

II.
STEFAN KÜHL

The Cooperation of German Racial Hygienists and American Eugenicians before and after 1933

The bureaucratized and systematic killing of religious and ethnic minorities and of mentally handicapped people in Nazi Germany is historically unique. But the mentality that made these mass murders possible is not limited to the period 1933 to 1945, nor to Nazi Germany. The Nazi extermination programs must be understood within a historic context—a context that extends beyond the period 1933 to 1945 and beyond the territories dominated by Nazi Germany. However, the killing of religious, ethnic, and social minorities by the Nazis cannot be explained by focusing only on racism and antisemitism. The ideology of race struggle was a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the Nazi genocide.¹ Without the underlying racist ideology, neither Auschwitz nor the murder of handicapped people in Hadamar would have been possible.

Only in recent years have historians and sociologists attempted a detailed examination of how eugenics, racial hygiene, racial anthropology, psychiatry, human genetics, and population science contributed to the formation of this racist ideology. Important historical studies about racist science in the United States, Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Spain have illustrated both the similarities to and differences from the development of racial hygiene, anthropology, population science, and psychiatry in Germany. However, we often still find a very simple matrix. Historians writing about eugenic movements in various national contexts have either emphasized similarities and continuities to Nazi race policies, or they have argued that certain aspects of eugenics should be distinguished from these policies. Here we see repeated an oversimplified discussion that long dominated the controversy about the German racial hygiene movement as an ideological forerunner to Nazi race policies.²

Why this disparity between excellent studies about eugenics in different countries and overly simplistic descriptions of the relationship of these movements to Nazi race policies? The reason is to be found in the limits of a national perspective. By focusing on eugenics as a national movement and a national science, historians

Based on information from *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism* by Stefan Kühl. Copyright © 1994 by Oxford University Press, Inc. Reprinted by permission.

have tended to obscure the issue of international collaboration and have failed to provide a more detailed account of the differences and similarities of national eugenics movements vis-à-vis Nazi race policies. Although important recent studies mention that eugenics was an international phenomenon, their national narrative has not allowed for detailed insights into the workings of transnational cooperation.³ My research seeks to correct this deficiency by providing a transnational perspective as it explores the relationship of the American eugenics movement to Nazi race policies. First, I reject the claim that the German scientific community accepted and supported Nazi race policies only because of its subjugation to a totalitarian state. Second, I hope to provide new insights into an important controversy about eugenics in the United States. The interpretations of American historians still differ on whether and to what extent the eugenics movement in the United States supported the Nazis.⁴ I will illustrate the degree to which American eugenicians supported, and thereby helped legitimize, Nazi race policy. In the discussion that follows, a distinction will be made between different concepts of race improvement within the eugenics movement, and there will be an exploration of how ideas about race shaped different reactions to Nazism. Although reactions varied significantly, I would argue that all reactions were structured by the inherently racist presumptions embedded within eugenics ideology. I will then describe how the connection to Nazi Germany influenced the standing of the American eugenics movement within the scientific community and how eugenicians' support for Nazi race policies played a role in the transformation of the American eugenics movement. Finally, I will offer suggestions regarding future research strategies.

The Legitimation of Nazi Race Policies by the American Eugenics Movement

Nazi eugenics' measures—including sterilization, marriage restrictions for unwanted members of society, and government subsidies for people defined as "valuable"—corresponded with the goals of eugenicians all over the world. Indeed, eugenicians understood Nazi race policies as the realization of their own scientific goals and political demands. In 1934, Leon F. Whitney, secretary of the American Eugenics Society, expressed his admiration for the German sterilization law. "Many far-sighted men and women in both England and America," he stated, "have long been working earnestly toward something very like what Hitler has now made compulsory."⁵

American eugenicians recognized that Hitler's steps toward improving the "German race" represented not only the implementation of their practical proposals but, even more important, the adoption of their basic ideology. Regardless of nationality or affiliation within the eugenics movement, all eugenicians urged governments to be "eugenically minded" in matters of political programs and social organization.⁶ The world, they argued, should operate according to scientific biological principles.⁷ Nazism implemented this kind of thinking on an unprecedented scale. At the 1936 meeting of the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, Falk Ruttko, the ideologist of race for the Nazi state, explained how the German government had designed all measures of racial welfare according to the scientific results of eugenics. To

him this represented the consistent “adaptation of biological knowledge to statesmanship.”⁸ The deputy leader of the Nazi Party, Rudolf Hess, expressed the same thought in even simpler terms: “National Socialism is nothing but applied biology.”⁹

Thus, the appeal of National Socialism for eugenicists was strong: for the first time, their ideas had become the basis for the organization of an entire state. The *Eugenical News* announced that “nowhere else than in Germany are the findings of genetics rigorously applied to the improvement of the race.”¹⁰ In the other important eugenics journal in the United States, the *Journal of Heredity*, Paul Popenoe, a California member of the board of directors of the American Eugenics Society, praised Hitler for basing “his hopes of biological regeneration solidly on the application of biological principles of human society.”¹¹

The year 1933 marked a turning point in the relationship between German and American eugenicists. In the 1920s, German eugenicists had admired the influence American eugenicists exerted on various U.S. policies. Between 1907 and 1930, more than half of the American states passed sterilization laws, chiefly comprised of measures mandating the sterilization of handicapped persons and criminals.¹² Nazi propaganda expressed admiration for such measures and referred to the “U.S. model” as a major influence on the development of their own race policy. In 1935, the *Rassenpolitische Auslandskorrespondenz* declared that, in terms of race policies, Germany had acted as a “good disciple of other civilized societies.”¹³ Adolf Hitler declared several times that the United States had made great achievements with their race policies. He studied carefully the American sterilization laws and praised the U.S. Immigration Restriction Act as excluding “undesirables” on the basis of hereditary illness and race.¹⁴

