a social point of view, are the improvement of those genetic characteristics which make (a) for health, (b) for the complex called intelligence, and (c) for those temperamental qualities which favour fellow-feeling and social behaviour rather than those (to-day most esteemed by many) which make for personal 'success', as success is usually understood at present.

A more widespread understanding of biological principles will bring with it the realization that much more than the prevention of genetic deterioration is to be sought for, and that the raising of the level of the average of the population nearly to that of the highest now existing in isolated individuals, in regard to physical wellbeing, intelligence and temperamental qualities, is an achievement that would –so far as purely genetic considerations are concerned –be physically possible with a comparatively small number of generations. Thus everyone might look upon 'genius,' combined of course with stability, as his birthright. As the course of evolution shows, this would represent no final stage at all, but only an earnest of still further progress in the future. The effectiveness of such progress, however, would demand increasingly extensive and intensive research in human genetics and in the numerous fields of investigation correlated therewith.

This would involve the co-operation of specialists in various branches of medicine, psychology, chemistry and, not least, the social sciences, with the improvement of the inner constitution of man himself as their central theme. The organization of the human body is marvelously intricate, and the study of its genetics is beset with special difficulties which require the prosecution of research in this field to be on a much vaster scale, as well as more exact and analytical, than hitherto contemplated. This can, however, come about when men's minds are turned from war and hate and the struggle for the elementary means of subsistence to larger aims, pursued in common.

The day when economic reconstruction will reach the stage where such human forces will be released is not yet, but it is the task of his generation to prepare for it, and all steps along the way will represent a gain, not only for the possibilities of the ultimate genetic improvement of man, to a degree seldom dreamed of hitherto, but at the same time, more directly, for human mastery over those more immediate evils which are so threatening our modern civilization.

Signatories:

- F. A. E. Crew,
- C. D. Darlington,
- J. B. S. Haldane,
- S. C. Harland,
- L. T. Hogben,
- J. S. Huxley,
- H. J. Muller,
- J. Needham,
- G. P. Child,

- P. R. David,
- G. Dahlberg,
- Th. Dobzhansky,
- R. A. Emerson,
- C. Gordon,
- J. Hammond,
- C. L. Huskins,
- P. C. Koller,
- W. Landauer,
- H. H. Plough,
- B. Price,
- J. Schultz, ..
- G. Steinberg,
- C. H. Waddington.160

[Return](#)

Appendix 2

100 Books Dealing with German History during the Weimar Period and under National Socialism

Books with no references to eugenics in index

1. Abel, Theodore. 1938, 1966. The Nazi Movement. Atherton Press.
2. Abel, Theodore. 1938. Why Hitler Came into Power. Prentice-Hall.
3. Arendt, Hannah. 1965. Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil. Viking Press.
4. Baird, Jay W. 1990. To Die for Germany: Heroes in the Nazi Pantheon. Indiana University Press.
5. Barnouw, DagMarch 1988. Weimar Intellectuals and the Threat of Modernity. Indiana University Press.
6. Berg-Schlosser, Dirk; Rytlewski, Ralf (eds). 1993. Political Culture in Germany. St. Martin's Press.
7. Brecht, Arnold. 1944. Prelude to Silence: The End of the German Republic. Oxford University Press, New York.
8. Bullock, Alan. 1962. Hitler: A Study in Tyranny. Harper & Row.
9. Carsten, Francis L. 1965. Reichswehr und Politik 1918-1933. Kiepenheuer & Witsch. Reissued in English in 1966 by Oxford at the Clarendon Press.
10. Cecil, Robert. 197. The Myth of the Master Race: Alfred Rosenberg and Nazi Ideology. Dodd Mead & Company.
11. Childs, David. 1991. Germany In the Twentieth Century. HarperCollins Publishers.
12. Compton, James V. 1967. The Swastika and the Eagle: Hitler, the United States, and the Origins of World War II. Houghton Mifflin Company.
13. Goldensohn, Leon. 2004. Nuremberg Interviews: An American Psychiatrist's Conversations with Defendants and Witnesses, Knopf.
14. Davidson, Eugene. 1996. The Unmaking of Adolf Hitler. University of Missouri Press.
15. Diehl, James M. 1977. Paramilitary Politics in Weimar Germany. Indiana University Press.
16. Dobkowski, Michael N.; Wallimann, Isidor. 1989. Radical Perspectives on the Rise of Fascism in Germany 1919-1945. Monthly Review Press.
17. Eksteins, Modris. 1975. The Limits of Reason: The German Democratic Press and the Collapse of Weimar Democracy. Oxford University Press.
18. Eschenburg, Theodor; Fraenkel, Ernst; Sontheimer, Kurt; Matthis, Erich; Morsey, Rudolph; Flechtheim, Ossip K.; Bracher, Karl Dietrich; Krausnick, Helmut; Rothfels, Hans; Kogon, Eugen. 1966. The Path to Dictatorship 1918-1933: Ten Essays. Frederick A. Praeger.

