

THE INHERENT RACISM OF POPULATION CONTROL

By

Paul Jalsevac

Published by *LifeSiteNews.com* – A division of *Interim Publishing*

Copyright LifeSiteNews.com, 2004

*Permission given for photocopying or laser or inkjet printing
for personal, classroom or advocacy use*

PREFACE

My strong interest in the activities of population control advocates grew during my first visit to the United Nations headquarters in New York during March of 2000. I was fortunate enough on that visit to work with the World Youth Alliance as a lobbyist at a conference on population and development. During this visit I learned much about the efforts of the world's powerful to control the world's population.

I was particularly struck by the comments of other lobbyists who noticed that it often seemed that population control activities were aimed at minority populations. I began to wonder if this was mere coincidence or something more.

Three years later, after another visit to the U.N. and more reading on the topic it came time to write my Senior Thesis for my Political Science Major at Christendom College. Thus, I set out to look further into the motivations and the ideology of the population control advocates. The final paper that was the result of my study and was titled, *The Inherent Racism of Population Control*, so struck others that I was encouraged to update, expand and publish the paper. Campaign Life Coalition of Toronto encouraged me to work on this project during a large part of my summer work term with the organization in 2003.

Dr. William Luckey, the Chairman of the Political Science and Economics Department at Christendom College, guided my efforts in his capacity as my thesis director. Dr. Pat Keats, Academic Dean and Associate Professor of the English Language and Literature Dept. at Christendom, also kindly offered his helpful assistance by editing the paper as did my father, Stephen Jalsevac, Managing Director of LifeSite.net. The final draft was completed with the very helpful editing and insightful comments of Hilary White of Campaign Life Coalition, Canada.

Paul Jalsevac
Toronto
January 2004

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
--------------------------	----------

Chapter I

The History of Population Control.....	5
---	----------

The Industrial Revolution and the Enclosure Acts	5
Malthus' Final Solution for the Industrial Poor	6
The Birth of "Scientific" Racism.....	7
The Economics of Malthusian Racism	9
Darwin's Debt to Malthus.....	10
Herbert Spencer's Social Darwinism.....	11
Eugenics: Francis Galton's Pseudo-Science.....	12
The Poor: Enemies of the People.....	14
The Super Race: Breeding for Perfection	15
Flawed Premises : Flawed Conclusions.....	15
Eugenics' Popularity Spreads	16

Chapter II

"Scientific" Racism Takes Root.....	19
--	-----------

Eugenics Spreads Throughout the Western World.....	19
Famous Names and a Higher Profile	20
Eugenics Spreads in the United States.....	21
Legislated Sterilization: The Beginning of Positive Eugenics in the US	22
The Teutonic Cult	23
America Embraces Eugenics	25
Eugenics in Action in America.....	27
A Surprising Alliance: American Money and German Know-how.....	30

Chapter III

The Population Firm	34
Margaret Sanger and the New Eugenics.....	34
Early Publicity for the Culture of Death.....	36
Sanger’s Eugenics in Action - The Birth of Planned Parenthood.....	37
Racial Genocide Via The “Negro Project”	39
Planned Parenthood Takes on the World.....	39
John D. Rockefeller and Hugh Moore	40
Malthusianism Becomes Official US Policy	42
USAID, The UN and The World Bank Join The Population Firm.....	44
The Population Firm Today	47
Conclusion	52

Introduction

Since the eighteenth century the world has undergone an era of enormous change characterized by rapid technological improvements that have increased the standard of living worldwide. Accompanying these improvements has been a great increase in human population.

United Nations statistics estimate that man passed the six billion mark in the year 2000 and should surpass the nine billion mark by the year 2050¹. The most dramatic increases that the world has ever seen in population have been accompanied by an equally dramatic trend towards urbanization. In the nineteen sixties, the images of teeming populations in the super-cities of the twentieth century began providing fuel for various overpopulation fears in the popular imagination as certain observers raised questions about the earth's ability to support the ever-increasing human population.

These fears and questions quickly helped catapult overpopulation concerns into a position of prominence among the leaders of Western society.

The increasing importance which society began to place on population concerns was exhibited by a series of eight nationwide polls taken in the United States between 1974 and 1988. Those being polled were asked to say whether they thought any particular one of a list of different problems would be "a serious problem" in the next twenty-five to fifty years. As a possible problem, "overpopulation" appeared on that list in all eight polls and the percentage of those who answered 'it will be a serious problem' ranged from a low of forty-four percent in 1978 to a high of sixty-five percent in 1991."² Overpopulation had fast become as large a worry for the American population as was their worry of nuclear holocaust during the Cold War.

Are these fears justified? They certainly continue to be seen everywhere today, forcing their way into the everyday life of the average North American as the newspapers, radio, magazines, TV programs, movies, and even school textbooks proclaim overpopulation fears. The constant presence of these fears is somewhat surprising in light of substantial evidence to the contrary. The doomsday claims of economist Thomas Malthus, who first raised the spectre of overpopulation in 1793 and worried about a resource shortage, were disproved in his own lifetime by the rapid agricultural advances that accompanied population growth. In America in the late 1830's, for example, "the shipment of wheat from Chicago amounted to only seventy-eight bushels in 1838... ten years later, Chicago alone was shipping two million."³ In reality, food production easily kept up with population growth and the increasing population brought improved health care, better food production, lower mortality rates (including maternal mortality), increased economic development, and longer life spans instead of the increased poverty and starvation that was predicted.

¹ *Population, Resources, Environment and Development Databank* (New York: United Nations Population Division, 2002). Available from the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat.

² Julian Simon, ed., *The State of Humanity* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1995), 621.

³ Wilson, quoted in Chase, 75.

The pattern continues today. Economist Dennis Avery explained in 1995 that, food production was more than keeping pace with population growth since the world had, “more than doubled world food output in the past 30 years. We have raised food supplies per person by 25 percent in the populous Third World.”⁴

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (UNFAO) also dispelled fears of shortages in the food supply when, in preparation for the World Food Summit in Rome in November of 1995 it reported that, “Globally food supplies have more than doubled in the last 40 years...at a global level, there is probably no obstacle to food production rising to meet demand.”⁵ The UNFAO also later estimated that, simply with the present available technologies fully employed, the world could feed 30 to 35 billion people, i.e. roughly six times the present world population.⁶ It also reported that the number of people considered malnourished has declined from 36 percent in 1961-1970 to 20 percent in 1988-90 and later proclaimed that “earlier fears of chronic food shortages over much of the world proved unfounded.”⁷

The World Bank joined in to predict in 1993 that the improvement in the world food supply would continue, while pointing out that in developing countries grain production has grown at a faster rate than population since 1985. Grain production has slowed in the United States, but that is because stocks have grown so large that additional production could not be stored.⁸ A further wealth of evidence is available to remove any concerns about resource shortage in the modern world.

Yet, despite the evidence, the author intends to show in this publication that overpopulation fears helped fuel the creation of a massive, highly organized, and often coercive population control program designed to reduce population growth worldwide through the use of such “family planning” techniques as abortion, contraception, and sterilization. The question this paper seeks to answer is what are the roots of, the reasons behind, and the motivating factors of this population control program?

The quest for the roots of population control takes one back a few centuries to the year 1793, the year that British economist Thomas Malthus published his *First Essay on Population*. Chapter I of *The Inherent Racism of Population Control* explains how Malthus became the father of population control by frightening leaders of British society with his claim that the forces of food production and subsistence were not and could never be capable of keeping pace with the much greater force of population increase. This claim in itself seemed harmless, especially since the evidence would soon prove it untrue, but there was more to Malthus’ claims.

Since food production could not keep up with population growth, Malthus explained, there would always have to be some people who did not have enough. These people were the poor, the laborers, who had been ordained by to nature to bear the weight of nature’s necessary checks on population. Nature must devastate the poor through the checks of

⁴ Julian Simon, ed., *The State of Humanity* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1995), 376.

⁵ United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, *Food and Population: FAO Looks Ahead*, quoted in Jacqueline Kasun, *Room for More* (Front Royal, Va.: Population Research Institute, 200), 10.

⁶ Eamonn Keane, *Population and Development* (: Forestville Printing, 1999), 10.

⁷ UNFAO, *World Agriculture Toward 2000*, cited in Keane, 9.

⁸ Cf. Donald O. Mitchell and Merlinda D. Ingco, *The World Food Output*, International Economics Department of the World Bank, November 1993. Cited in Keane, 9.

famine, pestilence, and war in an attempt to equalize the forces of food growth and population growth. This was a lot in life that the poor could never escape because, as a result of their misfortune of being born in squalid conditions, they had not the ability to rise above their position or the resources available to do so.

In making these claims, Malthus effectively had designated the poor as separate, innately inferior race. It was thus counterproductive, in his firmly held view, to try to help the poor because a bettering of their situation would increase their numbers and would only increase the harshness of nature's checks on them as it sought to reign in the force of population growth.