Although sterilization was never as widely implemented in the United States as in Nazi Germany, German racial hygienists and Nazi race politicians frequently called attention to the fact that sterilization measures in some parts of the United States were more radical than those in Nazi Germany. However, they criticized the United States for using sterilization as a form of punishment. Furthermore, they contrasted the arbitrary character of sterilization practices in the United States with the comprehensive nature of the Nazi program and with the latter’s elaborate decision-making process. On the other hand, American eugenicists were proud of their influence on legislation in Nazi Germany. They recognized that the German Law to Prevent Hereditary Sick Offspring was influenced by the California sterilization law and designed after the American Model Eugenic Sterilization Law, which Harry H. Laughlin developed in 1922.¹⁵ The transmission to Germany of information about the legislation and medical implementation of sterilization in the United States was one reason why the Nazi government could pass the sterilization law in Germany only six months after coming to power. In a letter to the Reich Ministry of the Interior in Berlin, Fritz Sauckel, administrator in the Thuringian Ministry of the Interior, explained that German legislators had to rely on reports from foreign countries because of a lack of experience in their own country.¹⁶ In a speech at the Conference of the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations in 1934, the Nazi race politician Ruttko explained that, prior to the passage of the German sterilization law, the experience of other countries had been studied in great detail. He claimed that the German sterilization law was the first to be based on a systematic analysis of practices and discussions abroad.¹⁷

Detailed analyses of the sterilization measures in California played a particularly important role in the construction of the German law. Both before and after 1933, Paul Popenoe and his colleagues in the California sterilization movement regularly informed German racial hygienists about new developments in California, the state responsible for nearly half of all sterilizations in the United States. Maria Kopp, an American eugenicist visiting Germany in 1935, reported that Nazi race politicians often stated that without information regarding sterilization in California, it would have been impossible to implement the comprehensive German sterilization program.

In view of such recognition, it is not surprising that Popenoe and the California eugenics movement strongly supported the Nazi sterilization law. Popenoe saw in this law the consistent application of the principles developed by the California movement. After the German sterilization law became effective in January 1934, he jubilantly announced that the law encompassed “the largest number of persons who had ever been included in the scope of such legislation at any one time.”¹⁸ He called the German law well conceived and argued that it could be considered superior to the sterilization laws of most American states.

Support for the Nazi sterilization law was not limited to California eugenicists. In a letter to the state government of Virginia in 1934, Joseph DeJarnett, a leading member of the Virginia sterilization movement, argued that there were too few sterilizations in Virginia. In urging the government to extend the sterilization law, he argued that “the Germans are beating us at our own game.”¹⁹ Leon F. Whitney, author of an important book about sterilization policy, was similarly full of praise for Hitler’s race policies. In a note sent to several newspapers in 1933, Whitney, speaking for the American Eugenics Society, claimed that Hitler’s sterilization policy had demonstrated the Führer’s courage and statesmanship.²⁰ Though he harbored doubts about the German government’s ability to implement fully the sterilization law, he described the measures as evidence that “sterilization and race betterment are . . . becoming compelling ideas among all enlightened nations.”²¹ Harry Laughlin, a leading figure in both the American Eugenics Society and the Eugenics Research Association, described the Nazi sterilization law as the “most important legislation of this kind, which was ever achieved by a nation.”²²

Why was the eugenics movement in the United States so enthusiastic about the Nazi sterilization law? In the view of American eugenicists, the Nazi government had avoided mistakes that were made in the formulation of sterilization laws in various American states. The German government, they believed, enjoyed the advantage of introducing a nationwide, well-conceived law, far superior to the heterogeneous and inconsistent measures that prevailed in the United States. Furthermore American eugenicists saw the Law to Prevent Hereditary Sick Offspring as firmly grounded in scientific research. After returning from her study tour through Germany, Kopp reported: “The German Law is based on 30 years of research in psychiatric genealogy which was undertaken under the leadership of Dr. Ernst Rüdin at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Psychiatric Research in Munich.”²³

American eugenicists believed the German law was so well developed legally that abuses would be nearly impossible. *Eugenical News* claimed that “to one acquainted with English and American laws, it is difficult to see how the new German Sterilization Law could, as some have suggested, be deflected from its purely eugenical pur-

pose.”²⁴ The American eugenicists were particularly impressed by the clear definition of hereditary illness and the polished legal and bureaucratic system that supported the sterilization law. They pointed to the establishment of special Hereditary Health Courts and appellate courts as safeguards for individuals who faced the prospect of sterilization.

Laughlin, a well-known promoter of sterilization and immigration laws in the United States, was an enthusiastic supporter of Nazi Germany. He used his position as assistant director of the Eugenics Record Office in Cold Spring Harbor in New York State to organize the dissemination of Nazi race propaganda to the American public. He was impressed by the modern methods of Nazi race propaganda, especially by the use of films as a persuasive medium in propagating eugenic goals.

In 1936 he purchased an English-language version of the movie *Erbkrank: A Hereditary View*, one of the main propaganda films of the Racial Political Office of the NSDAP, in order to show it at the Carnegie Institution in Washington. Laughlin described the movie as confined to the “problem of hereditary degeneracy in the fields of feeble-mindedness, insanity, crime, hereditary disease and inborn deformity.” Although the film propagated the notion that Jews were particularly susceptible to feeble-mindedness, mental deficiency, and moral deviancy, Laughlin asserted in the *Eugenical News* that the picture contained “no racial propaganda of any sort.” The film’s sole purpose, he argued, was to “educate the people in the matter of soundness of family-stock quality—physical, mental and spiritual—regardless of race.”²⁵

Impressed by the film’s powerful effect on the audience at the Carnegie Institution, Laughlin decided to use a slightly altered version of *Erbkrank* to help inform the wider American public about race betterment. He raised money to fund the distribution of the film’s edited version, entitled *Eugenics in Germany*, to churches, clubs, colleges, and high schools. The millionaire Wickliffe Draper and his Pioneer Fund undertook to finance the distribution of the Nazi movie. In cooperation with the Eugenics Research Association, the Eugenics Record Office sent a flier advertising the film to biology teachers in three thousand high schools. The Pioneer Fund, the Eugenics Record Office, and the Eugenics Research Association anticipated a favorable response because of the attractive medium and the low cost to viewers.²⁶ Although plans for national distribution were never realized, the Nazi press reported that *Erbkrank* had been a success in the United States. In a Nazi newspaper, an article entitled “Racial Political Propaganda on the German Model Receives Great Attention among American Scientists” reported that the movie had made an “exceptionally strong impression” on American eugenicists.²⁷