19. Eyck, Erich. 196. A History of the Weimar Republic. Harvard.
20. Farago, Ladislas. 1974. Aftermath: Martin Bormann and the Fourth Reich. Simon Schuster.
21. Feuchtwanger, E. J. 1995. From Weimar to Hitler: Germany 1918-1933. St. Martin's Press.
22. Fraser, Lindley. 1945. Germany Between Two Wars: A Study of Propaganda and War-Guilt. Oxford University Press.
23. Frazer, David. 1993. Knight's Cross: A Life of Field Marshal Erwin Rommel. HarperCollins.
24. Fried, Hans Ernest. 1943. The Guilt of the German Army. The Macmillan Company.
25. Fritzsche, Peter. 1998. Germans Into Nazis. Harvard University Press.
26. Fritzsche, Peter. 1990. Rehearsals for Fascism: Populism and Political Mobilization in Weimar Germany. Oxford University Press.
27. Fulbrook, Mary. 1992. The Divided Nation: a History of Germany 1918-1990. Oxford University Press.
28. Guérin, Daniel. 1994. The Brown Plague: Travels in late Weimar & Early Nazi Germany. Duke University Press.
29. Halperin, S. William. 1965. Germany Tried Democracy: A Political History of the Reich from 1918 to 1933. Norton.
30. Hamann, Brigitte. 1999. Hitler's Vienna: A Dictator's Apprenticeship. Oxford University Press.
31. Hanser, Richard. 1970. Putsch! How Hitler Made Revolution. Peter H. Wyden, Inc.
32. Heiber, Helmut. 1972. Goebbels. Hawthorn Books.
33. Heiber, Helmut. 1974. Die Republik von Weimar. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag. Reissued in English in 1993 by Blackwell.
34. Heiden, Konrad. 1944. The Führer. Carroll & Graf Publishers.
35. Herzstein, Robert Edwin. 1974. Adolf Hitler and the German Trauma 1913-1945. Capricorn Books.
36. Heydecker, Joe J.; Leeb, Johannes. 1962. The Nuremberg Trial: A History of Nazi Germany As Revealed Through the Testimony at Nuremberg. Greenwood Press.
37. Hiden, J. W. 1974. The Weimar Republic. Longman.
38. Hilger, Gustav; Meyer, Alfred G. Meyer. 1953. The Incompatible Allies: A Appendix 2 119 Memoir-History of German-Soviet Relations 1918-1941. Macmillan.
39. Hitler, Adolf. 1942. The Speeches of Adolf Hitler April 1922 –August 1939. Oxford University Press.
40. Hitler, Adolf. 1971. Mein Kampf, Houghton Mifflin Company.
41. Homer, F. X. J.; Wilcox, Larry, D. 1986. Germany and Europe in the Era of the Two World Wars, University Press of Virginia.
42. Housden, Martyn. 2000. Hitler: Study of a Revolutionary? Routledge.
43. de Hoyos, Ladislas. 1985. Klaus Barbie. W. H. Allen.
44. Hughes, John Graven. 1987. Getting Hitler into Heaven. Corgi Books.
45. Jablonsky, David. 1989. The Nazi Party in Dissolution: Hitler and the Verbotzeit 1923-1925. Frank Cass.
46. Shirer, William L. 1990. The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany, Touchstone Books.
47. Jasper, Gotthard. 1968. Von Weimar zu Hitler 1930-1933. Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
48. Jetzinger, Franz. 1958, 1976. Hitler's Youth. Greenwood Press.
49. Jones, J. Sydney. 1983. Hitler in Vienna 1907-1913. Stein and Day Publishers.
49. Jones, Nigel H. 1987. Hitler's Heralds: The Study of the Freikorps 1918-1923, John Murray.
50. Kastning, Alfred. 1970. Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie zwischen Koalition und Opposition. Ferdinand Schöningh.
51. Kersten, Felix (ed.: Herma Briffault). 1947. The Memoirs of Doctor Felix Kersten. Doubleday & Co.
52. Kilzer, Louis. 2000. Hitler's Traitor: Martin Bormann and the Defeat of the Reich. Presidio.
53. Klemperer (von), Klemens. 1957, 1968. Germany's New Conservatism: Its History

- and Dilemma in the Twentieth Century, Princeton University Press.
54. Kochan, Lionel. 1963. *The Struggle for Germany 1914-1945*. Edinburgh at the University Press.
 55. Koch-Weser, Erich. 1930. *Germany in the Post-War World*. Dorrance & Co.
 56. Koenisberg, Richard A. 1975. *Hitler's Ideology: A Study in Psychoanalytic Sociology*. The Library of Social Science.
 57. Könneman, Erwin; Krusch, Hans-Joachim. 1972. *Aktionseinheit contra Kapp-Putsch*. Dietz Verlag.
 58. Kosok, Paul. 1933. *Modern Germany: A Study of Conflicting Loyalties*. University of Chicago Press.
 59. Langer, Walter C. *The Mind of Adolf Hitler: The Secret Wartime Report*. Basic Books.
 60. Lee, Marshall M.; Michalka, Wolfgang. 1987. *German Foreign Policy 1917-1933*. Berg.
 61. Linklater, Magnus; Hilton, Isabel; Ascherson, Neal. 1985. *The Nazi Legacy: Klaus Barbie and the International Fascist Connection*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
 62. Ludecke, Kurt G. W. 1937. *I Knew Hitler*. Charles Scribners.
 63. Manvell, Roger; Fraenkl, Heinrich. 1969. *The Canaris Conspiracy: The Secret Resistance to Hitler in the German Army*. David McKay Company.
 64. McKenzie, John R. P. 1971. *Weimar Germany 1918-1933*. Rowman and Littlefield.
 65. Merker, Paul. Vol. 1, 1944, Vol. 2, 1945. *Deutschland: Sein oder nicht sein?* El Libro Libre, Mexico City.
 66. Messenger, Charles. 1991. *The Last Prussian: A Biography of Field Marshal Gerd von Rundstedt 1875-1953*. Brassey's.
 67. Mitcham, Samuel W. 1996. *Why Hitler? The Genesis of the Nazi Reich*, Praeger.
 68. Mommsen, Hans. 1991. *From Weimar to Auschwitz*. Princeton University Press.
 69. Morgan, J. H. 1945. *Assize of Arms: Being the Story of the Disarmament of Germany and Her Rearmament 1919-1939*. Methuen & Co.
 70. Murphy, David Thomas. 1997. *The Heroic Earth: Geopolitical Thought in Weimar Germany 1918-1933*. Kent State University Press.
 71. Nicholls, A. J. 1991. *Weimar and the Rise of Hitler*. St. Martin's Press.
 72. Nicholls, Anthony; Matthias, Erich (eds.). 1971. *German Democracy and the Triumph of Hitler*. George Allen and Unwin.
 73. Pachter, Henry. 1982. *Weimar Studies*. Columbia University Press.
 74. Paris, Erna. 1986. *Unhealed Wounds: France and the Klaus Barbie Affair*. Grove Press.
 75. Patch, William L. 1998. *Heinrich Brüning and the Dissolution of the Weimar Republic*. Cambridge University Press.
 76. Payne, Robert. 1973. *The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler*. Praeger.
 77. Peterson, Edward N. 1969. *The Limits of Hitler's Power*. Princeton University Press.
 78. Pool, James. 1997. *Hitler and His Secret Partners: Contributions, Loot and Rewards 1933-1945*. Pocket Books.
 79. Price, G. Ward. 1938. *I Know These Dictators*. Henry Holt and Company.
 80. Price, Morgan Philips. 1999. *Dispatches from the Weimar Republic: Versailles and German Fascism*. Pluto Press.
 81. Robinson, Jacob. 1965. *And the Crooked Shall Be Made Straight: The Eichmann Trial, the Jewish Catastrophe, and Hannah Arendt's NarraAppendix 2 121 tive*. Macmillan.
 82. Roll, Erich. 1933. *Spotlight on Germany: A Survey of Her Economic and Political Problems*. Faber & Faber Limited.
 83. Russell (Lord) of Liverpool. 1963. *The Record: The Trial of Adolf Eichmann for His Crimes Against the Jewish People and Against Humanity*. Alfred A. Knopf.
 84. Schacht, Hjalmar Horace Greeley. 1974. *Confessions of "The Old Wizard": Autobiography*. Greenwood Press.
 85. Scheele, Godfrey. 1946. *The Weimar Republic: Overture to the Third Reich*.