Malthus' claims carried a strong appeal to the upper echelons of society. Malthus had created a theory enshrining the inherent superiority of these elite of society, those who may have considered themselves better than the poor and labourers. He had also created a theory for those of the wealthy who were greedy by giving them reasons not to waste their wealth in, what he called, 'foolish' philanthropy. Thus, Malthus soon drew in many elite followers and earned the distinction of being the father of a new scientific racism, a racism more far-reaching than the old ethnic types of racism because it declared an enormous segment of the whole world's population inferior because of their socioeconomic status.

The spread of Malthus' ideas was greatly increased by the influence of the ideas of the famous proponent of evolutionary theory, Charles Darwin. Darwin's evolutionary theory provided the 'scientific' ideas which two men, Herbert Spencer and Francis Galton, used to provide a 'scientific' defense of Malthus' scientific racism. Herbert Spencer created 'Social Darwinism' by applying the idea of natural selection to the social setting. He claimed that the more able and superior elements of humanity had become the upper class of society simply through 'survival of the fittest' and therefore were genetically superior to the lower classes.

Francis Galton, a cousin to Darwin, gave Malthusianism a further boost through his publicized 'scientific' studies, which he claimed gave further 'scientific' evidence that the natural selection of evolution had indeed left the poor inferior and worthless. Galton distinguished himself as the father of 'eugenics,' which he first defined as the "science of improving stock-not only by judicious mating, but whatever tends to give the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had."⁹ Spencer and Galton joined ethnic racism with scientific racism by declaring that, according to the same 'scientific' principles that showed the poor inferior, certain races could be included along with the poor classes as being inherently inferior.

Part I of Chapter II of this paper shows how Spencer's Social Darwinism swept through the elite circles of Europe and North America in the 1800's laying the ground for the widespread acceptance of Galton's radical eugenics thought. Eugenics first took root in Galton's England, but America soon became its leading proponent. With the weight of the English movement behind it, eugenics spread through the elite in America with devastating consequences.

⁹ Yanguang Wang, Ph.D. *A Call for a New Eugenics* [internet] found at <http://www.biol.tsukuba.ac.jp/~macer/EJ93/ej93e.html>

The blossoming American eugenics movement quickly began to actively apply this radical version of Malthus' principles to society. Its efforts in the 1920s resulted in the first laws imposing sterilization on members of society who had been deemed unfit according to criteria developed by the eugenicists. The movement also succeeded in introducing a law in 1924 restricting the immigration of those deemed 'unfit.' The implementation of these laws and the support they received showed that Malthus' ideas, as propagated through Social Darwinism and eugenics, had been embraced by the leaders of the American society. Even more telling were the close connections of many American scientists and intellectuals with the leaders of Nazi Germany's eugenics programs as described in the last section of Chapter II. The Second World War, however, soon exposed the horrors of Nazi eugenics, making the eugenics movement unpopular for the time being.

Part I of Chapter III, however, shows that Malthus' ideas were now deeply rooted and began to take on a much stronger form under the leadership of Margaret Sanger and her friends. Sanger, a strong supporter of both Malthus and Galton, saw birth control as the best new means to practice a method of negative eugenics, the active attempt to reduce the propagation of those considered unfit. She founded Planned Parenthood, the new face of the eugenics movement, which began the work of legalizing abortion and spreading birth control throughout the world.

With the help of the ever-present elite, Sanger's Planned Parenthood became one of the most influential organizations in the world, drawing leaders throughout the world into its inner circle. It became the first and the foremost of a series of powerful international organizations that became part of, what Steven Mosher, the director of the Population Research Institute, calls the Population Firm.

Next, Chapter III shows how this small group of elite individuals and their organizations, many of them connected to Planned Parenthood, became dedicated to forcing its brand of Malthus' scientific racism on the rest of the world. Its efforts convinced the United States government to join in their efforts and form the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The power of the World Bank and the United Nations was also soon brought under the sway of the population controller's Malthusian ideas.

With the support of the world's wealthy, these organizations began to use their might and their resources to push a drastic population control agenda on the world. Their efforts were the impetus behind the massive population control program that went into effect in the latter half of the twentieth century and continues to grow today, engulfing more governments and bringing more powerful organizations and individuals into its exclusive clique as it gained a powerful momentum that still carries it forward today.

Thus, this will show that the population control movement of today, as perpetuated by the Population Firm, is the result of a long line of scientific racism, an ideology that drew its essential ideas from Malthus' belief in the inherent inferiority of the poor and uneducated of society.

Chapter One

The History of Population Control

The Industrial Revolution and the Enclosure Acts

The story begins during a period of rapid change in eighteenth century England. At the beginning of the century, the agricultural revolution that swept through Europe created the most rapid advance in food production that England had yet seen. Historian John W. Osborne writes that, as a result of the improvements brought about by the introduction of new crops and new methods of production, grain output in England increased 43% during the 18th century and even more rapidly after 1800.¹⁰ The increases dramatically improved the potential profitability of previously untenable large-scale agricultural ventures.

This apparent improvement, however, brought with it a new set of social problems. Village artisans and small farmers had previously depended upon these lands to raise a few animals or plant some crops to feed their families. The legal owners of these “commons” began driving off the free users so that the lands could be exploited for more profitable ventures. These landlords of the commons in England were aided in this venture by the Enclosure Acts, which began around 1760. As a result, tens of thousands of struggling village craftsmen and landless farmers flooded into the cities and industrial towns with their families to find jobs in the factories of the blossoming Industrial Revolution. These previously rural families were hard put to adapt to the harsh conditions of the cities and to support their families on their low factory pay. As well, those left in the country were deprived of their former means of survival and were often forced to depend on the charity of their churches.

The massive influx of people from rural areas caused the population of the cities to swell. Historian Allan Chase explains that the population in the cities also grew further as the improvements in standard of living caused by the Industrial Revolution and the agricultural improvements slashed the death rate by almost half between 1740 and 1820. This led to a net British population growth rate of about one and a half percent per year between 1801 and 1831. Despite the improvements reducing the overall death rate, the English poor still suffered terribly and the appalling conditions in the industrial towns resulted in the death of one out of every two children before the age of five.¹¹ Prime Minister William Pitt’s Poor Laws were just one attempt to alleviate this and many other social problems.

This state of affairs provided the perfect setting for Thomas Malthus to arrive on the scene with his dire predictions about the dangers of overpopulation.

¹⁰ John W. Osborne quoted in Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), 72.

¹¹ Chase, 73.

Malthus' Final Solution for the Industrial Poor

Thomas Robert Malthus, born in 1766, introduced a radical new way of viewing the tumultuous social situation in England. Malthus, originally a country curate who later became England's first professor of political economy, believed that man had the natural ability to increase his numbers in a geometric progression. Malthus did not believe that the human power to multiply could ever be fully realized, but, based on the experience of the United States where the population had recently doubled in twenty-five years, Malthus claimed that, "It may be safely asserted, therefore, that population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical progression of such a nature as to double itself every twenty-five years."¹² Food production unfortunately, claimed Malthus, only has the ability to increase at an arithmetic ratio and, therefore, cannot possibly keep pace with population increase. Malthus sums up the problem this presents saying:

Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. Substinence increases only in an arithmetical ratio. A slight acquaintance with numbers will shew the immensity of the first power in comparison of the second.¹³

Malthus, however, thought that humanity had rarely lived up to its ability to double every twenty-five years and likely rarely would. Food production simply could not long sustain such an increase before nature would have to step in and check the population growth. Nature, claimed Malthus, has always been exerting, and must always exert a check to equalize the two rival forces of population growth and food production growth. Malthus explains that:

By that law of our nature which makes food necessary to the life of man, the effects of these two unequal powers must be kept equal.

This implies a strong and constantly operating check on population from the difficulty of substinence. This difficulty must fall somewhere and must necessarily be severely felt by a large portion of mankind. . . This natural inequality of the two powers of population and of production in the earth, and that great law of our nature which must constantly keep their efforts equal, form the great difficulty that to me appears insurmountable in the way to the perfectibility of society.¹⁴

The checks on population that Malthus postulates can take the form of "positive" checks or "preventative checks." Malthus describes preventative checks as "a foresight of the difficulties attending the rearing of families" in his *First Essay On Population* and later includes under preventative checks all checks to the birthrate.¹⁵

These preventative checks are ways in which humans can actively work to prevent rapid population growth from ever occurring. If preventative checks are not properly implemented by human effort, however, and population increases because of a failure to

¹² Thomas Malthus, *An Essay On the Principle of Population* (New York: Penguin Books, 1970), 238.

¹³ Ibid, 71-72

¹⁴ Ibid, 72.