The National Socialist government was conscious of the important role that Laughlin played in propagating Nazi race policies outside Germany and rewarded him in 1936 with an honorary doctorate from the University of Heidelberg. He thanked Carl Schneider, professor of racial hygiene and later scientific adviser in the mass killing of handicapped people, for awarding him such a “high honor,” one that “stands for the highest ideals of scholarship and research achieved by those racial stocks which have contributed so much to the foundation blood of the American people.” Laughlin wrote Schneider that he considered the conferring of the degree as evidence of a common understanding of German and American scientists. Both scientific communities, Laughlin proclaimed, were in agreement concerning the prac-

tical application of those “fundamental biological and social principles” that would determine the racial health of future generations.”²⁸

The 1935 Congress for Population Sciences in Berlin marked the apex of international support for Nazi race policies. The International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems [IUSIPP], an organization closely connected to its eugenic counterpart, the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, had already initiated plans in 1931 for the conference to be held in Berlin. The International Union did not alter its plans, even after it recognized that the Nazi government would use the Congress for its own purposes. The president of the IUSIPP, Raymond Pearl, remained committed to Berlin as the conference site, although he feared that population science would be politicized.²⁹ Pearl, a professor at Johns Hopkins University, was initially a eugenics enthusiast who had become critical of that discipline in the late 1920s and veered toward population science.³⁰ His position regarding Nazi policies was ambiguous. Although he criticized the Nazi appropriation of eugenics and population sciences for political purposes, he defended the Nazi aim of forcing German Jews out of university positions. Pearl honored the president of the Population Conference, the German racial hygienist Eugen Fischer, as a distinguished and broad-minded scientist. He accepted Fischer’s invitation to serve as vice president of the conference as “a great honor.” As it turned out, however, Pearl was unable to attend the conference.³¹

Instead, two other American eugenicists jointly served as vice presidents of the Berlin conference: Harry Laughlin and Clarence G. Campbell. Laughlin, too, could not go to Berlin. Nevertheless, he accepted the honorary position of vice president and contributed a paper.³²

Clarence G. Campbell, president of the Eugenics Research Association, served as the senior representative of the American eugenics movement at the Berlin conference. He delivered a lecture, “Biological Postulates of Population Study,” in which he stressed the accomplishments of eugenics during the previous decades and underscored the importance of Nazi race policies for other nations. He claimed that from a synthesis of the work of several non-German eugenicists, Adolf Hitler had been able to construct comprehensive race policies that promised to be “epochal in racial history” and set a pattern that other nations and other racial groups had to follow.³³ At the end of the conference Campbell presented a toast, “To that great leader, Adolf Hitler!”³⁴

After his return to the United States, Campbell attempted to garner support among colleagues for the race policies in Nazi Germany. “Anti-Nazi propaganda with which all countries have been flooded,” he lamented, “has gone far to obscure the correct understanding and the great importance of the German race policies.”³⁵ In an article in *Eugenical News*, the official organ of the Eugenic Research Association, the Galton Society, the American Eugenics Society, and the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, Campbell claimed that Nazi race policies had gained the “enthusiastic support and cooperation of practically the entire German nation.” He argued that evidence of public support by “racially valuable families” could already be seen in Germany’s increasing birthrate: “Where American families desire another motor-car, when they can afford it, German families desire another child.”³⁶ Campbell’s enthusiastic support for German race policies was exceptional. Campbell’s

statements, however, represent only the most extreme example of collaboration; Nazi race policies were widely supported by the American eugenics movement as a whole. Until 1940, the two major scientific journals of the American eugenics movement published only positive articles about eugenics measures in Nazi Germany. The three major national societies for eugenics in the United States—the American Eugenics Society, the Eugenics Research Association, and the Galton Society—all reacted positively to eugenic policies under the Nazis.

Variations within the American Eugenics Movement

Despite the widespread enthusiasm for Nazi race policies by American eugenicists, historical scholarship has traditionally argued that only a small group of eugenicists supported Nazi race policies and that this group was increasingly marginalized and discredited within the scientific community.³⁷ Historians such as Kenneth M. Ludmerer and Daniel J. Kevles have differentiated between two groups within the eugenics movement: “mainline” and “reform” eugenicists. Mainline eugenicists who lent support to Nazi race policies, they argue, attempted to improve the white race by eliminating the “inferior” elements and by preventing miscegenation with other races. On the other side, these historians argue that reform eugenicists separated themselves from Nazism and mainline eugenicists by pleading for selection on an individual rather than a racial basis.³⁸ Some historians, who employ the distinction between reform and mainline eugenics, emphasize the two groups’ relationship to science as the key differentiating factor. They stress the fact that reform eugenicists were knowledgeable about the latest developments in genetics and were in step with modern scientific thought. Mainline eugenicists and Nazi racial hygienists, on the other hand, are viewed as having appropriated “pseudoscience” to support strongly biased political positions.³⁹

My interpretation differs from that conventional historical scholarship on eugenics. I will argue below that it is too simple to separate the activists of the American Eugenics Society into two groups, one supporting and one opposing Nazi race policies. Furthermore, I disagree that the relationship of eugenicists to science can be used as an adequate delineating factor. Such a distinction between “science” and pseudoscience fails to recognize that science is socially constructed within a particular historical context and that both science and pseudoscience share a common basis. Eugenicists perceived themselves as both scientists and social activists, believing that there should be a close relationship between their science and its political implementation. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of eugenicists favored only an analytical distinction between “pure” and “applied” eugenics.

I propose that a more useful way to distinguish between strands in the eugenics movement is to emphasize differing conceptions of race improvement. All eugenicists believed that it was possible to distinguish between inferior and superior elements of society, but not all traced inferiority directly to a racial basis. I argue, however, that any attempt to designate a group as inferior, combined with a political agenda of genetic improvement for a certain racial group, constitutes racism.

This understanding of eugenics relies on a new, broader conception of racism.⁴⁰ Historian Gisela Bock has shown that Nazi race policies extended beyond ethnicity and skin color, and she therefore distinguishes between two forms of racism: eugenic

and ethnic. Ethnic racism represents “classical racism,” the application of hierarchical standards to the taxonomy of human racial groups. Eugenic racism is the demarcation of certain elements within a particular race as inferior, followed by attempts to eliminate these elements through discriminatory policies.⁴¹

Based on this broader perception, a few historians have argued that any attempt to distinguish between mainline and reform eugenicists is extremely problematic. Focusing on the American Eugenics Society, historian Barry Mehler has pointed out that the borders between these two groups were highly fluid and that it is difficult to situate firmly individual eugenicists in one camp or the other.⁴² While I agree with these points, I also believe it is essential to retain an appreciation for the differences among various branches of the American Eugenics Society. Specifically, I see the need to distinguish among three groups: orthodox eugenicists, racial theorists, and reform eugenicists.⁴³ Differing concepts for race and race improvement serve as the basis of my differentiation.