Faber and Faber Limited.

86. Schellenberg, Walter. 1956. *The Labyrinth: Memoirs*. Harper and Brothers Publishers.
87. Schultz, Sigrid. 1944. *Germany Will Try It Again*. Reynal & Hitchcock.
88. Stachura, Peter D. 1983. *The Nazi Machtergreifung*. George Allen & Unwin.
89. Stachura, Peter D. 1993. *Political Leaders in Weimar Germany: A Biographical Study*. Simon & Schuster.
90. Taylor, Simon. 1983. *The Rise of Hitler: Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany 1918-1933*. Universe Books.
91. Dederke, Karlheinz. 1984. *Reich und Republik Deutschland 1917-1933*. Klett-Cotta.
92. Villard, Oswald Garrison. 1933. *The German Phoenix: The Story of the Republic*. Harrison Asmith & Robert Haas.
93. Waite, Robert G. L. 1952. *Vanguard of Nazism: The Free Corps Movement in Post-War Germany*. Harvard.
94. Watkins, Frederick Mundell. 1939. *The Failure of constitutional emergency Powers under the German Republic*. Harvard University Press.
95. Welch, David. 1983. *Nazi Propaganda: The Power and The Limitations*. Croom Helm & Barnes & Noble Books.
96. Wheeler-Bennett, John W. 1967. *The Nemesis of Power: The German Army in Politics 1918-1945*. Viking Press.

Books with references to eugenics in index

97. Benderesky, Joseph W. 1956. *A History of Nazi Germany*. Burnham Inc. According to the index, eugenics is mentioned on mentioned on 10 pages, but several of these actually refer to euthanasia rather than eugenics, and the others are limited to Hitler's belief in "Aryan" racial superiority.
98. Bramwell, Anna. 1985. *Blood and Soil: Richard Walther Darré and Hitler's "Green Party"*. Kensal Press, 7 mentions.
99. Hiden, John. 1996. *Republican and Fascist Germany: Themes and Variations in the History of Weimar and the Third Reich 1918-1945*, Longman, 2 mentions.
100. Peukert, Detlev J. K. 1991. *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity*, Hill and Wang, 2 mentions.

Works Cited

- American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). 2000. "The Human Genome," *Science*, special issue, Vol. 291, No. 5507.
- Associated Press. 1992. "Study Shows Brains Differ in Gay, Heterosexual Men: Anterior Commissure Area Larger in Homosexuals," *Washington Post*, August 1, A2.
- Associated Press. 2001a. "Population rises halt in developed nations," *Washington Times*, May 22, A6; quoting Population Reference Bureau.
- Associated Press. 2001b. "Scientist says he will clone humans in U.S. or abroad," *Washington Times*, December 15, A2.
- Atkinson, Richard. 2001. "SAT Is to Admissions as Inadequate Is to..." *Washington Post*, March 26, A1.
- Bailey, Michael; Pillard, Richard C. 1991. "A Genetic Study of Male Sexual Orientation," *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, 48, 1089-96.
- Bajema, Carl Jay. 1976. *Eugenics Then and Now*. Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross, Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania. Balter, Michael. 2001. "Anthropologists Duel Over Modern Human Origins," *Science*, March 2, Vol. 291, 1728-1729.
- Baur, Erwin; Fischer, Eugen; Lenz, Fritz. 1931. *Human Heredity*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Bearden, H. Joe; Fuquay, John W. 2000. *Applied Animal Reproduction (Fifth Edition)*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Binding, Karl; Hoche, Alfred. 1920. *Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens*. F. Meiner, Leipzig.
- Blank, Robert H. 1982. *Torts for Wrongful Life: Individual and Eugenic Implications*. *Social Philosophy*

and Policy Center, Bowling Green, Ohio.

- Bodart, Gaston. 1916. *Losses of Life in Modern Wars*. H. Milford, London/New York.
- Borkenau, Peter; Riemann, Rainer; Agleitner, Alois; Spinath, Frank M. 2001. "Genetic and Environmental Influences on Observed Personality: Evidence from the German Observational Study of Adult Twins," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 80, No. 4, 655-668.
- Bowler, Peter J. 1986. *Theories of Human Evolution: A Century of Debate, 1844-1944*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore/London.
- Bravin, Jess; Regaldo, Antonio. 2003. "U.N. Puts Off Human-Clone Ban Amid Demands by U.S., Vatican," *Wall Street Journal*, November 7, A3.
- Brock, Dan; Buchanan, Allen; Daniels, Norman; Wickler, Daniel. 2000. *From Chance to Choice: Genes And The Just Society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K./New York.
- Broyde, Machael J. Undated, between 1997 and 2002. "Cloning People and Jewish Law: A Preliminary Analysis." www.jlaw.com/Articles/Cloning.html.
- Campbell, John H. 1995. *Taken from Evolution and Human Values*. 1995.
- Campbell, J. H.; Wesson, R.; and Williams, P. (editors) *Rodopi Press, Amsterdam*, 79-114. www.home.comcast.net/~neoeugenics/camp.htm.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Power of Myth*. Interview with Bill Moyers, Public Television.
- Cavalli-Sforza, L. L.; Bodmer, W. F. 1971. *The Genetics of Human Populations*. W. H. Freeman, San Francisco.
- Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. 1936. "On Pedological Distortions in the Commissariats of Education," *Pravda*, July 5.
- Christians for the Cloning of Jesus. "The Shroud of Turin." www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/8611/page2.html.
- Clark, A. J. 1998. *Animal Breeding: Technology for the 21st Century*, Harwood Academic, multiple publishing sites.
- Cole, Tim. 1999. *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler: How History is Bought, Packaged, and Sold*. Routledge, New York.
- Collange, Jean François; Houdebine, Louis-Marie; Huriet, Claude; Lecourt, Dominique; Renard, Jean-Paul; Testart, Jacques. 1999. *Faut-il vraiment cloner l'homme?* Presses universitaires de France, Paris.
- Cooperman, Alan. 2002. "Number of Jews in U.S. Falls 5 Percent: Report Cites Couples' Decision to Delay Having Children as Principal Cause," *Washington Post*, October 9, A3.
- Crew, F. A. E.; Darlington, C. D.; Haldane, J. B. S. Harland, S. C.; Hogben, L. T.; Huxley, J. S. Muller, H. J.; Needham, J.; Child, G. P.; David, P. R.; Dahlberg, G.; Dobzhansky, Th.; Emerson, R. A.; Gordon, C.; Hammond, J.; Huskins, C. L.; Koller, P. C.; Landauer, W.; Plough, H. H.; Price, B.; Schultz, J.; Steinberg, G.; Waddington, C. H. "Social Biology and Population Improvement," *Nature*, Vol. 144, No. 3646, 521-522.
- De Marco, Donna. 2001. "What's in a name?: For direct marketers, a gold mine of data about a consumer's tastes, pocketbook," *Washington Times*, June 17, A1, 6. "Disability Rights Advocates," Center for Genetics and Society www.genetics-and-society.org/constituencies/disability.html.
- "Docs Grow Heart Cells," 2001. DNA Diagnostics Center, August 2, www.dnacenter.com/geneticnews.html.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1983. *Who Rules America Now? A View for the '80s*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Dougherty, Carter. 2001. "Free censorship with purchase? ISP blocks access to sites without consent to curb 'spam,'" *Washington Times*, May 30, B8, 9.
- Drouard, Alain. 1999. *L'eugénisme en questions: L'exemple de l'eugénisme "français"*. Ellipses, Paris.
- Duster, Troy. 1990. *Backdoor to Eugenics*. Routledge, New York/London.
- Eisenberg, Daniel. 2002. "The Ethics of Cloning." www.us-israel.org/jsource/Judaism/clone.html
- Elliman, Wendy. 2001. "Statistical probabilities and probable cures," *Jerusalem Post*, February 27, WWW.
- *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 2001. "Genetic disease, human."
- "Eugenics – Euthenics – Euphenics," www.bioethicsanddisability.org/Eugenics%20Euthenics.%20Euphenics.html.
- Eysenck, H. J. 1982. "The sociology of psychological knowledge, the genetic interpretation of the IQ, and Marxist-Leninist ideology," *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, No. 35, 449-451.
- Finkelstein, Norman G. 2000. *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*. VERSO, London/New York.