¹⁵ Ibid, 89.

equalize the forces of population and subsistence, then the need for positive checks arise. Positive checks, on the other hand:

...are extremely various, and include every cause . . . which in any degree contributes to shorten the natural duration of human life. Under this head, therefore, may be enumerated all unwholesome occupations, severe labour and exposure to the seasons, extreme poverty, bad nursing of children, great towns, excesses of all kinds, the whole train of common diseases and epidemics, wars, plague, and famine.¹⁶

Malthus further classed these checks by saying that, after an examination of them, “It will be found that they are all resolvable into moral restraint, vice, and misery.”¹⁷ Man, therefore, has the ability to reduce the stress of population growth by showing moral restraint and exercising a preventative check on population in the form of, for example, later marriages. Malthus himself was personally opposed to contraception. If man, however, is not able to exercise this moral restraint, which Malthus thought he is invariably unable to do because of the power of his sexual urges, population must be cut back by the positive checks of the forces of vice and misery. Vice and misery will take the forms of war, pestilence and famine.

The Birth of “Scientific” Racism

Malthus’ theory now began to take on a sinister tone. Someone must bear the weight of the devastation wreaked by the “positive checks”, and it was a weight that he believed would not be shared by all. He explained that, “The positive check, by which I mean the check that represses an increase which is already begun, is confined chiefly, though not perhaps solely, to the lowest orders of society.”¹⁸ The poor, because of the weakness of their situation, are the “large portion of mankind” on which the misery of positive checks must necessarily fall. Any well-intentioned efforts of charity and benevolence, therefore, that seek to alleviate the situation of the poor are grossly misinformed attempts to interfere with nature’s course. It is nature that has ordained that the poor must suffer the abuse of positive checks.

Alleviating the situation of the poor would decrease the death rate and encourage procreation and merely exacerbate the situation. It would increase the ranks of the poor and place an added stress on the already meager resources available, thereby necessitating an increased intensity in the positive checks flung at the poor by nature. In other words, “nature” retaliates to benevolence by increasing the “positive checks” of war famine and misery. Traditional philanthropy, consequently, is self-defeating.

Malthus further claimed that the strain that the increased numbers place on a country’s resources also makes life more difficult for members of the middle class and the upper classes and threatens to drag them into the pool of suffering that rightly belongs to the lot of the poor. Malthus pointed to this supposed problem when he attacked William Pitt’s Poor Laws stating that they were defective because they tended “to increase population without increasing the means of its support.”¹⁹ In doing so they “have spread the general

¹⁶ Malthus, *A Second Essay*, quoted in Malthus, 23.

¹⁷ Malthus, 249.

¹⁸ Ibid, 93.

¹⁹ Ibid, 101.

evil over a much larger surface,”²⁰ into, in other words, the classes to which Malthus and his circle belonged. Laws intended to help the poor exasperated Malthus because, he explained, they can only serve to bring closer the “gigantic inevitable famine [which] stalks in the rear.”²¹ Malthus, therefore, was radically opposed to all laws and acts of charity that aided the poor in any way.

At first glance Malthus’ motives may appear simply humanitarian – he may have simply wished to decrease the suffering of the poor and reduce the wrath and intensity of positive checks on them by allowing nature to naturally limit their numbers. Yet, at the core of his ideas lay a dangerous attitude, one which Allan Chase describes saying, “The poor in the eyes of Malthus, were a race apart from the non-poor, as indeed were ‘the middling classes’ created lower and apart from the gentry by the workings of the same Natural Laws.”²² Malthus had indeed effectively declared the poor a separate lower race, “the race of labourers.”²³ This declaration was inevitable in the light of his initial claims about the inequality of the forces of population and substinence. As Malthus saw it, “It has appeared that from the principle of population more will always be in want than can adequately be supplied.”²⁴ If the supply of resources can never meet the demand, he posited, then there must always be some who are in want, and these are the poor. Any attempt to share wealth (i.e. welfare) or help the poor will not help them because it cannot increase the availability of the means of subsistence. If anything, it will simply inflate food prices and leave the situation exactly as it was before. Malthus explains that,

When substinence is scarce in proportion to the number of people, it is of little consequence whether the lowest members of the society possess eight pence or five shillings. They must at all events be reduced to live upon the hardest fare and in the smallest quantity.²⁵

The poor cannot escape their fate; their lot in life ensures that they do not have the capacity to rise above their situation even if nature would allow it. The poor said Malthus, “to use a vulgar expression, seem to always live from hand to mouth. Their present wants employ their whole attention, and they seldom think of the future.”²⁶

Malthus’ conclusion, therefore, is the harsh statement that “the truth is that the pressure of distress on this part of a community [labouring poor] is an evil so deeply seated that no human ingenuity can reach it.”²⁷ Poverty is not only unstoppable, but necessary, for the evil that the poor “suffer from want of labour and unwholesome habitations, must operate as a constant check to incipient population.”²⁸

Malthus’ convictions about the poor led him towards a simple solution to solve the social problems they presented. Nature must be allowed to take its course. Society must not interfere with poverty; it is “bound in justice and honour formally to disclaim the right of

²⁰ Ibid, 94.

²¹ Ibid, 119.

²² Ibid, 82.

²³ Ibid, 117.

²⁴ Ibid, 178.

²⁵ Ibid, 95.

²⁶ Ibid, 98.

²⁷ Ibid, 101.

²⁸ Ibid, 103.

the poor to support.”²⁹ Malthus further claimed that, not only must nature be allowed to take its course, but it must be actually aided in its venture. Malthus strongly concluded that:

We should facilitate, instead of foolishly and vainly endeavoring to impede the operations of nature in producing this mortality; and if we dread the too frequent visitation of the horrid form of famine, we should sedulously encourage the other forms of destruction, which we compel nature to use. Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country, we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settlements in all marshy and unwholesome situations. But, above all, we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases; and those benevolent, but much mistaken men, who have thought they were doing a service to mankind by projecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disorders.³⁰

Remarkably, Malthus was encouraging an active repression and abuse of the poor based on what he believed was their natural inferiority. In doing so he essentially had created and was advocating a new type of racism, a “scientific” racism by which whole segments of the population were to be discriminated against based on their socioeconomic status. The term “pauperism” came to mean a racial classification of those who were “naturally” and incurably poor. Allan Chase explains the outlook of the new “scientific” racism created by Malthus saying:

The poor and the near poor of all nations were—and still are—held to be a race apart, ‘a definite race of pauper stocks.’ In the countinghouse philosophy of scientific racism, the physiological, cultural, and economic woes of the poor and the nonaffluent ‘middling classes’ were scientifically ordained by Nature, and therefore neither preventable nor reversible.³¹

According to this view the poor owned nothing—not even the right to live. If a man is born poor, explained Malthus, “and if the society does not want his labour, [he] has no claim of *right* to the smallest portion of food, and, in fact, has no business to be where he is. At nature’s mighty feast there is no cover for him.” (Emphasis added).³² Thus, Malthus became the father of a “scientific” racism much more encompassing and more dangerous than the ethnic racisms of the past.

The Economics of Malthusian Racism

It is perhaps surprising that Malthus never softened his radical views on population and food resources when evidence during his own life indicated that his views were founded on erroneous premises (see Foreword). His ideas may have seemed to contain some truth during the tumultuous times in which he lived, but the rapid agricultural and technological advances being made at the time should have at least left some doubt as to the complete truth of his dire predictions.

²⁹ Thomas Malthus, *Essay on the Principle of Population*, quoted in Chase, 6.

³⁰ Ibid, 6.

³¹ Chase, 3.

³² Thomas Malthus, quoted in Chase, 72.

Allan Chase suggests that Malthus clung to his claims because, born of a well-off family, he had become a sort of spokesman for the wealthy industrialists and landowners who depended on the urban and rural poor as their labour force. Malthus' motive, claims Chase, was not to save mankind from self-destructing through over-breeding, but to protect this vast reservoir of cheap labour from the charitable attempts that Malthus claimed had the "tendency to remove the necessary stimulus to industry."³³ To preserve this "necessary stimulus", he maintained, all relief or legislative actions that could possibly diminish poverty by increasing the standard of living of the poor should be avoided and prevented at all cost.³⁴

Regardless of Malthus' true motivation, he had created a new ideology which presented a serious threat to the well being of whole classes of people. His "scientific" racism held a strong appeal to "successions of venal men and pinchpenny governments"³⁵ by giving them supposedly "scientific" excuses to ignore the poor and their plight. Indeed, Malthus had started an ideological trend that, with the impetus provided by the ideas of a few other notable men, would sweep through the elite circles of the Western world.