Orthodox eugenicists dominated the eugenics movements in the United States, Scandinavia, and Germany up to the early 1930s. They believed in white superiority yet argued that the white race also needed further improvement. They explained the inequality of races as resulting from superior adaptation by some groups in the struggle for existence. Whites, in other words, were viewed as more advanced than others in the evolutionary process. Orthodox eugenicists, represented by figures such as Laughlin, Davenport, and Whitney, thus agreed in principle with the ethnic as well as the eugenic racism implemented in Nazi Germany. Although most Orthodox eugenicists were themselves antisemitic, they were careful not to be too blatant in supporting Nazi discrimination against the Jews. They feared that Nazi antisemitism would dominate the perception of eugenics in the United States and would overshadow more “acceptable” measures, such as sterilization, marriage restrictions for handicapped individuals, and special support for the procreation of “worthy” couples. Orthodox eugenicists sought to redirect public attention to these “exemplary” eugenic measures and tried to minimize the antisemitism of Nazi Germany, especially after the passing of the Nuremberg law against “miscegenation” in 1935.⁴⁴

The group of eugenicists who voiced the strongest support for Nazi Germany was clustered around the racial theorists Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, and Clarence G. Campbell. American racial theorists were closely allied with orthodox eugenicists in the various national eugenics societies. Racial theorists, however, based their ideology on the assumption of the French racial philosopher Arthur Comte de Gobineau that races are innately unequal. Their belief in Nordic superiority was combined with a strong antisemitic bias.⁴⁵ Grant, Stoddard, and Campbell were more explicit than the orthodox eugenicists in voicing their support not only for eugenic racism in Nazi Germany but also for racism directed at ethnic and religious minorities.

Reform eugenicists grouped around Frederick Osborn, Roswell H. Johnson, and Ellsworth Huntington—all of whom served at different times as president of the American Eugenics Society—distanced themselves from the blatant ethnic racism of the racial theorists and National Socialists. They argued that biological differences among groups were negligible compared to the much more significant differences existing among individuals. After 1930 reform eugenicists gained increasing influence in the United States.

Roswell H. Johnson, a member of the board of directors of the American Eugenics Society from 1928 onward, laid the ideological basis for reform eugenics. Focusing his attack on Madison Grant, Johnson criticized the notion that all members of one race were in principle superior to those of other races; he labeled such views "ultra racist."⁴⁶ In contrast to racial anthropologists and National Socialists, he developed a concept of "overlap racism." His premise was that "in mental traits some races do differ in a significant degree, although the overlap is so great that individual differences outrank social differences in importance." In other words, although races differed in quality, the high quality individuals of a lesser race might be superior to low quality individuals of a higher race. Still, Johnson also believed that the chances of finding a superior human being were higher among whites than among members of other races. This concept of overlap racism shaped the specific position of reform eugenics on Nazi race policies. Johnson regretted that the enormous progress of the eugenics movement under Hitler "suffered by being linked with anti-Semitism." He feared that the "excellent eugenic program" adopted by the Nazis would be nullified by the "dysgenic" consequences of discrimination against ethnic minorities. The persecution of hereditarily "superior" Jews would cause Germany to remain behind the attainment that would otherwise have been theirs.⁴⁷

Frederick Osborn also combined criticism of Nazi's Nordic arrogance and their discrimination against Jews with enthusiasm for the eugenics measures in Nazi Germany. In 1937, he praised the Nazi eugenics program as the "most important experiment which has ever been tried." Despite his doubts that compulsory sterilization could obtain better results than voluntary sterilization, he called the German sterilization program "apparently an excellent one."⁴⁸

The simultaneous criticism of antisemitism and enthusiastic support for the Nazi eugenic program by American reform eugenics was possible only because the proponents refused to recognize the inseparable connection between eugenic and ethnic racism in Nazi Germany. Again and again, reform eugenics stressed that the eugenics measures of Nazi Germany needed to be evaluated independently of its totalitarianism and antisemitism.⁴⁹ Thus, reform eugenics did not equate the eugenics measures of Nazi Germany with National Socialism, and they believed that Nazi antisemitism had nothing to do with the eugenic concept of race improvement. In their minds, the fact that the two things were linked together in Nazi Germany was merely an unfortunate coincidence.

Nazi Race Policies and Their Influence on the Transformation of American Eugenics

The reaction of the eugenics movement to Nazi race policies must also be seen within the context of the larger scientific community in the United States. In the 1930s, important scientific and political groups grew more skeptical about the prejudicial policy of the eugenics movement toward ethnic minorities. The scientific basis for the discrimination against blacks and Jews was questioned by prominent figures such as the socialist geneticists Hermann J. Muller and Walther Landauer, the liberal geneticist L. C. Dunn, and the anthropologist Franz Boas. In the scientific community, Muller, Landauer, and other geneticists enjoyed increasing prestige

stemming from the research successes and growing importance of genetics. In contrast to Boas and Dunn, who were in principle critical of eugenics, Muller and Landauer represented a group of socialist, often antiracist eugenics who were primarily responsible for coordinating the scientific critique against Nazi race policies. Although socialist eugenics argued in general that there was no evidence for intellectual differences among races, they believed that the human race as a whole should be improved by supporting the procreation of "capable" individuals and preventing the reproduction of "inferior" persons.⁵⁰ Socialist eugenics, as well as critics such as Boas and Dunn, therefore centered their criticism on the ethnic racism of Nazi Germany. They concentrated their attacks on dismantling the scientific basis of Nazi antisemitism, the ideology of Nordic superiority, and the Nazi policy prohibiting so-called miscegenation. They argued that the Nazis abused science for their political purposes and based their ideas and policies on pseudoscience.