- Fletcher, John C. 1983. "Moral Problems and Ethical Issues in Prospective Human Gene Therapy," *Virginia Law Review*, Vol. 69, No. 3, April, 515-546.
- Fletcher, Joseph. 1974. *The Ethics of Genetic Control: Ending Reproductive Roulette*. Anchor Press, Garden City, New York.
- Flynn, James R. 1984. "The Mean IQ of Americans: Massive Gains 1932 to 1978," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 95, No. 1, 29-51.
- Ford, Gerald. 2002. "Curing, Not Cloning," *Washington Post*, June 5, A23.
- "Fordham team discovers cause of genetic disorder that affects people of Eastern European Jewish descent," 2001. Fordham University, www.neswise.com/p/articles/view/22419.
- Fox, Maggie. 2002. "Genie out of the bottle on cloning, expert says," *Reuters*, May 15, www.ablewise.com/article/article_026.shtml
- Frazer, Lorraine. 2002. "In-vitro pioneer backs cloning for infertility, but with safeguards," *London Sunday Telegraph*, reprinted in the *Washington Times*, June 9, A7.
- Fuller, John L. "Social Biology: Whence and Whither," *Social Biology*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 112-114.
- Gallup Organization. 1999. "New Poll Gauges Americans' General Knowledge Levels," July 6.
- Gallup Organization. 2000. "One in Five Americans Unaware that Either Bush or Gore Is a Likely Presidential Nominee," March 22.
- Gallup Organization. 2001. "Public Favorable to Creationism," February 14.
- Garber, Robert (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum). 2001. E-mail letter to John Glad, December 19.
- Gershon, Elliot S. 1983. "Should Science Be Stopped? The Case of Recombinant DNA Research," *The Public Interest*, Spring, No. 71, 3-16.
- Gist, John G. 2000. "Wealth Distribution in 1998: Finds from the Survey of Consumer Finances," *American Association of Retired Persons*, WWW.
- Glad, John. 1998. "A Hypothetical Model of IQ Decline Resulting from Political Murder and Selective Emigration," *The Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No. 3, 279-298.
- Glad, John. 2001. "The Current Attitude Toward Eugenics in France," *The Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 1, Fall 2001, 77-89.
- Gladue, Brian A.; Green, Richard; Hellman, Ronald E. 1984. "Neuroendocrine Response to Estrogen and Sexual Orientation," *Science*, September 28, Vol. 225, 1496-1499.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. Norton, New York.
- Graham, Loren R. "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s," *American Historical Review*, 82:1133-1164.
- Grobstein, Clifford; Flower, Michael. 1984. "Gene Therapy: Proceed with Caution," *The Hastings Center Report*, April, 13-17.
- "Gun deaths decline 26 percent since '93." 2001. *Washington Times*, April 13, A6.
- Guttmacher, Alan F. 1964. "The Tragedy of the Unwanted Child," *Parents' Magazine*, June.
- Haller, Mark H. 1963. *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Hardin, Garrett. 1977. *The Limits of Altruism: An Ecologist's View of Survival*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Harper, Jennifer. 2004. "Brits can't find Chicago, Dallas in geography test," *Washington Times*, January 4, A2.
- Henderson, Helen. 1999. "Breaking Down Barriers," *Toronto Star*, October 23, <http://www.pcs.mb.ca/~ccd/ts231099.html>
- Henshaw, Stanley K.; O'Reilly, Kevin. 1983. "Characteristics of Abortion Patients in the United States," 1979 and 1980," *Family Planning Perspectives*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 5-16.
- Herrnstein, Richard J.; Murray, Charles. 1994. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. Free Press, New York.
- Hersh, A. H. 1966. "Eugenics," *Encyclopedia Americana: International Edition*, Vol. 10, 567-571.
- Hewlett, Sylvia Ann. 2002. "Household Help," a review of *Joined at the Heart: The Transformation of the American Family by Al and Tipper Gore*, *Washington Post*, Bookworld, December 8, 7.
- Hirschi, Travis; Hindelang, Michael J. 1977. "Intelligence and Delinquency: A Revisionist Review," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 42, August, 571-587.
- Holden, Constance. 2001. "Study Suggests Pitch Perception Is Inherited," *Science*, March 9, Vol. 291, 1879.
- Holmes, Samuel Jackson. 1933. *The Eugenic Predicament*.
- Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York. Howells, William White. 1997. *Getting Here: The Story of*

Human Evolution. Compass Press, Washington, D.C.