Darwin's Debt to Malthus

The work of Charles Darwin, the British naturalist who published his *Origin of Species* in 1859 and himself drew inspiration from Malthus, was instrumental in elevating Malthus' ideas to a place of prominence. Darwin's research in the Galapagos Islands led him to believe that all species are formed through a gradual process of evolutionary change that began with one original life form and has spanned millions of years. Variations or differences occurred randomly over time as species evolved. The survival or extinction of organisms bearing each variation depended on a process of natural selection. Those organisms which had the ability to adapt to their environment survived, those which did not perished. Darwin's view of the natural world shocked the scientific world with his harsh, yet apparently practical view, of the natural progress of life processes.³⁶

Darwin professed that he owed a debt to Malthus for his ideas on the formation of new species. Darwin wrote,

In October 1838, that is, fifteen months after I had begun my systematic inquiry, I happened to read for amusement Malthus on Population, and being well prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence which everywhere goes on, from long-continued observation of the habits of animals and plants, it at once struck me that under these circumstances favourable variations would tend to be preserved and unfavourable ones to be destroyed. The result of this would be the formation of a new species.³⁷

Darwin further pointed to Malthus' influence on his thought when, during his voyage on the H.M.S Beagle, he faced the:

³³Chase, 7.

³⁴Ibid, 6-7.

³⁵Ibid, 8.

³⁶*Charles Darwin: British Naturalist* [article on-line]; can be found at

<http://www2.lucidcafe.com/lucidcafe/library/96feb/darwin/darwin.html>; Internet; accessed 1 April 2003.

³⁷ Charles Darwin, "Autobiography," quoted in Malthus, 49-50.

...inexplicable problem how the necessary degree of modification could have been effected, and it would have thus remained forever, had I not studied domestic productions, and thus acquired a just idea of the power of selection. As soon as I had fully realized this idea, I saw, on reading Malthus On Population, that natural selection was the inevitable result of the rapid increase of all organic beings; for I was prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence by having long studied the habits of animals.³⁸

Although Darwin was influenced by Malthus' views on population, he mostly limited his ideas to the sphere of biology and did not attempt to become a real social commentator. Researcher Jacqueline Kasun explains that Darwin wrote to a German acquaintance saying that it had not even occurred to him that his biological theories could be applicable to social matters.³⁹

Herbert Spencer's Social Darwinism

Yet, although Darwin did not make a serious attempt to apply his ideas to the social and political sphere, others were quick to do so. Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), a Victorian biologist and philosopher, used Darwinian evolution to provide what appeared to be a strong biological defense of Malthus' claims about the inferiority of the poor, although it was based on unproven assumptions and flawed premises. Spencer, who had explored the idea of evolution before Darwin himself, applied evolutionary theory to philosophy, psychology, and the study of society in a new method he called "synthetic philosophy."⁴⁰ He defined all things in terms of evolution and suggested that the "principle of continuity" was that homogeneous organisms are unstable, that organisms develop from simple to more complex and heterogeneous forms, and that such evolution constituted a norm of progress."⁴¹ Applying this idea of evolution to social circumstances Spencer created Social Darwinism and claimed that it explained the competitive processes by which society removes its 'inferior' elements. According to Spencer, the struggles of the marketplace and the greed and aggression of individuals were all simply the methods of survival of the fittest (a term he, not Darwin, was responsible for coining, contrary to popular belief) by which 'the unfit' were removed from society.⁴²

Like Malthus, Spencer was entirely opposed to all social programs and legislation designed to help the poor because it went against the "natural truths" of biology and served as the "artificial preservation of those least able to take care of themselves."⁴³ Also, like Malthus, Spencer believed that the government should allow the forces of nature to run their course on the poor and unfit and asserted that those who prospered in society were simply the fittest. He considered the millions of 'inferior' poor and underprivileged as inherently 'unfit.' Finally, like Malthus, Spencer believed that society should take steps to prevent the propagation of those considered inferior:

³⁸ Ibid, 50.

³⁹ Kasun, 158.

⁴⁰The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, *Herbert Spencer* [article on-line]; can be found at <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/s/spencer.htm>; Internet; accessed 1 April 2003.

⁴¹ Ibid, 3

⁴² Chase, 8.

⁴³ Ibid, 8.

Human society is always in a kind of evolutionary process in which the fittest – which happened to be those who can make lots of money – were chosen to dominate. There were the armies of unfit, the poor, who simply could not compete. And just as nature weeds out the unfit, an enlightened society ought to weed out its unfit and permit them to die off so as not to weaken the racial stock.⁴⁴

Spencer, however, took Malthus' ideas another step further because of a belief in the hereditary transmission of postnatally acquired physical and behavioral characteristics. He thought that a careful program of selective breeding could produce a race of the super-fit from the stock of the fittest. All humans, he thought, were to be evaluated according to a scale of social value and those highest on the scale were to be considered the most fit and treated accordingly. This scale was a subjective scale devised according to criteria set forth by Spencer and his fellow Social Darwinists. As Kasun states: "Without hesitation or embarrassment, the Social Darwinists determined the scale itself and undertook to measure men by it. Not surprisingly, those who shared the social and economic attributes of the movement's leaders rated highest."⁴⁵ Spencer also went beyond Malthus by designating certain whole races as being unfit and low on the scale of social value.

Through his scale of value Spencer sought to provide a biological proof for the inferiority of the poor. Chase explains that, by doing so, Spencer not only gave the wealthy and elite a reason to think themselves better than the lower classes, but gave them an even stronger version of the excuse Malthus had given them to satisfy their greed at the expense of the lower classes. As Spencer explained in a 1917 issue of the *Birth Control Review*:

Instead of an immense amount of life of low type, I would far sooner see half the amount of life of a high type. Increase in the swarms of people whose existence is subordinated to material development is rather to be lamented than rejoiced over."⁴⁶

Eugenics: Francis Galton's Pseudo-Science

Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911), journalist, political writer and sociologist, a Social Darwinist and a cousin to Darwin, next added further impetus in the 19th century to the claims of "scientific" racism by providing extra 'scientific' proof for the inferiority of those considered 'unfit.' Galton created the pseudo-science of eugenics, which he first defined as the "science of improving stock-not only by judicious mating, but whatever tends to give the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had."⁴⁷

Galton's interest in the idea of natural selection had lead him into the study of heredity and the laws that governed it. From his studies he drew some conclusions very similar to

⁴⁴ Herbert Spencer, *Social Darwinism* [article on-line]; can be found at <http://www.ioa.com/~shermis/socjus/socdar.html>; Internet; accessed on 1 April 2003.

⁴⁵ Kasun, 159.

⁴⁶ Herbert Spencer, *Birth Control Review*, Volume 1, Number 6 (June 1917), 5. Cited in Birth Control Review Quotes from 1917, Human Life International Anti-Life Quote Archive, http://www.hli.org/bcr_1917.html, accessed on July 29, 2003.

⁴⁷ Yanguang Wang, Ph.D. *A Call for a New Eugenics* [internet] found at <http://www.biol.tsukuba.ac.jp/~macer/EJ93/ej93e.html> Accessed on January 6, 2004.

those of Spencer. He decided “that man’s character and capacities were primarily shaped by heredity and the present generation, therefore, had the power to control and improve the inborn qualities of many generations.”⁴⁸ Galton made these suppositions based on an amazing collection of bad scientific theories, incorrectly gathered ‘data,’ and unproven medical ‘reports.’

One such ‘scientific theory’ on which Galton depended was the now long disproved science of craniology, which measured skulls for a cephalic index by which to analyze the individual’s personality and temperament. British anthropologist A. H. Keane showed decisively as far back as 1889 that craniology was unable to provide “sufficient, or even altogether trustworthy, materials for distinguishing the main divisions of mankind.”⁴⁹

Galton also depended on another long discredited ‘science’ called phrenology, “the practice of divining individual intellects and personality from an examination of skull shape.”⁵⁰ It was discovered in Galton’s own lifetime that, “since skull thickness varies, the surface of the skull does not reflect the topography of the brain, invalidating the basic premise of phrenology.”⁵¹

In truth, Galton was not concerned with the validity of the evidence he drew from such bad science but was concerned only with the conclusions he was able to draw. Chase gives an insight into the real methodology of Galton’s ‘science’ when he explains that:

Where cranial measurements and the examinations of the phrenologists—in whose “science” Galton also believed—failed to supply Galton with statistical “data” that confirmed his belief that the Natural Laws of heredity preformed the economic, social, cultural, moral, and health levels of mankind, he placed equally unquestioning reliance on the gossip of anonymous and scientifically illiterate “travelers” and on the racist myths of the Victorian drawing rooms and countinghouses.⁵²

On the basis of information drawn from such questionable sources Galton arbitrarily asserted that the members of the human race could be divided according to their inborn abilities into seven letter-graded classes with very specific ratios between them. Those of the higher classes were born less often than those of the lower and more common classes. His classes were so specific that he claimed that the superior or genius humans, who comprised those in the most exceptionally heredity-endowed Class G appeared only once in every 79,000 persons.⁵³

Much of Galton’s motivation came from his consuming fear that the lower and lesser classes, if supported and allowed to breed in good conditions, might overrun the world with their unfitness and hamper the natural improvement of the human race. He possessed the Malthusian disdain for all social systems that supported and maintained these classes. Like Malthus, he believed that helping the poor constituted a perversion of

⁴⁸ Mark H. Haller, *Eugenics* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1963), 10

⁴⁹ Chase, 96.