The conflict between critical American scientists and Nazi racial hygienists escalated during the preparations for the Seventh International Congress for Genetics in 1939. Prior to the conference, which was originally to be held in Moscow, thirty American geneticists sent a resolution to the general secretary of the conference, the Soviet geneticist Solomon G. Levit. They demanded a special section to discuss differences between human races, the question of whether theories of racial superiority had any scientific basis, and whether eugenics measures could lead to definite improvements in human society. Leading American geneticists signed the resolution. Even some reform eugenics, such as Clarence C. Little, president of the American Eugenics Society between 1928 and 1929, and Robert C. Cook, editor of the *Journal of Heredity*, also signed.⁵¹

The government of the Soviet Union canceled the conference because of its new policy against genetics. The conference was then postponed until late August 1939 and relocated to Edinburgh. Although the conference closed early due to the outbreak of the Second World War, leading socialist eugenics and geneticists succeeded in preparing a resolution against Nazi race policies, the so-called *Genetico Manifesto*.⁵² The manifesto was prepared and supported primarily by scientists from the United States. It demanded effective birth control and the emancipation of women, stressed the importance of economic and political change, and condemned racism against ethnic minorities. The manifesto, however, still reflected a eugenic ideology. The *Genetico Manifesto* clearly demonstrated that the scientists who opposed Nazi race policies did not do so because of opposition to its eugenic orientation. The manifesto signatories were critical of discrimination against ethnic, social, and religious minorities but continued to advocate an individualistic concept of race improvement.⁵³

The struggle within the scientific community in the United States concerning the correct position on Nazi race policies was not between a liberal group of anti-eugenics "real" scientists and a group of reactionary, racist "pseudoscientists." Rather, it was primarily a struggle between scientists with differing conceptions of race improvement and differing positions on how science, economics, and policies should be used to realize their goals.

In the 1920s, American orthodox eugenics held prestigious positions as professors at universities and as members of leading research institutes, where they

received support from major foundations. Their influence extended into the highest political levels of the state and federal governments. The important role they played as scientific experts in shaping immigration policy, health administration, and sterilization laws indicates the extent of their influence in political decision-making processes. By the 1930s, however, orthodox eugenicists had lost a large part of this influence. A number of factors contributed to their demise: public criticism of blatantly antisemitic statements of eugenicists such as Laughlin, discoveries in genetics that contradicted the scientific basis of orthodox eugenicists, and the demand for a stronger sociological approach to the problems of modern society.⁵⁴ Critics outside the eugenics movement heightened the distrust by pointing out connections between orthodox eugenics and Nazi racial hygiene. The increasing radicalization of Hitler's race policies provided critics with a vivid illustration of the potential dangers of orthodox eugenicists' racism.

Through their comprehensive and uncritical support of Nazi race policies, orthodox eugenicists made their own standing in the United States dependent partly on the reputation of Nazi Germany. As Nazism grew more unpopular with the American public, orthodox eugenicists were no longer able to distance themselves from Nazi race policies. Laughlin, for example, was ousted from influential political and scientific positions. The Carnegie Foundation, sponsor of the major institutional base of orthodox eugenics, the Eugenics Record Office, accused it of producing political propaganda.⁵⁵ One demand was that the Eugenics Record Office cut its close ties to the *Eugenical News*, the journal that played a central role in support of Nazi race policies. Even after it adopted a more restrained strategy, criticism directed at the Eugenics Record Office continued. Finally, in 1939, the Carnegie Foundation forced Laughlin to retire as assistant director. The office closed on December 31 of that year.

Historians have tended to interpret the difficulties of orthodox eugenicists in the 1930s as a crisis of eugenics as a whole. I question this assumption. A recent study concerning sterilization in the United States has proven that eugenically motivated cases of sterilization increased during the 1930s—the same period in which the institutionalized eugenics movement was undergoing redefinition.⁵⁶ The transformation of eugenics should not be viewed as a decline but rather as a shift in power from eugenicists with strong notions of Nordic superiority and antisemitism to socialist eugenicists and the reform wing within the American Eugenics Society. Furthermore, the 1930s witnessed the diffusion of eugenic ideas into other scientific fields, such as population science and psychiatry.

The confusion within the American Eugenics Society in the 1930s made it ripe for a transformation into a more sociologically oriented movement. The changes took place peacefully, without an intense internal power struggle and without undermining the solidarity among the different wings of the eugenics movement. The growing influence of reform eugenicists within the American Eugenics Society did not result in the exclusion of orthodox eugenicists such as Laughlin and Davenport, who remained models for younger professionals. The “friendly takeover” of eugenics societies by reform eugenicists opened the movement to new genetic discoveries, new sociological methods, and the question of overpopulation. However, the core of eugenics ideology—the distinction between superior and inferior genetic groups—remained intact. What changed was the definition of “inferior” and “superior”

groups. The leaders of the American Eugenics Society after 1935 did not entirely renounce the notion that there were differences among races but adopted a reformist outlook that argued for selection on an individual basis.⁵⁷

Reform eugenicists enjoyed greater influence partially because they had been more careful not to ally themselves with the Nazi regime. Initially, they had stressed the positive features of the German eugenics program. Unlike orthodox eugenicists, however, they were able to separate themselves from Nazi Germany by disavowing both antisemitism and totalitarian “excesses.” Their critical position toward these features of Nazism enabled the eugenics movement, dominated by reform eugenicists, to survive the 1940s without being held accountable for their support of Nazi Germany. Successful reform eugenicists began to conceal their previous support for the eugenics measures of Nazi Germany.

When relations between the eugenics movement in the United States and German racial hygienists began to cool in the late 1930s it was not because American eugenicists recognized the negative consequences of the implementation of eugenics principles. Rather, a combination of different factors was at work: gradual recognition by the public and the scientific community that antisemitism was the core concept of Nazi race policies; a power shift inside the scientific community of the United States toward a group of progressive, socialist eugenicists and geneticists; and the rapid decline in the late 1930s of the reputation of Nazi Germany within the United States.

Conclusion

Relations between German and American eugenicists reached a state of crisis after the outbreak of World War II. Prior to 1939, Nazi propaganda claimed that Germany had no interest in going to war against nations that belonged to the same “white Nordic stock.” American eugenicists who believed this reacted with surprise when the Nazis initiated aggression against nations of similar racial composition. Nazi aggression obviously strained relations between Germany and the American eugenics movements. Nevertheless, during the years 1939 to 1941, connections between the two were not severed completely. American eugenicists such as T. U. H. Ellinger and Lothrop Stoddard still visited Germany to study Nazi race policies. Exchange of information through letters also continued. The complete break between German and American eugenicists occurred with the entrance of the United States into the war against Germany and Japan. After December 7, 1941, the day of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, all contact between the German and American eugenics movements ceased.