- Hunt, Earl. 1995. "The Role of Intelligence in Modern Society," *American Scientist*, July-August, WWW.
- Huntington, Ellsworth. 1935. *Tomorrow's Children: The Goal of Eugenics*. Wiley, London, Chapman and Hall, London.
- "Infertility and Conception" Undated. Epigee Birth Control Guide, www.epigee.org/guide.
- Itzkoff, Seymour W. 2000. *The Inevitable Domination by Man: An Evolutionary Detective Story*, Paideia Publishers, Ashfield, Massachusetts.
- Jenkins, Philip. 1982. "The Radicals and the Rehabilitative Ideal, 1890-1930," *Criminology*, Vol. 20, Nos. 3-4, 347-372.
- Jensen, Arthur R. 1980. *Bias in Mental Testing*. Free Press, New York.
- Jordan, David Starr. 1915. *War and The Breed : The Relation of War to the Downfall of Nations*. Clivedon Press, Boston.
- Kahn, Susan Martha. 2000. *Reproducing Jews: A Cultural Account of Assisted Conception in Israel*. Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina.
- Kaiser, Jochen-Christoph; Nowak, Kurt; Schwartz, Michael. 1992. *Eugenik, Sterilisation, "Euthanasie": Politische Biologie in Deutschland 1895-1945*. Buchverlag Union, Halle.
- "Kansas Board Revives Teaching of Evolution: New Science Standards Undo Religious Conservatives' Controversial 1999 Move," *Washington Post*, February 15, 2001, A10; reprinted from *Los Angeles Times*.
- Kristol, William (chairman, the Bioethics Project); Arkes, Hadley (professor of American Institutions, Amherst College); Bauer, Gary (president, American Values); Bennett, William J. (Codirector, Empower America); Bottum, J. (books and arts editor, the *Weekly Standard*); Bradley, Gerard V. (professor of law, University of Notre Dame); Cameron, Nigel (dean, the Wilberforce Forum); Casey, Samuel B. (exec. director and CEO, Christian Legal Society); Colson, Charles W. (Prison Fellowship Ministries Chairman, the Wilberforce Forum); Combs, Roberta (president, Christian Coalition of America); Connor, Ken (president, Family Research Council); Dobson, James (president, Focus on the Family); Forbes, Steves (businessman and former U.S. Presidential candidate); Fadkin, Hillel (president, Ethics and Public Policy Center); Fukuyama, Francis (professor of International Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University), George, Robert P. (professor of jurisprudence, Princeton University); Kilner, John (president, The Center for Bioethics and Human Dignity); Land, Richard D. (president and CEO, Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission); Mitchell, C. Ben (editor, *Ethics and Medicine: An International Journal of Bioethics*); Murray, William J. (chairman, Religious Freedom Coalition); Neuhaus, Richard John (Institute for Religion and Public Life); O'Steen, David (exec. director, National Right to Life Committee); Prentice, David (M.D., Do No Harm); Rios, Sandy (president, Concerned Women of America); Ruse, Austin (president, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute); Smith, Wesley J. (author); Stevens, David (M.D., exec. Director, Christian Medical Association); Weigel, George (Ethics and Public Policy Center); Weyrick, Paul (Free Congress Foundation). 2002. "An assault on human dignity: President Bush shows moral leadership on human cloning," *Washington Times*, January 10, A17.
- Kröner, Hans-Peter; Toellner, Richard; Weisemann, Karen. 1990. "Inwieweit Erwin Baur in die geistige Urhebererschaft der historischen Verbrechen, die der Nationalsozialismus begangen hat, verstrickt war oder nicht." *Erwin Baur: Naturwissenschaft und Politik*. Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften, Münster, 1991, WWW.
- Lamb, James I. 2002. "Cloaked Cloning," *Update*, Spring, Lutherans for Life. www.lutheransforlife.org/update/2002/spring/cloaked_cloning.htm
- Laris, Michael. 2002. "Herd Round the World: 2.3 Million Granddaughters and Counting For Bull of the Century from Loudoun," *Washington Post*, June 30, A1, 10-11.
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1914. "A Liberal Professor on Equality," *Put' pravdy*, No. 33, March 11.
- Leonard, Mary. 2002. "Coalition urges a ban on all human cloning," *Boston Globe*, March 22, www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/081/nation
- Lerner, Barbara. 1980. "The War on Testing: David, Goliath & Gallup," *Public Interest*, No. 60, summer, 119-147. Lo Duca, (Giuseppe). 1969. *Histoire de l'érotisme. La jeune parque*, Paris.
- Lunden, Walter. 1964. *Statistics on Delinquents and Delinquency*, C. C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois.
- Lynn, Richard. 1996. *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations*. Praeger, Westport, Connecticut/London.
- Margolin, C. R. "Attitudes Toward Control and Elimination of Genetic Defects," *Social Biology*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 33-37.