⁵⁰ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15th edition, ‘Sir Francis Galton’ (London: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1986), Vol. 15, 85.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 85.

⁵² Chase, 97.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 102-103.

the laws of nature. In fact, his entire political and religious system of eugenics, created “to give the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable,” was based around the Natural Laws of Thomas Robert Malthus.⁵⁴

Applying his Malthusian ideals, he fought all his life against social reforms such as hygienic reforms, laws supporting the poor, and education reforms. He expressed disbelief that “there exists a sentiment, for the most part quite unreasonable, against the gradual extinction of an inferior race.”⁵⁵ It is important to note that Galton’s mistaken science had an important effect on Darwin’s extremely influential later writings. Encyclopedia Britannica explains of Galton’s book *Hereditary Genius* that, “this book doubtless helped Darwin to extend his evolutionary theory to man,” and explains that Darwin’s *Descent of Man* incorporated several quotes from Galton’s work.⁵⁶

The Poor: Enemies of the People

Galton, like Spencer, took Malthusianism a step further by declaring certain races as belonging to the class of the ‘inferior’ because he believed they had naturally inferior moral, intellectual, and physical qualities. Like Malthus and Spencer, Galton quickly relegated all poor to the class of ‘unfit,’ but he also believed, largely because of their physical differences, that black people were genetically inferior and considered the Jews naturally morally corrupt and “parasitical.” Galton not only advocated a removal of all societal aids to these groups, but also advocated a system of active prevention against their propagation. He became the father of “eugenics” or “good birth,” a system bent on implementing systems to actively better the human race by weeding out those considered inferior.

Galton explained that the poor and the inferior became enemies of the people if they insisted on breeding and saddling society with the burden of their ‘dysgenic babies.’⁵⁷ His categorization of those considered inferior was extremely broad and included the subjective category of those considered ‘feeble-minded.’ He insisted that “stern compulsion ought to be exerted to prevent the free propagation of the stock of those who are seriously afflicted by lunacy, feeble-mindedness, habitual criminality, and pauperism.”⁵⁸ He became the leading advocate of sterilization as one means of ‘stern compulsion’ necessary to reduce the propagation of the ‘unfit.’ If the unfit continued to propagate, he insisted, “it is easy to believe that the time may come when such persons would be considered as enemies to the State.”⁵⁹

⁵⁴ Ibid, 98

⁵⁵ Haller, 10.

⁵⁶ Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 15, 85.

⁵⁷ Kasun, 159.

⁵⁸ Francis Galton, *Memories of My Life* [article on-line]; can be found at <http://www.mugu.com/galton/books/memories/chapter-XXI.html>; Internet; accessed 1 April 2003.

⁵⁹ Francis Galton, *Hereditary Improvement*, quoted in Chase, 100.

The Super Race: Breeding for Perfection

Galton's support of sterilization was based on his belief, similar to Spencer's in man's ability to breed a super race. Galton, carrying Malthus' ideas through to their natural conclusion, became the chief proponent of an active campaign of race improvement. Galton expresses his belief in man's ability to breed a super race when he spoke about his book *Hereditary Genius*, saying:

I propose to show in this book that a man's natural abilities are derived by inheritance, under exactly the same limitations as are the form and the physical features of the whole organic world. Consequently, as it is easy, notwithstanding those limitations, to obtain by careful selection, a permanent breed of dogs or horses gifted with peculiar powers of running, or of doing anything else, so it would be quite practicable to produce a highly-gifted race of men by judicious marriages during several consecutive generations.⁶⁰

Galton focused his research on the finding of and promoting the increase of "the superior breeding stock" in an effort to intensify the positive qualities of such stock to the betterment of the human race. He advocated all methods of supporting the superior stock, including the use of financial subsidies. He hoped that his work would make "the naturally gifted" more aware of their superiority so that they would come together to propagate the race.⁶¹ He emphasized the importance of "eugenic marriages" and proclaimed that eventually society's reasonable leaders must intervene to improve the human race. He further claimed that "a democracy cannot endure unless it is composed of able citizens; therefore it must in self-defense withstand the free introduction of degenerate stock."⁶²

Galton aptly described the reasoning behind his eugenics beliefs in a chapter on race improvement in his autobiographical work *Memories of My Life*. He explains away the seemingly harsh aspect of eugenics explaining that it is simply a more efficient and 'humane' method of Natural Selection:

This is precisely the object of Eugenics. Its first object is to check the birth rate of the Unfit, instead of allowing them to come into being, though doomed in large numbers to perish prematurely. The second object is the improvement of the race by furthering the productivity of the Fit by early marriages and healthful rearing of their children. Natural Selection rests upon excessive production and wholesale destruction; eugenics on bringing no more individuals into the world than can be properly cared for; and those only of the best stock.⁶³

Flawed Premises : Flawed Conclusions

Galton's ideas are frightening because they hint at such horrors as genetic enslavement, but they should have had little effect because of the many flaws in Galton's arguments.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 101

⁶¹ Chase, 100

⁶² Galton, 1.

⁶³ Ibid, 6.

Besides the many problems with the phrenology and craniology he depended on, Galton's ideas were simplistic and based on generalizations. He failed to recognize that humanity's much greater complexity made it impossible to breed man in the same manner as animals. Even more amazing was his complete failure to give any importance to cultural influences such as family, school, and community. He simply held that life experience had no effect at all on a person's formation.

More importantly Galton ignored the important principle that correlation does not necessarily imply causation. For example, it is far too simplistic to claim, as Galton did, that the normal existence of higher abilities in the rich means simply that their abilities must be genetically inherited.⁶⁴ It should have come as no surprise to him that the rich and wealthy who have access to much better education, nutrition, and leisure are better able to lead more healthy and productive lives.

Galton should also have been aware of numerous cultural and artistic leaders of the likes of Shakespeare and Beethoven who had a complete absence of any similar contributors in their lineages. At the same time, he should have been aware of the numerous "half-wits, psychotics, and wastrels who had succeeded to the thrones of great monarchs, the ownership of family banks and industries, and other social, military, and economic fiefdoms by virtue of being biological descendents" of gifted parents.⁶⁵ Galton made no effort to explain away these exceptions to his rules of genetic inheritance.

The flaws in Galton's arguments show, as Allan Chase comments, that Galton's "talent for ignoring the hard data of the legitimate biomedical sciences equaled Malthus' capacity to ignore the equally hard data of the Agricultural Revolution."⁶⁶ Malthus and Galton indeed shared, along with Spencer, an incredible tendency towards sweeping generalities, an ability to ignore vast amounts of well established and proven medical and biological data, and a see-no-science-hear-no-science mentality.⁶⁷ Because of it, the cumulative *positive* social, political, and biological contributions of these three men were negligible. *Encyclopedia Britannica* explains that Malthus' *Essay on Population*, the work which laid the foundation for the thought of all three thinkers, was not based on empirical data, but rather was an 'abstract-analytical' work. "At no point, even up to the final massive sixth edition of 1826, did he [Malthus] ever adequately set out his premises or examine his logical status. Nor did he handle his factual and statistical materials with much critical or statistical rigor."⁶⁸

Eugenics' Popularity Spreads

Despite their poor scholarship, however, the ideas of Malthus, as projected through the thought of Spencer and Darwin, would soon grip the minds of the elite across the western world and reach a level of great prominence and widespread acceptance in the early 20th Century (as seen in the next chapter). More amazing than Malthus', Spencer's, and

⁶⁴ Ibid, 100-101.

⁶⁵ Chase, 101.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 102.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 97.

⁶⁸ Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 7, 746

Galton's clinging to their ideas was the rapidity with which the leaders of Western society embraced them.

Historian Paul Johnson, explained of the spread of Malthusianism that:

All the ablest elements in Western society . . . were wholly taken in by this monstrous doctrine of unreason. Those who objected were successfully denounced as obstructionists, and the enemies of social progress. They could no longer be burned as heretical subverters of the new orthodoxy, but they were successfully and progressively excluded from the control of events.⁶⁹

Galton himself, in a rare moment of perception, recognized that it was the educated classes to whom his ideas would most appeal. He attempted to convince them of the truth of his theories with a three-stage approach. First, he said he must make eugenics

...familiar as an academic question until its exact importance has been understood and accepted as fact; secondly it must be recognized as a subject whose practical development deserves serious considerations; and thirdly it must be introduced into the national consciousness as a new religion.⁷⁰

Galton and Spencer were both extremely successful in their appeals to the rich. Spencer, with his sweeping rejections of any social tool, project, or legislation that hinted at an attempt to help the 'undeserving poor,' quickly became the beloved philosopher of the rich. His early disciples included the railroad tycoon James J. Hill, oil tycoon John D. Rockefeller, Sr., and steel tycoon Andrew Carnegie.⁷¹ Their interest in him, and the interest of many other wealthy and influential men, made him one of the most talked-about English thinkers of the Victorian period.