After 1945, American eugenicists' reactions to the Nazi radicalization of eugenics continued to depend on whether the former belonged to the orthodox or reformist wings of the movement. Orthodox eugenicists ignored the excesses of the Nazis. They continued to view the eugenics measures in the 1930s as exemplary, and they referred with pride to the important role the United States had played in the development of this policy. As late as the 1970s, Marian S. Olden, the leading figure in the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, and Leon F. Whitney, secretary of the American Eugenics Society, proudly recalled their support of Nazi race policies.⁵⁸

Historical investigation can demonstrate the continuity of this kind of research and can remind us of the past consequences of scientific racism. The radicalization of eugenics ideology among the Nazis and the consequent discrimination, sterilization, and elimination of millions of human beings defined as "inferior" stands as an indictment of scientists who helped to mold and legitimate this process. Obviously, the actions of eugenicists in the United States and Nazi Germany were not identical. Indeed, American scientists did not take part in the mass sterilization of hundreds of thousands of persons, did not participate in the selection of tens of thousands of handicapped people for the Nazi gas chambers, and did not use the bodies of murdered handicapped people and Jews for scientific experimentation. But the ideology that paved the way for and served to legitimate applied racism in Germany was by no means limited to German scientists. Rather, it was the result of a long history that condoned attempts to distinguish scientifically between "inferior" and "superior" members of humankind.

Further research must show how these scientific attempts extended beyond national scientific and political movements. Eugenics not only existed in many countries; eugenicists from different national backgrounds cooperated internationally in formulating and propagating eugenics policies. The international congresses for eugenics in the early decades of the twentieth century played a central role in organizing eugenics on an international level. The international societies for eugenics and racial hygiene provided a forum for this international cooperation, serving as an arena for debate and exchange of information.

Focusing on the international eugenics movement shows us that racism was not always linked to nationalism. In the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, an important group promoted the cooperation of all "white" nations in international politics. They urged an end to military conflicts between nations of similar "superior" racial stocks, arguing that such conflicts would only help racially different nations and the "inferior elements" within their own populations. The engagement of eugenicists in developing an ideal, eugenically influenced world order, their favoring of restrictive migration policies, and their position regarding so-called miscegenation shows that racism could be combined with a certain vision of internationalism.

On an international level, we can observe the process of differentiation of views on eugenics among various branches of science, and later the diffusion of eugenic thinking into other sciences. While a group of orthodox eugenicists tried to stabilize the eugenics movement, another group of eugenicists moved into other scientific fields, though largely without abandoning the core of their eugenic ideology. The development and differentiation of human genetics, population science, clinical psychiatry, and mental hygiene was closely connected with the decline of organized eugenics. The diffusion of eugenics first took place on an international level and was then followed by a similar process in various national contexts.

One main purpose of the international eugenics movement was to exert influence—through scientific experts—over national and international policy decision-making. The International Federation of Eugenic Organizations tried to influence migration policy, mailed resolutions about the potential dysgenic effects of war to governments, and attempted to influence the Italian population policy under

Mussolini. After 1933, with the establishment of Nazi race policies in Germany, the International Federation played an important role in supporting these policies. This positive reaction was due to the fact that the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations represented the more radical eugenicists' position. Critics of Nazi race policies, who generally continued to propagate their eugenic ideology, organized themselves outside the eugenics organization.⁵⁹ In sum, my case study of the American support of Nazi race policies shows that the tendency of scientific racism to enter into a symbiosis with political racism did not stop at the boundaries of the Third Reich. By examining different concepts of race improvement, we can work out some fundamental differences between American eugenicists and their position toward Nazi race policies. By adopting an international perspective, we can gain important insights into cooperation among national eugenics movements. Concerning Nazi racism, such a focus can help us to understand to what extent Nazi race policies prior to World War II constituted a "Sonderweg," and to what extent they were part of an international history of scientific and political racism.

NOTES

1. Hermann Lübke, "Rationalität und Irrationalität des Völkermords," in *Holocaust: Die Grenzen des Verstehens: Eine Debatte über die Besetzung der Geschichte*, ed. Hanno Loewy (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1992), p. 89.

2. Studies focusing on the eugenics movement as an ideological forerunner to the policy in Nazi Germany include George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964); idem, *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism* (London: J. M. Dent, 1978); Günther Altner, *Weltanschauliche Hintergründe der Rassenlehre des Dritten Reiches: Zum Problem einer umfassenden Anthropologie* (Zürich: EVZ, 1968); Daniel Gasman, *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League* (New York: American Elsevier, 1971); and Patrick von Mühlen, *Rassenideologien: Geschichte und Hintergründe* (Berlin: J. H. W. Dietz, 1977). Studies that attempt to separate the history of social Darwinism and the early eugenics movement from the later radicalization of Nazi racial hygiene include Sheila F. Weiss, *Race Hygiene and National Efficiency: The Eugenics of Wilhelm Schallmayer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); Alfred Kelly, *The Descent of Darwin: The Popularization of Darwinism in Germany, 1860–1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981); and Loren R. Graham, "Science and Values: The Eugenics Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s," *American Historical Review* 82 (1977): 1135–64.

3. For Germany, see Gisela Bock, "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany: Motherhood, Compulsory Sterilization, and the State," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 8 (1983): 400–21; idem, *Zwangsstereilisation im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik* (Opladen: WDV, 1986); Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll, Kurt Bayertz, *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1988); Robert Proctor, *Racial Hygiene: Medicine under the Nazis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988); and Paul Weindling, "The 'Sonderweg' of German Eugenics: Nationalism and Scientific Internationalism," *British Journal of the History of Science* 22 (1989): 321–33. For the United States, see Barry Mehler, *A History of the American Eugenics Society: 1921–1940*, Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois, 1988. For Canada, see Angus McLaren, *Our Own Master Race: Eugenics in Canada, 1885–1945* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990).