- McConaughy, John. 1933. *Who Rules America? A Century of Invisible Government*. Toronto, Longmans, Green and Co., New York/Toronto.
- McNeill, William H. 1984. "Human Migration in Historical Perspective," *Population and Development Review*, No. 1, March, 1-18.
- Mednick, Sarnoff. 1985. "Crime in the Family Tree," *Psychology Today*, March, 58-61.
- Missa, Jean-Noël; Susanne, Charles (eds.). 1999. *De l'eugénisme d'État à l'eugénisme privé*, DeBoeck Université, Brussels.
- Monde (Le). 2002. "La naissance annoncée des premiers clones humains," May 24, WWW.
- Mooney, Chris. 2001. "Irrationalist in Chief," *The American Prospect*: Online. September 24.. Quoting Leon Kass in *Toward a More Natural Science*, 1985, and Virginia Postrel in the *Los Angeles Times*. www.prospect.org/V12/17/mooney-c.html
- Moravec, Hans. 1997. "When will computer hardware match the human brain?" *The Journal of Transhumanism*, Vol. 1, WWW, December.
- National Assessment of Education Progress. *National Test Results*.
- Neel, James V. 1983. "Some Base Lines for Human Evolution and the Genetic Implications of Recent Cultural Developments," *How Humans Adapt: A Biocultural Odyssey*, Donald J. Ortner (ed.). Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- *New York Times*. 2002. "Dr. Frankenstein on the Hill," May 18, A14.
- Osborne, Frederick. "History of the American Eugenics Society," *Social Biology*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 115-126.
- Paul, Diane B. 1995. *Controlling Human Heredity: 1865 to the Present*, Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey.
- Paul, Diane B. 1998. *The Politics of Heredity*. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Pearson, Ian. 2000. November 17. *The Future of Human Evolution: Part One*, WWW.
- Pearson, Roger. 1997. *Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe*. Washington, D.C.
- Perkins, Joseph. 2002. "Cloning research under wraps," *Washington Times*, June 5, A14.
- Petersilia, Joan; Greenwood, Peter W.; Lavin, Marvin. 1978. *Criminal Careers of Habitual Felons*, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, July.
- Pichot, André. 1995. *L'eugénisme ou les généticiens saisis par la philanthropie*. Paris.
- Pichot, André. 2000. *La société pure: De Darwin à Hitler*. Paris.
- Pickrell, John. 2001. "Human Cloning: Experts Assail Plan to Help Childless Couples," *Science*, March 16, Vol. 291, 2061, 2063.
- Pisto, Sergio. 2002. *Father of the Impossible Children: Ignoring nearly universal opprobrium, Severino presses ahead with plans to clone a human being*, WWW.
- Pomerantz, G. 1973. "Man without an Adjective," *Ethics*, Vol. 83, No. 2, 126-145.
- Population Reference Bureau. 2003 *World Population Data Sheet*. Washington, D.C.
- Population Reference Bureau. Undated. *World Population and the Environment*. Washington, D.C.
- Price, Joyce Howard. 2001. "Australian scientists fertilize mice eggs without using sperm." *The Washington Times*, July 13, A8.
- Rajeswary, L. 1985. "Study Finds Illiteracy Widespread," *Washington Post*, August 3, A8.
- Revel, Michel. 2003? "Human Reproductive Cloning, Embryo Stem Cells, and Germline Gene Intervention: An Israeli Perspective," *Weizmann Institute of Science*, Rehovot, Israel, http://www.academy.ac.il/bioethics/english/articles/bioethics_revel.htm
- Reichler, Max (Rabbi). 1916. *Jewish Eugenics and Other Essays*. New York.
- Richards, W. (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum). 2001. E-mail letter to John Glad, December 20.
- Ridley, Mark. 2001. "Sex, Errors and The Genome," *Natural History*, Vol. 110, No. 5, p43; WWW (EBSCO).
- Roper, Allen G. 1913. *Ancient Eugenics*. Oxford.
- Rothman, Stanley; Lichter, S. Robert. 1982. *Roots of Radicalism: Jews, Christians, and the New Left*. New York/Oxford.
- Rubin, Debra. 2001. "Wiesel Laments anti-Semitism among Jews," *Washington Jewish Week*, March 22, 29.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz. 1999. "Islamic Perspectives on Cloning," www.people.virginia.edu/~aas/issues/cloning.htm
- Saetz, Stephen B. 1985. "Eugenics and the Third Reich," *Eugenics Bulletin*, taken here from the *Future Generations* website (eugenics.net).

- Schwartz, Michael. 1995. *Sozialistische Eugenik: Eugenische Sozialtechnologien in Debatten und Politik der deutschen Sozialdemokratie 1890-1933*. Bonn.
- Segal, Nancy. L. 1999. *Entwined Lives: Twins and What They Tell Us About human Behavior*. New York.
- Smith, Alison. 2002. "Measuring Up: Should genetic testing decide who is born?" *The National, Canadian Broadcasting News*, March 11,
- Singer, Peter. 1999. *A Darwinian Left: Politics, Evolution and Cooperation*. New Haven/London.
- Snyderman, Mark; Rothman, Stanley. 1986. "Science, Politics, and the IQ Controversy," *The Public Interest*, No. 83, spring, 79-97.
- "Speaking in Fewer Tongues." 2001. *Washington Post*, June 9, A13.
- Special Correspondant, 2002. "La naissance annoncée des premiers clones humains," *Le Monde*, May 24, WWW.
- Sprow, Marla. 2002. "Bill could criminalize cloning for scientists," *The Michigan Daily Online*, June 10, www.michigandaily.com/vnews/display/2002/06/10.
- Squires, Sally. 1985. "Pinpointing the Killer," *Washington Post*, May 29.
- Statistical Abstract of the United States 1982-83. Washington, D.C.
- Stein, Rob. "Wider Human-Chimp Gap," *Science Notebook, Washington Post*, September 9, A7.
- Stolberg, Sheryl Gay. 2002. *Total Ban on Cloning Research Appears Dead*, *New York Times*, June 14, A18.
- Stoler-Lis, Sachlav. 2003. "'Mothers Birth the Nation': The Social Construction of Zionist Motherhood in Wartime in Israeli Parents' Manuals," *Nashim*, No. 6, fall, 104-118, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, The Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, The Hadassah-Brandeis Institute, Jerusalem. Stone, Naomi. 2000. *Erasing Tay-Sachs Disease*, WWW.
- "Study rejects bacterial genes claim." 2001. *Washington Times*, May 18, A10.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. 1914. *Criminology*. J. B. Lippincott, Philadelphia.
- Thomas, Jean-Paul. 1995. *Les fondements de l'eugénisme*. Paris.
- Timberg, Craig. 2003. "Williams Aims To Be Mayor of A Bigger D.C.: Attracting Residents Is Goal As 2nd Term Begins Today," *Washington Post*, January 2, A1, A11.
- Traub, James. 2002. "Common Talk: In Enron-sized America, why is populism such a dirty word?" *New York Times, Magazine Section (No. 6)*, October 16, 23-24.
- Traubmann, Tamara. 2004. "Do not have children if they won't be healthy," *Haaretz*, July 3, 5764, www.
- Tucker, William H. 1994. *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*, Urbana/Chicago.
- Vedantam, Shankar. 2001. "Tracing the Synapses of Our Spirituality: Researchers Examine Relationship Between Brain and Religion," *Washington Post*, June 17, A1, A9.
- Vedantam, Shankar. 2004. "Dementia and the Voter: Research Raises Ethical, Constitutional Questions," *Washington, Post*, September 14, A1, A9.
- Velle, Weiart. 1984. "Sex Differences in Intelligence: Implications for Educational Policy," *Journal of Human Evolution*, No. 13, 109-115.
- Verschuer, Otmar von. 1938. "The Racial Biology of Jews," *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Vol. III, Hamburg, Translated by Charles E. Weber, WWW.
- Verschuer, Otmar von. 1943. *Manuel d'eugénique et hérédité humaine*. Translated by Dr. George Montandon (shown as Professor of Ethnology and Anthropology). Paris.
- Vining, Daniel. 1982. "Dysgenic Fertility and Welfare: An Elementary Test," *Person. Individ. Diff.* Vol. 4, No. 5, 513-518.
- Vining, Daniel. 1983. "Illegitimacy and Public Policy," *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 9., No. 1, March, 105-110.
- Wade, Nicholas. 2002. "Stem Cell Mixing May Form A Human-Mouse Hybrid: Mice With Human Cells Would be Likely," *New York Times*, November 27, A17.
- Wade, Nicholas. 2004. "Human Gene Total Falls Again, to 20,000+," *New York Times*, October 21, A23.
- Weingart, Peter. 2000. "Eugenics and Race-Hygiene in the German Context: A Legacy of Science Turned Bad?" 202-223, *Humanity at the Limit: The Impact of the Holocaust Experience on Jews and Christians*. Bloomington/ Indianapolis.
- Weingart, Peter; Kroll, Jürgen; Bayertz, Kurt. 1988. *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Weinrich, James D. 1978. "Nonreproduction, Homosexuality, Transsexualism, and Intelligence: A Systematic Literature Search," *Journal of Homosexuality*, Vol. 3 (3), Spring, 275-289.
- Weiss, Meira. 2002. *The Chosen Body: The Politics of the Body in Israel Society*. Stanford University