The attraction of the wealthy and elite to Malthusianism is perhaps best explained by its appeal to human greed and selfishness. The "scientific" racism of Malthus was more powerful than simple ethnic racism because it "was not based on emotion and hate, but on love. What the creators of scientific racism loved, however, was money."⁷² Malthus' scientific racism provided the wealthy with a reason to fight against the taxes on their profits, taxes that were earmarked for promoting the general welfare of the lower classes on whose backs the profits were made. In America, as in other places, Spencer's disciples added Galton's hereditary assertions to Spencer's restricted government attitude to create the perfect formula proving their superiority and thereby justifying their every greedy action and avoidance of philanthropy (if it supported the "unfit").⁷³ The synthesis of Spencer and Galton's theories formed a very appealing brand of Malthusianism.

Chase aptly explains the combined attraction of Spencer and Galton's theories to the rich and elite when he states that:

Where Spencer offered 'revolutionary' rationales for low wages and subhuman working and living conditions. Galton offered the 'hereditary' reasons in the Natural Laws of

⁶⁹ Paul Johnson, *A History of the English People*, quoted in George Grant, *Killer Angel* (New York: Ars Vitae Press, 1995), 52.

⁷⁰ Ibid, 100.

⁷¹ Ibid, 8.

⁷² Chase, 3.

⁷³ Chase, 99-100.

biology for not wasting sympathy, money, education, and, above all else, health care on biologically low-class types who were destined by the Will of God and/or Nature to be nothing but drains on society and a rapidly proliferating population of hereditary paupers, thieves and parasites.⁷⁴

The foundations for a new “scientific” racism had now been built. The ideas of Malthus as projected by Spencer and Galton, had begun to capture the minds and hearts of the wealthy and elite of the Western world. Thus, a process was started that would spread the influence of Malthus across the globe and cause the essentials of his “scientific” racist ideas to become permanently ingrained in the public conscience. The theory was taking hold. The next step was application.

⁷⁴ Ibid, 105-106.

Chapter Two

“Scientific” Racism Takes Root

Eugenics Spreads Throughout the Western World

The Malthusian cult spread rapidly in the late nineteenth century in the form of Social Darwinism, resulting in what Allan Chase calls “institutionalized ‘scientific’ racism.” It was soon to pave the way for the widespread acceptance of the more frightening policies of Galton’s eugenics, which first began to take hold in his home country of England.⁷⁵

The spread of Spencer’s Social Darwinism led to an increased interest in England in various new scientific theories, such as the craniology and phrenology upon which Galton depended and which were based on a belief in the idea of genetically inherited social characteristics. One theory that gained acceptance through the influence of Social Darwinism was the idea of criminal anthropology. Developed from the ideas of researchers like Dr. B.A. Morel’s, its proponents generally held that criminal behavior stemmed from mental aberrations which were the result of physical defects attributable to heredity. This supposed ‘science’ served, along with the other theories based on inherited traits, as a catalyst for the formation of the eugenics movement in England. It appealed to noblemen, literary figures, and other intellectuals who believed that these theories would improve science’s ability to better the human race.⁷⁶

The eugenics movement took a major step towards respectability with the formation of the Eugenics Education Society in 1907 by the distinguished lawyer Montague Crackanthorpe. With the prestigious Francis Galton as its Honorary President the society actively promoted its race improvement agenda to the public and published the *Eugenics Review*. Following its Malthusian origins, it also began lobbying against the British poor laws. The organization was given great weight by the membership of prominent eugenicists such as Dr. Caleb Williams Saleeby, professors and researchers such as the well-known sexologist Havelock Ellis and professor of divinity W. R. Inge, literary figures such as George Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells, and various members of the nobility. Bernard Shaw showed his enthusiasm for eugenics when he proclaimed that “there is now no reasonable excuse for refusing to face the fact that nothing but a eugenic religion can save our civilization from the fate that has overtaken all previous civilizations.”⁷⁷

Karl Pearson, a brilliant disciple and friend of Galton, became the first professor of eugenics at University College, London in 1911.⁷⁸ Pearson was an open advocate of laws to prevent Jewish immigration to England because he believed phrenologic tests had proven the Jews to be a hereditary race of parasites. In the opening issue of the *Annals of*

⁷⁵ Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), 8.

⁷⁶ Mark. H. Haller. *Eugenics* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1963),14-15.

⁷⁷ Michael W. Perry, ed., *Eugenics and Other Evils* (Seattle: Inkling Books, 2000), 59.

⁷⁸ Haller, 18-19.

Eugenics in October 1925, Pearson published a eugenics study titled “The Problem of Alien Immigration into Great Britain, Illustrated by an Examination of Russian and Polish Children.” In it, among other things, he attempted to prove the innate inferiority of Jewish children through head-form measurements and cephalic indexes and used this “proof” to explain why Jews and other such human “refuse” should be kept out of America.⁷⁹

With the help of the groundwork laid by Social Darwinism and the various trends of its offshoots, Galton’s eugenics was fast becoming a world movement by the end of his life. Eugenics societies were springing up all over Europe in countries such as Sweden and Germany where Alfred Ploetz, a man who once wrote “race is a criterion of value,” formed the German Society for Racial Hygiene.⁸⁰ The Eugenics Education Society had branches in every major city of Great Britain. In 1910 a Eugenics Record Office had also been set up on Long Island, New York.

Famous Names and a Higher Profile

Perhaps the greatest testament to the size of the movement and its growing influence was the remarkable list of prominent thinkers, scientists, social scientists, and politicians who attended the International Congress of Eugenics in London in 1912. The conference was organized by the largely German-dominated International Society for Racial Hygiene and by some accounts was attended by as many as 800 participants. They included:

Leonard Darwin, son of the famous evolution theorist Charles Darwin and head of the British Eugenics Society, the official sponsor of the Congress; the American inventor, Alexander Graham Bell; Charles B. Davenport, director of the Eugenics Record Office in Cold Spring Harbor located in Long Island, New York; Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University; and David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University. Ploetz and Max von Gruber, professor of hygiene in Munich, served as German vice-presidents. Great Britain was represented by Winston Churchill, then secretary of state for Home Affairs, and William Collins, vice-chancellor of the University of London. Lucien March, director of the Institute for Statistics in Paris, and Edmond Perrier, director of the Museum for Natural History in Paris, acted as vice-presidents from France, while August Forel, a famous psychiatrist from Zurich, represented Switzerland.⁸¹

The last session of the conference helped explain the conference’s agenda. In it, the participants discussed the practical application of eugenics towards the prevention of procreation of the ‘unfit’ by methods such as segregation and sterilization, as well as discussing positive methods of encouraging procreation of the ‘fit.’ The conference was so successful in promoting international co-operation between eugenicists that it led to the creation of the Permanent International Commission of Eugenics, and was followed by international congresses in New York in 1921 and 1932. Galton’s radical version of scientific racism had effectively become a worldwide rallying call for the intellectual, cultural, and scientific elite.⁸²

⁷⁹ Chase, 308.

⁸⁰ Alfred Ploetz, quoted by Winifride Prestwich, *The Interim* August, 1994.

⁸¹ Stefan Kuhl, *The Nazi Connection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 14.

⁸² Kuhl, 14-15.

Although the eugenics movement got its jump-start in England, it was the United States and Germany which most enthusiastically embraced the ideology and quickly became world leaders in implementing its policies. The world is well aware of the horrific results of the implementation of eugenic policies in Germany, which helped point out to the public the fundamental problems of eugenics. The world is less aware, however, of the strong connection between German and American eugenicists and of the impetus that America provided to the German agenda. Alfred Ploetz pointed to this connection in an interview he gave to the Berliner Tageblatt concerning his experiences at the First International Congress for Eugenics in 1912. Sociologist Stefan Kuhl explains that, during the interview, Ploetz's glowing description of the United States as the bold leader in the realm of eugenics was a foreshadowing of the close relationship which would develop between Germany and the United States.⁸³

Eugenics Spreads in the United States

The United States of the twentieth century proved a fertile ground for eugenics because of the groundwork laid by Social Darwinism. The various currents of Social Darwinist thought had attracted a core group of educated and wealthy Americans who used their influence and money to spread Spencer's ideas across America. They also applied Social Darwinism to their daily lives.

Spencer's nineteenth century American admirers included the railroad tycoon James J. Hill, who defended the ruthlessness of the new railroad monopolies by writing that 'the fortunes of railroad companies are determined by the law of the survival of the fittest.' In this he was echoed by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., who told a Sunday-school class that 'the growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest . . .merely the working out of a law of nature and a law of God.' Andrew Carnegie wrote that in Spencer's writings he had finally "found the truth of evolution."⁸⁴

Social Darwinism gained a firm hold in the minds of educated Americans in the nineteenth century, but the growing belief in the importance of heredity in social traits was instrumental in opening the door for eugenics. Mark H. Haller explains that the increasing intensity of American social problems at the end of the nineteenth century helped spark this belief. At the time, the United States was struggling with the rising pressures of the rapid move towards urbanization and its accompanying growth of slums and poverty. It was also struggling with labour tensions and the abuses of industrialization, as well as an increasing influx of new immigrants, and the ever-present racial problems following the Civil War.