4. See Robert Proctor, "Eugenics among Social Sciences: Hereditarian Thought in Germany and the United States," in *The Estate of Social Knowledge*, ed. JoAnne Brown and David K. van Keuren (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), p. 178.
5. Leon F. Whitney, *The Case for Sterilization* (New York: Frederick A. Stocks, 1934), p. 7.
6. Report of the Sub-Committee on Ultimate Program for the Eugenics Society of America, introduction, Jennings Papers: Eugenics Society of America, American Philosophical Society (hereafter APS) Philadelphia.
7. See Herbert S. Jennings, *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1930), p. 203.
8. Falk Ruttke, "Erbbpflege in der deutschen Gesetzgebung," *Der Erbarzt* 3 (1936): 113.
9. Rudolf Hess at a mass meeting in 1934. See Robert Lifton, *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 1986), p. 31. Robert Proctor has shown that the expression was coined by Fritz Lenz in 1931. See Fritz Lenz, *Menschliche Auslese und Rassenhygiene (Eugenik)*, 3rd ed. (Munich: Lehmann, 1931), and Robert Proctor, "Nazi Biomedical Technologies," in *Lifeworld and Technology*, ed. Timothy Casey and Lester Embree (Washington, D.C.: Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology and University Press of America, 1989), p. 23.
10. *Eugenical News* 20 (1935): 100.
11. Paul Popenoe, "The German Sterilization Law," *Journal of Heredity* 25 (1934): 257.
12. In 1930, twenty-five states had passed sterilization laws. In 1938, twenty-nine states had such laws. See Human Betterment Foundation, *Human Sterilization Today* (Pasadena: Human Betterment Foundation, 1939).
13. "Das Ausland als Vorbild für die deutsche Rassengesetzgebung," *Rassenpolitische Auslandskorrespondenz* 2/4 (1935): 1.
14. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 1924; trans. and with an introduction by D. C. Watt (London, 1974), p. 400. On the fact that Hitler studied American sterilization laws with great interest, see Otto Wagener, "Hitler aus nächster Nähe," in *Aufzeichnungen eines Vertrauten 1929–1932*, ed. Henry A. Turner (Frankfurt/M.: Ullstein, 1978), p. 264.
15. *Eugenical News* 18 (1933): 89; Roswell H. Johnson, "International Eugenics," Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1934, p. 120. Marie E. Kopp, "A Eugenic Program in Operation," in *Summary of the Proceedings of the Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Nursing*, ed. Frederick Osborn, unpub., American Eugenics Society Papers, Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Nursing, APS Philadelphia; Laughlin's Model Law in Harry H. Laughlin, *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States* (Chicago: Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1922), pp. 446–47.
16. Fritz Sauckel to the Reich Ministry of the Interior, April 4, 1933, Bundesarchiv Koblenz, R 43 II/717.
17. Falk Ruttke, "Erbbpflege in der deutschen Gesetzgebung," *Ziel und Weg* 4 (1934): 601.
18. Paul Popenoe, "The Progress of Eugenic Sterilization," *Journal of Heredity* 25 (1934): 19–25.
19. Joint Committee on Voluntary Sterilization, *Report of the Departmental Committee on Sterilization*, pamphlet (n.p.: June 1934), p. 5; quoted in Daniel J. Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), p. 116.
20. Davenport Papers, Leon F. Whitney, "Memoirs," 204, APS, Philadelphia.
21. Leon Whitney, *The Case Sterilization* (New York: Frederick A. Stocks, 1934), p. 137.
22. Laughlin's enthusiastic opinion regarding the German sterilization law was published in "Amerikanische Anerkennung für das deutsche Sterilisationsgesetz," *Der Angriff*, July 26, 1933.
23. Kopp, "Eugenic Program," p. 4.
24. "Eugenical Sterilization in Germany," *Eugenical News* 88 (1933): 89.
25. Harry H. Laughlin, "Eugenics in Germany: Motion Picture Showing How Germany Is Presenting and Attacking Her Problems in Applied Eugenics," *Eugenical News* 22 (1937): 65–66.
26. See the letter from Laughlin to W. P. Draper, December 9, 1938, Laughlin Papers, Kirksville, Missouri. See also Frances Janet Hassencahl, "Harry H. Laughlin: 'Expert Eugenics Agent' for the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 1921 to 1931," Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1970, pp. 355–56.
27. "Rassenpolitische Aufklärung nach deutschem Vorbild: Grosse Beachtung durch die amerikanische Wissenschaft," press agency report of the NSK, March 19, 1937, and notes, in *Ziel und Weg* 7 (1937): 361, and in *Volk und Rasse* 12 (1937): 150.
28. Laughlin to Schneider, May 16, 1936, Laughlin Papers, Kirksville, Missouri.
29. Population science in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s was based on a eugenics ideology. I use "population science" only in discussing the actions of organizations that described their purpose either as the promotion of population science or as population policy.
30. For information on Raymond Pearl's shift from a eugenicist to a main representative of early population science who preserved a eugenic ideology, see Garland E. Allen, "Old Wine in New Bottles: From Eugenics to Population Control in the Work of Raymond Pearl," in *The Expansion of American Biology*, ed. Keith R. Benson, Jane Maienschein, and Ronald Rainger (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991), pp. 231–61.
31. Pearl to Sir Charles Close, British eugenicist and population scientist and leading member of the IUSIPP, on December 11, 1934, Pearl Papers, IUSIPP, APS Philadelphia.
32. Harry H. Laughlin, "Studies on the Historical and Legal Development of Eugenic Sterilization in the United States," in *Bevölkerungsfragen: Bericht des Internationalen Kongresses für Bevölkerungswissenschaft Berlin, 26 August–1 September 1935*, ed. Hans Harmsen and Franz Lohse (Munich: J. F. Lehmann, 1936), pp. 664–75. Laughlin to Fischer, July 31, 1935, Laughlin Papers, Kirksville, Missouri.
33. Clarence G. Campbell, "The Biological Postulates of Population Study," in *Bevölkerungsfragen*, ed. Harmsen and Lohse, p. 602.
34. Quote in Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics*, p. 347.
35. Clarence G. Campbell, "The German Racial Policy," *Eugenical News* 21 (1936): 25.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 28 and 26, respectively.
37. Mark H. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1963), p. 174; and Kenneth M. Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. 174. Both were distinguished eugenicists critical of the Nazi race policies of eugenicists who did not see that the eugenic measures of the Nazi government represented a "perversion of the true eugenic ideal as seen by well-meaning men deeply concerned about mankind's genetic future" (Ludmerer, *Genetics*, p. 117). More recently, Kevles made the distinction between a small group of Nazi supporters and a larger group of eugenicists who criticized Nazi policies (Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics*, p. 118).
38. Ludmerer, *Genetics*, and Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics*. For the application of this distinction to Scandinavian eugenic movements, see Nils Roll-Hansen, "Geneticists and the Eugenics Movement in Scandinavia," *British Journal for the History of Science* 22 (1989): 335–46. For Great Britain, see Geoffrey R. Searle, *Eugenics and Politics in Britain, 1909–1914* (Leyden: Nordhoff International, 1976). Sheila F. Weiss applied a similar concept to the racial hygiene movement in Germany before 1933 in "The Race-Hygiene Movement in Germany, 1904–1945," in *The Wellborn Science: Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil and Russia*, ed. Mark B. Adams (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 8–68.
39. See Ludmerer, *Genetics*, pp. 148–50. Some recent scholarship also uses this distinction; see, for example, Nils Roll-Hansen, "The Progress of Eugenics: Growth of Knowledge and Change in Ideology," *History of Science* 26 (1988): 293–331.
40. Bock, *Zwangssterilisation*, p. 63. See also idem, "Antinatalism, Maternity, and Paternity in National Socialist Racism," in *Maternity and Gender Policies: Women and the Rise of the European Welfare State, 1880–1950s*, ed. Gisela Bock and Pat Thane (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 233–55. For the United States, see Garland Allen, "The Misuse of Biological Hierarchies: The American Eugenics Movement, 1900–1940," *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences* 5 (1983): 105–28; and Robert Proctor, *Racial Hygiene*; and Mehler, *History*.
41. Bock, *Zwangssterilisation*, p. 65.