- Press. Weiss, Rick. 2002. "Free to Be Me: Would-Be Cloners Pushing the Debate," Washington Post, May 12, A1, A10. Wetzstein, Cheryl. 2001. "Unwed mothers set a record for births: 33% of infants born out of wedlock," Washington Times, April 18, A1.
- Weyl, Nathaniel & Possony, Stefan. 1963. *The Geography of the Intellect*. Chicago.
 - Weyl, Nathaniel. 1967. "Aristocide as a Force in History," *Intercollegiate Review*, June 1967, 237-245.
 - Willing, Richard. 2001. "Human Cloning Banned by House," USA Today, August 1, www.dnacenter.com/geneticnews.html.
 - Wright, Lawrence. 1997. *Twins and What They Tell Us About Who We Are*. New York.
 - Wright, William. 1998. *Born That Way: Genes, Behavior, Personality*. New York.
 - Yax, Laura K. 2000. "Statistical Brief: Mothers Who Receive AFDC Payments," U.S. Census Bureau, September 13, WWW.
 - Zohar, Noam J. 1998. "From Lineage to Sexual Mores: Examining 'Jewish Eugenics,'" *Science in Context*, 11, 3-4, 575-585.
 - Zoll, Rachel. 2002. "Jewish population in U.S. declining: Median age up 4 years, survey finds," Washington Times, October 9, A2.

Endnotes

- 1 Francis Galton, "Eugenics, Its Definition, Scope, and Aims," *Sociological Papers*, 1905, I, 45-50, 45; quoted in Weingart, Kroll, and Bayertz, 1988, 33.
 - 2 Pichot, 2000, 12-13.
 - 3 Balter, 2001.
 - 4 Itzkoff, 2000, 265.
 - 5 Campbell.
 - 6 Neel, 1983.
 - 7 Examination Alpha, Test 8, Forms 8 and 9, quoted by Paul, 1995, pg. 66, from Robert M. Yerkes, ed. *Psychological Examining in the United States Army*, Vol. 15 of *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, Washington, D.C., 1921.
 - 8 Herrnstein/Murray, 1994, 345.
 - 9 Flynn, 1984.
 - 10 Herrnstein/Murray, 1994, 401.
 - 11 Lerner, 1980, 121.
 - 12 Snyderman/Rothman, 1986, 83.
 - 13 Finkelstein, 2000, 36-37.
 - 14 Tucker, 1994, 219; Cited by B. S. Bloom, "Testing Cognitive Ability and Achievement," *Handbook of Research on Testing*, ed. N.c. Gage, 1963, 384.
 - 15 Hewlett, 2002.
 - 16 Herrnstein/Murray, 1994, 351.
 - 17 Henshaw/O'Reilly, 1983, 10.
 - 18 Weyl and Possona, 1963; Weyl, 1967.
 - 19 Glad, 1998.
 - 20 Trafford, 2002, F8.
 - 21 *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "Genetic disease, human."
 - 22 Ridley, 2001.
 - 23 Hersh, 1966, 568.
 - 24 Mann, Fritz, "Eugénique et éthique commune dans la société pluraliste," *Missa/Susanne*, 1999, 140.
- Endnotes 139
- 25 Lévinas, E., *Totalité et infini: Essai sur l'extériorité*, Coll. *Biblio Essais*, No. 4120, 1971, pg. 310; quoted in *Missa/Susanne*, 97.
 - 26 Pembre, M., "Prenatal diagnosis and its ethical implication," *A Report to the European Commission Group of Advisors on the Ethical Implication of Biotechnology*, October 1994, 3-4; quoted in *Missa/Susanne*, 38-39.
 - 27 Brock et al.
 - 28 Traubmann, 2004.
 - 29 Elliman, 2001.
 - 30 Elliman, 2001.

- 31 Stone, 2000.
- 32 "Disability Rights Advocates."
- 33 Smith, 2002.
- 34 Henderson, 1999.
- 35 www.bioethicsanddisability.org/eugenics.html 36 Eugenics –Euthenics – Euphenics.
- 37 Lo Duca, 1969.
- 38 Bearden/Fuquay, 2000, 2.
- 39 Wright, 1997, 25.
- 40 Wright, 1997, 147-148.
- 41 Borkenau et al, 2001.
- 42 Wright, 1997, 61.
- 43 Wright, 1997, 61.
- 44 Wright, 1997, 63.
- 45 Bearden/Fuquay, 2000, 151.
- 46 Laris, 2002.
- 47 Weiss, Rick, 2002, A10.
- 48 Mooney, 2001.
- 49 Kristol, 2002.
- 50 Stolberg.
- 51 Bravin/Regalado.
- 52 Wade, 2004.
- 53 Paul, 1998, 12-13.
- 54 Population Reference Bureau, 2003 World Population Data Sheet.
- Endnote140 s
- 55 Hardin, 1977.
- 56 Singer, 1999, 42.
- 57 Gallup Organization, February 14, 2001.
- 58 Fletcher, 1983, 519.
- 59 McConaughy, 1933, 1, 7.
- 60 Timberg, 2003.
- 61 Traub, 2002.
- 62 Gallup, March 22, 2000.
- 63 National Assessment of Education Progress.
- 64 Gallup, July 6, 1999.
- 65 Rajeswary, 1985.
- 66 Harper, 2004.
- 67 Vedantam, 2004.
- 68 See: Pomerantz, 1973, for a sensitive discussion.
- 69 Bajema, 1976, 257.
- 70 Herrnstein/Murray, 1994, 197.
- 71 David Lykken, quoted in Wright, 1997, 131. See also Herrnstein/Murray, 1994, 191-201.
- 72 Guttmacher, 1964.
- 73 Vining, 1983.
- 74 Yax, 2000.
- 75 Price, 2001.
- 76 Wright, 1997, 64.
- 77 Wright, 1997, 60.
- 78 Holden, 2001.
- 79 Haller, 1963, 17.
- 80 Wright, 1997, 123.
- 81 Lunden, 1964, 86.
- 82 Hirschi/Hindelang, 1977, 573-574.
- 83 Hirschi/Hindelang, 1977, 573-574.
- 84 Hirschi/Hindelang, 1977, 581.
- 85 Herrnstein/Murray, 1994, 235, 242, 735.
- 86 See: McNeill, 1984, for a discussion.
- 87 Herrnstein/Murray, 1994, 359.