Soon, many American states began organizing special and separate care for those considered dependent or delinquent, such as alcoholics, criminals, and those thought to be feeble-minded. A network of new institutions created to care for these people led to the creation of the social worker profession. As the new social workers struggled to understand their clients' problems they formed new societies to facilitate information exchange. Many of these social workers, and in particular those who cared for those with mental disabilities or those considered feeble-minded, became disillusioned by failures in their initial attempts to rehabilitate or educate those who were considered depraved and

⁸³ Kuhl, 13.

⁸⁴ Chase, 8.

infirm. They also observed that many of the children of the morally corrupt, such as criminals and alcoholics, seemed to share many of the traits of their parents.⁸⁵ Their observations spawned a large number of studies into the importance of heredity in passing on undesirable qualities. These included studies in criminal pathology and feeble-mindedness, such as that of Richard Dugdale, who claimed to have discovered long histories of crime and pauperism in several families.

As a result of these studies, “by the 1890’s, Americans active in the study and treatment of the dependent and delinquent increasingly found in heredity a major cause for those mental aberrations that cost the nation so much in maintenance of asylums, prisons, and poor relief.”⁸⁶ Criminal anthropology in particular drew a large following and achieved great publicity through the works of important scientists and influential writers such as Jack London, Frank Norris, and Max Nordeau. Support for both criminal anthropology and feeble-mindedness research gave rise to a new campaign which began calling for restrictions on the propagation of the hereditary unfitness of criminals and those considered feeble-minded.⁸⁷

By the end of the nineteenth century, belief in the heredity of feeble-minded and criminal characteristics had become so ingrained in popular opinion that a movement for legislation restricting propagation of these groups went into full swing. Marriage restrictions were the first preventive method proposed, since sterilization had not yet been perfected or fully accepted. In 1896 Connecticut became the first state to regulate the reproduction of those seen as feeble-minded by restricting their marriages. Connecticut’s legislation was quickly followed by similar eugenics legislation in Kansas in 1903, New Jersey and Ohio in 1904, and Michigan and Indiana in 1905.

Legislated Sterilization: The Beginning of Positive Eugenics in the US

The eugenicists were not satisfied, however, that marriage restriction laws would adequately restrict the procreation of those they considered defective and delinquent. They began pushing for forced sterilization laws. In 1907, with the encouragement of Dr. Harry Sharp, the man who brought the vasectomy to the United States, Indiana earned itself the notorious distinction of becoming the first state in the United States and the world to pass a bill mandating the sterilization of those considered confirmed criminals, idiots, imbeciles, and rapists in state institutions – as long as the practice was recommended by a board of ‘experts.’⁸⁸ In the next few years, under the urging of the eugenicists thirty states followed suit, drawing heavily from a Model Eugenic Law written by eugenicist Harry Laughlin.⁸⁹ The devastation wrought by the new law was great. By 1968, 65,000 Americans had been sterilized against their will in the thirty states that had passed the laws, with more than 52 percent of those being labeled as “mentally retarded” by IQ tests which presupposed their inferiority.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ Haller, 22-29

⁸⁶ Ibid, 38

⁸⁷ Ibid, 41-42.

⁸⁸ Haller, 48-50.

⁸⁹ Kasun, 159.

⁹⁰ Chase, 135.

America's politicians were not the only ones to succumb to the eugenicist arguments calling for sterilization of those deemed feeble-minded or delinquent. The courts also declared their support for eugenics. In the *Buck v. Bell* decision at the end of the 1920's, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a 1924 Virginia eugenics law giving the state the right to forcibly sterilize where deemed necessary. The court allowed Virginia to sterilize the defendant Carrie Buck, who had been designated as an "imbecile" because she had been born of a negligent mother and had an illegitimate child (who was later an honour student). It later became apparent that Carrie was institutionalized because her foster parents wished to avoid embarrassment after she had been made pregnant by their son. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes justified the decision, upheld by eight of the justices, saying, "It is better for all the world, if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime, or let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. . . three generations of imbeciles are enough."⁹¹ The United States was well on its way towards fully embracing eugenics.

The Teutonic Cult

The belief in the hereditary unfitness of the defective and delinquent was just one piece of the larger puzzle of eugenics thought that was sweeping the country. Eugenics was given an important boost by the ethnic racism of the Teutonic cult as propagated in the United States in the late nineteenth century by General Francis Amasa Walker, one of the most prominent economists in American history. General Walker served as superintendent of the U.S. Census, was one of the first presidents of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was president of the American Statistical Association, and was the first president of the American Economics Association. He was also an economics professor at Yale and head of the statistical bureau of the U.S. Treasury.⁹² Walker, a great admirer of Spencer and Galton, shared Galton's fear that the 'dysgenic' breeding of the unfit would have a negative impact on the rest of humanity. He was a firm believer in the Teutonism, or belief in the racial superiority of the Teutonic peoples, which was espoused by French diplomat Joseph Arthur comte de Gobineau in his *Inequality of the Races*. Walker believed that the English and Germanic peoples directly descended from the superior Teutonic race. He believed that the earlier generations of Americans shared the same superior Teutonic heritage because of their English descent, but believed that many of the immigrants from other countries were inferior.

Walker was afraid that the increasing flow of European immigrants from the supposedly less suitable races would have a strong negative effect on the social atmosphere and living conditions of native Americans. By "native" Americans he did not mean the early aboriginal Americans, but was referring to those Nordics who had first replaced them. Walker understood the important role immigration had played in the initial building and founding of America, but believed that preventing non-Nordic people from coming to America was essential to retain America's greatness.⁹³ He proclaimed:

⁹¹ William Brannigan, "Virginia's Forced Sterilization Policies," *Population Research Institute Review* 12, no. 2 (March-April 2002), 14.

⁹² The History of Economic Thought Website, Gen. Francis Amasa Walker, [internet], can be found at <http://cepa.newschool.edu/het/profiles/walker.htm> (accessed on July 31, 2003).

⁹³ Chase, 108-110.

There is no reason why every foul and stagnant pool of population in Europe, in which no breath of intellectual or industrial life has stirred for ages, should be so admitted as immigrants to the United States. . . . The problems which so sternly confront us today are serious enough without being complicated and aggravated by the addition of some millions of Hungarians, Bohemians, Poles, south Italians, and Russian Jews.⁹⁴

Walker's words appealed to those in the educated classes who had already been influenced by the Social Darwinism and Eugenics thought that had made its way over from England. Many of this class were also likely more susceptible to eugenics because of the undercurrent of racism already fostered in the United States by the old institution of slavery and the problematic aftermath of its destruction. The poor and squalid conditions following the Civil War, which fomented disease and increased crime among African Americans, began to be used as proof by some educated Americans that African Americans had evolved from a lower species. Allan Chase explains that, encouraged by General Walker, many educated Americans were quick to use the Teutonic myth as proof of their own superiority and as a reason to maintain that blacks were second-class citizens. Their attitude quickly became part of a larger racist concept that rejected all people of other colours, including the Chinese and Japanese whose immigration had already caused tensions with white Americans. Thus, as immigration patterns moved away from the Protestant, well educated, and supposedly Teutonic peoples, like those of England, Scotland, and Germany, towards the Catholic, Greek Orthodox, or Jewish peoples of other parts of Europe with peasant backgrounds, higher illiteracy rates, and different cultures, the educated Teutonists began to grow alarmed by the change.⁹⁵

The voices of the American elite soon began to echo Walker's indictments against the Hungarians, Bohemians, Poles, and South Italians: "They have none of the ideas and aptitudes which fit men to take up readily and easily the problem of self-care and self-government, such as belong to those who are descended from the tribes that met under the oak-trees of old Germany to make laws and choose chieftains."⁹⁶

The formation of the Immigration Restriction League (IRL) in 1889 by three young wealthy Harvard students, Prescott Farnsworth Hall, Robert DeCourcy Ward and lawyer Charles Warren, was the natural outgrowth of these developments. The League's primary goal, guided by the assertions of Walker, was the introduction of legislation mandating literary tests as a method to exclude immigrants of "inferior" strains. The popularity of the IRL among the already largely Teutonic centered elite, as well as other racist groups, was remarkable:

Within a decade of its founding, the national committee of the IRL was to include the presidents of Harvard, Bowdoin, Stanford, Western Reserve, Georgia Tech., and the Wharton School of Finance . . . as well as scores of other university presidents and professors. Many of the nation's leading bankers were to be represented on its board, as were Henry Holt and other major American publishers. The overt anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, and anti-anything-but-Aryan purposes of the League's propaganda attracted the allegiance of racists and yahoos of all stripes – from the Teutonists with Ph.D.'s to the night riders of the revived Ku Klux Klan.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Chase 108.