42. Mehler, *History*, p. iii.

43. See the shift in my terminology as compared to Kühl, *Nazi Connection*, p. 72. Because reform eugenicists were the "mainline" after 1945, I prefer the more accurate term "orthodox eugenicist" to "mainline eugenicist."

44. In a speech at the conference of the American Eugenics Society in 1937, Kopp tried to shift emphasis away from the antisemitic measures of the Nuremberg Laws to what she saw as the more important marriage restrictions placed on the mentally and physically handicapped (Kopp, "Eugenic Program," p. 5). Similarly, Laughlin, in an article promoting the previously mentioned propaganda film *Erbkrank*, claimed, despite a long passage in the film about the connection between Jewishness and a disposition for mental illness, that "there is no racial propaganda of any sort in the picture" (Laughlin, *Eugenics in Germany*, pp. 65–66).

45. Arthur Comte de Gobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races*, trans. from the French edition of 1853–1855 by A. Collins (London: Heinemann, 1915). For a discussion concerning the close relationship of racial theorists to the organized eugenics movement in the United States, see Ludmerer, *Genetics*, pp. 64–66, and Hans-Peter Kröner, "Die Eugenik in Deutschland von 1891–1914," doctoral diss., University of Münster, 1980, p. 31. The more distant relation of German racial theorists to the racial hygiene movement is treated in Hans Jürgen Lutzhöft, *Der Nordische Gedanke in Deutschland 1920 bis 1940* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1971), pp. 163–64; and Günter Mann, "Rassenhygiene-Sozialdarwinismus," in *Biologismus im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Gunther Mann (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1973), pp. 73–77.

46. Johnson, *International Eugenics*, pp. 199–212, citation from p. 212.

47. *Ibid.*, pp. 184–85 and 227.

48. Osborn, *Summary of the Proceedings of the Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Nursing*, February 24, 1937, American Eugenics Society Papers: Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Nursing.

49. For example, before the Annual Meeting of the American Eugenics Society in May 1938, Osborn lamented the fact that the public opposed the "excellent sterilization program in Germany because of its Nazi origin" (Annual Meeting of the American Eugenics Society, May 5, 1938, Osborn Papers, I, 10, APS Philadelphia).

50. Often historians have not distinguished between socialist eugenicists and reform eugenicists. They have categorized all eugenicists who criticized the Nordic arrogance of orthodox eugenicists and National Socialists as either socialist or reform eugenicists. This approach, however, fails to recognize differences in the concept of race improvement held by the two groups. Their different reactions to Nazi race policies further illustrates that the single distinction between reform eugenicists and orthodox eugenicists does not cover the whole spectrum. See Donald K. Pichens, *Eugenics and the Progressives* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1968); Michael Freeden, "Eugenics and Progressive Thought: A Study in Ideological Affinity," *Historical Journal* 22 (1979): 645–71; Diane Paul, "Eugenics and the Left," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 45 (1984): 567–90; and Michael Schwartz, *Sozialistische Eugenik* (Bonn: J. H. W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1995).

51. Letter from Jennings to S. G. Levit, April 2, 1936, Jennings Papers, Levit, APS Philadelphia.

52. Historians of eugenics differ widely in their interpretation of the Manifesto. Ludmerer, *Genetics*, p. 129, called it a "condemnation" of eugenics. Roll-Hansen, "Progress of Eugenics," p. 312, saw in it "a pitiful formulation of the position of reform eugenics." Paul, "Eugenics and the Left," p. 583, claimed that the Genetico Manifesto is the "statement of a socialist eugenic position." In my opinion, the content of the resolution, as well as the analysis of the signatories, confirms Paul's position.

53. The Genetico Manifesto was widely published and, for example, was printed in the *Journal of Heredity* 30 (1939): 371–73.

54. See Garland E. Allen, "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910–1940: An Essay in Institutional History," *Osiris*, n.s., 2 (1986): 250; Kröner, *Eugenik*, 32; Kenneth M. Ludmerer, "American Geneticists and the Eugenics Movement 1905–1935," *Journal of the History of Biology* 2 (1969): 350–54.

55. See Allen, "Eugenics Record Office," pp. 225–64.

56. See Phillip R. Reilly, *The Surgical Solution: A History of Involuntary Sterilization in the United States* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), p. 96.

57. See Frederick Osborn, "Implications of the New Studies in Population and Psychology for the Development of Eugenic Philosophy," *Eugenical News* 22 (1937): 106. See also *ibid.*, "Memorandum on the Eugenics Situation in the United States," Osborn Papers, I #2, APS Philadelphia.

58. Marian S. Olden, *History of the Development of the First National Organization for Sterilization* (Gwynedd, 1974), p. 65. See also Whitney Papers, Autobiography, 204, APS Philadelphia.

59. For more details, see Stefan Kühl, *Die Internationale der Rassisten: Der Aufstieg und Niedergang der internationalen Bewegung für Eugenik und Rassenhygiene im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M.: Campus Verlag, 1997).