- 88 "Speaking in Fewer Tongues."
- 89 Haller, 1963, 4.
- 90 Haller, 1963, 19.
- Endnotes 141
- 91 Haller, 1963, 129.
- 92 Haller, 1963, 132.
- 93 Haller, 1963, 137, 141.
- 94 Ascencion Cambron, "Approche juridique de la stérilisation des handicapés mentaux en Espagne," article in Missa/Susanne, 1999, 121.
- 95 Drouard, 1999, 7.
- 96 Alexander Tille, *Das aristokratische Prinzip der Natur*, 1893; quoted in Kaiser et al, 1992, 1.
- 97 Otto Ammon, *Natürliche Auslese und Ständbildung*, 1893; quoted in Kaiser et al, 1992, 2-3.
- 98 Leitsätze der "Deutschen Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene," zur Geburtenfrage angenommen in der Delegiertenversammlung zu Jena am 6. und 7. June 1914; quoted in Kaiser et al, 1992, 14-15.
- 99 Leitsätze der "Deutschen Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene (Eugenik)," 1931/32; quoted in Kaiser et al, 1992, 62-64. 100 Statistisches Bundesamt Wiesbaden, *Bevölkerung und Wirtschaft 1872-1972*, Stuttgart/Mainz, 1972, 102: quoted in: Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 130-131. 101 Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 141-142, 382, 536-537, 539, 542, 597-601.
- 102 Missa/Susanne, 19.
- 103 Adolf Hitler, *Völkisches Menschenrecht und sogenannte humane Gründe* (1925/27), Munich, 1932, 444r, 444, *Mein Kampf*; quoted in Kaiser et al, 1992, 119-120. 104 Verschuer, 1943, 1.
- 105 Verschuer, 1943, 3.
- 106 Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 1998, 298. 107 Das "Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses" vom 14. Juli 1933; quoted in Kaiser et al, 1992, 126. 108 Missa/Susanne, 1999, 18-19 ;Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 470.
- 109 Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 469.
- 110 Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 22, 174, 263-265, 283, 294.
- 111 Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 300.
- Endnote 142 s
- 112 Karl H. Bauer, *Rassenhygiene: Ihre biologischen Grundlagen*, Leipzig, 1926, 207; Hans Luxenburger, "Möglichkeiten und Notwendigkeiten für die psychiatrischeugenische Praxis," *Münchener Medizinische Wochenschrift*, 1931, 78: 753-758, 753; Lothar Loeffler, "Ist die gesetzliche Freigabe der eugenischen Indikation zur Schwangerschaftsunterbrechung rassenhygienisch notwendig?" *Deutsches Ärzteblatt*, 1933, 63: 368-369, 369. All quoted in Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 524, 526.
- 113 Aktion "T4" / "Wilde Euthanasie" (1939-1945); Aussage des "T4"-Leiters Viktor Brack: "Nutzlose Esser" (1946); Aus: DOC-NO426, in GSTA, Rep. 335, Fall 1, Nr. 202, Bl. 11; quoted in Kaiser et al, 1992, 250.
- 114 David Irving, *Hitler's War*, Viking Press, 1977; quoted in Saetz, 1985.
- 115 English Translation: "Human Heredity, NY, 1931.
- 116 Lenin, 1914.
- 117 Schwartz, 1995.
- 118 Max Levien, "Stimmen aus dem teutschen Urwalde," *Under dem Banner des Marxismus*, 1928, 4:150-195, 162; quoted in Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 112. 119 Paul, 1994, 20; quoting H.J. Muller's "Out of the Night," 114-115.
- 120 J. B. S., Haldane, *Daily Worker*, November 14, 1949; quoted in Paul, 1998, 13.
- 121 Quoted in Paul, 1998, 13.
- 122 Singer, 1999, 9, 23. Income figures from Barnett, R. J. & Cavanagh. J. *Global Dreams: Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*, 1994; World Bank *Development Indicators*, 1997.
- 123 Paul, 1998, 29.
- 124 Wright, 1997, 10.

- 125 M.-T. Nisot's 1927-29 *La Question eugénique dans les divers pays*, two volumes, Brussels; quoted in Drouard, 1999, 19.
- 126 Huntington, 31.
- 127 Schwartz, 1995, 16, 33.
- Endnotes 143
- 128 Information provided by Benoit Massin to Peter Weingart; quoted in Weingart, 2000, 208-209. Also from WWW site of Kröner/Toellner/Weisemann, 1990.
- 129 Weingart/Kroll/Bayertz, 1988, 251.
- 130 Holmes, 1933, 122-123.
- 131 Y. Meir and A. Rivkai, *The Mother and the Child*, 1934, Tel Aviv: Kupat Holim, 63-64, quoted in Stohler-Lis, 2003, 110.
- 132 Traubmann, 2004.
- 133 Traubmann, 2004.
- 134 Weiss, Meira, 2002, 2.
- 135 Weiss, Meira, 2002, 32.
- 136 Kahn, 197.
- 137 Kahn, 140.
- 138 Kahn, 74.
- 139 Kahn, 106.
- 140 Revel, 2003.
- 141 Zohar, 1998, 584-585.
- 142 Graham, 1977.
- 143 Pearson, 1997, 10-11; quoting presidential address of Sandra Scarr at the annual meeting of the Behavior Genetics Association, *Behavior Genetics*, 12;3, 1987. 144 Grobstein/Flower, 1984, 13.
- 145 Pearson, 1997, 38; quoting Philippe Rushton: 52, "Science and Racism," 52.
- 146 Finkelstein, 2000, 11.
- 147 Cooperman, 2002.
- 148 Zoll, 2002.
- 149 Tucker, 1994, 279-295.
- 150 Glad, 2001.
- 151 Gershon, Elliot S. 1983, 3.
- 152 Wade, 2002.
- 153 Lynn, 1996, 35; quoting Coleman & Salt, 1992.
- 154 "Gun Deaths..." 2001.
- 155 Fletcher, 1974.
- 156 Brock, et al, 2000.
- 157 Campbell, John, 1995.