⁹⁵ Haller, 51-53.

⁹⁶ General Francis Amasa Walker, quoted in Chase, 110.

⁹⁷ Chase, 113.

With the aid of former Harvard professor Henry Cabot Lodge, a U.S. senator in 1895 and member of a wealthy family, the IRL's restrictionist bills were soon introduced into Congress. Three bills passed, one in 1897, another in 1913, and the third in 1915, but all three were vetoed because of concerns expressed by some wealthy businessmen. These wealthy men, the same men who were fathers of those in the IRL, were a little concerned that their sons' bills would deplete the mass of cheap labour upon which they had built the fortunes that their sons were using to support the IRL. By 1915, however, the labour situation had changed because of technological advances. More importantly, the leaders of the eugenics movement had stepped into the fray.

America Embraces Eugenics

Educated America had begun to embrace immigration restriction as well as measures restricting the propagation of those considered degenerate and delinquent. It would take little effort for the eugenics movement to turn this simmering cauldron of Malthusian impulses into full-blown eugenics. The American eugenics movement drew its initial inspiration from the British movement. The Harvard graduate, Charles Benedict Davenport, who became the scientific leader of and, more importantly, the primary promoter of the American movement in the early twentieth century, was impressed, while studying at Harvard, by the studies of Galton and his associate Pearson. As a result, he traveled to England in 1897 to meet them. He soon became a strong believer in eugenics despite later disputes with Pearson over Mendelian genetics.

Motivated by his new beliefs, Davenport lobbied the Carnegie Institute of Washington until he convinced it to put him in charge of and endow the new Carnegie Institute for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor, in 1904. While there, Davenport's enthusiasm for eugenics grew, leading him to persuade the American Breeders Association, an organization created to investigate and further the finds of Mendelian genetics, to create a Committee on Eugenics. He was appointed the Secretary of this Committee in 1912. The Committee, essentially run by Davenport, included most of the prominent founders of the American eugenics movement, and was set up "to investigate and report on heredity in the human race," as well as to "emphasize the value of superior blood and the menace to society of inferior blood."⁹⁸

Under Davenport's leadership the Committee increased its activities to include various special sub-committees encouraging eugenics studies on human heredity at universities and other institutions. The sub-committees included many eminent scientists, such as Harvard psychologist, Robert M. Yerkes, Frederick Adams Wood, a biologist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and criminologist William Healy. Davenport also united the mainstream eugenics movement with the Immigration Restriction League when he asked its founders, Hall and Ward, to lead the sub-Committee on Immigration.⁹⁹ Together, they were powerful propagandizers of a system of eugenics designed to remove 'unfit' peoples from America.

Davenport drew many intellectuals to his cause with a simplistic version of Mendelian genetics despite his continual failure to find any substantial scientific evidence to support

⁹⁸ Haller, 58.

⁹⁹ Haller, 57-65

his claims. Davenport held that every human trait or characteristic was created by a specific gene for a specific *unit of character*. These unitary traits or ‘unit characters’ were discrete particles of hereditary information.¹⁰⁰ Good blood, therefore, contained the hereditary endowment for the positive qualities leading to success, intelligence, and physical health, and the unit characters which gave the person the inborn immunity against the infectious disease that were often found among the poor. On the other hand bad blood contained the unit characters for all physical, mental, and moral defects, including the despised unit character for pauperism. Like Malthus, Davenport made no provision for the effect of environment and education on the formation of an individual personality.

Davenport and his erstwhile colleague, psychologist Henry Goddard, author of *The Kallikak family: A study in the heredity of feeble-mindedness*, sent droves of field workers with little or no training on missions going from door to door asking for information on the residents’ family’s heritage. The vast collection of unconfirmed housewife tales and family lore which these field workers brought back was used by Davenport and Goddard as a body of evidence supporting their theory of bad blood. They used this ‘evidence,’ gathered without recourse to proper scientific method, to advocate active prevention of the procreation of genetically inferior, “beaten men from beaten races.”¹⁰¹ Their unscientific theory nevertheless drew many elite supporters because it provided even more ‘scientific’ evidence proving the inferiority of the lower classes.

Despite his failures in the scientific field, Davenport was an extremely influential man because of his genius as a promoter. Wishing to further the cause of eugenics, Davenport proved his ability by convincing the wealthy Mrs. E. Harriman to fund a new Eugenics Record Office (ERO) at Cold Spring Harbor in 1910. She would support the ERO until 1918. After this, the Carnegie foundation stepped in to support it until 1940 as part of the Carnegie Institution Department of Genetics.

The Record Office quickly became the center of all eugenics activities in the United States. Its most important activity was to organize the propaganda machine and begin the political activism that would do much more to spread eugenics ideas in the U.S. than the dismal scientific attempts of the eugenics movement. The ERO set out to convert the American people with,

...its classes in eugenics for its field workers; its published reports on specific projects and studies; its monthly *Eugenical News*, a newsletter written in very simple lay language, whose readers included influential Americans in government, publishing, and education; its Eugenic Research Association, whose presidents (handpicked by Davenport) were to include the chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.¹⁰²

Davenport’s successful promotional efforts lead to the spread of eugenics within elite circles across the country. Most importantly, his efforts helped the eugenics movement gain a strong following in the academic community who soon included eugenics ideas in scientific courses at many important American universities. By 1914, Harvard,

¹⁰⁰ Chase, 116.

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 116.

¹⁰² Ibid, 119

Columbia, Cornell, Brown, Wisconsin, Northwestern, Clark, and Utah had courses in or relating to eugenics, and the University of Pittsburgh, MIT, Goucher College and the University of Wisconsin had staff or lecturers who were strong supporters of eugenics.

American academics wrote about their eugenics beliefs in many publications including the early issues of the *Birth Control Review*. Echoing the thoughts of many academics, Professor Warner Fite, from the Department of Philosophy at Princeton University, exclaimed in a 1921 issue of the *Review* that “I believe that overpopulation is the most serious menace to the peace of the world.”¹⁰³ Arthur E. Morgan, President of Antioch College, commented in 1932 that “the lack of racial responsibility is one of the greatest menaces to our society.”¹⁰⁴ Similar sentiments also made their way into the media with newspapers like the *Detroit Free Press* proclaiming that, “There are too many people; and above all, too many people of a sort that should not have been born, but which persist on breeding, and having bred, are kept alive for reasons which give more credit to the heart of the race than its head.”¹⁰⁵

The movement was given further prominence by Albert E. Wiggam, a well-known lecturer and writer who became one of its great publicists. Also, after 1910 numerous eugenics organizations sprang up across the country, including the Race Betterment Foundation, which was begun by Dr. John H. Kellogg at the urging of Davenport. The Kellogg foundation would later provide great support for eugenics throughout the twentieth century. Davenport acted as president and founder of The Galton Society of New York, whose membership list included Henry F. Osborn, the distinguished paleontologist of the American Museum of Natural History as well as Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard, the two leading racists and anti-Semites in the United States. The Society also included Ellsworth Huntington, a Yale geographer, and many other prominent scientists and academics such as John C. Merriam, President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.¹⁰⁶

Theodore Roosevelt proved another early convert to eugenics, declaring in a letter of January 14, 1913, in words that paraphrased Galton’s dicta of 1883:

It is obvious that if in the future racial qualities are to be improved, the improving must be wrought mainly by favoring the fecundity of the worthy types . . . At present, we do just the reverse. There is no check of the fecundity of those who are subnormal.¹⁰⁷

Eugenics in Action in America

Davenport and his associates were also largely responsible for uniting American eugenics efforts with the efforts of the international eugenics community and for bringing

¹⁰³ Professor Warner Fite, “Birth Control: Is it Moral? A Symposium of Representative Opinion,” *Birth Control Review*, Volume VI, Number I (January 1922), p.10. Cited in Birth Control Review Quotes from 1922, found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_1922.html

¹⁰⁴ Arthur E. Morgan, *Birth Control Review*, Volume XVI, Number 10 (October 1932), 253. Cited in Birth Control Review Quotes from 1932. Found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_1932.html

¹⁰⁵ Editorial, *Detroit Free Press*, May 22, 1930. Quoted in Birth Control Review, Volume XVI, Numbers 7 and 8 (July/August 1932), 221. Found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_1932.html

¹⁰⁶ Haller 72-73.

¹⁰⁷ Theodore Roosevelt, cited in Chase, 15.

American eugenicists the great prestige that catapulted them into a leadership role among that community. Davenport, Osborn, and Madison Grant, co-founder of the Galton Society of New York, all had very active roles in the planning and organizing of the Second and Third International Congresses on Eugenics in New York in 1921 and 1932. The second conference did not include delegations from the Germans because of strained relations resulting from the war, but by the third conference the German eugenicists had long been reintegrated into the movement. With the influence of Davenport and company, the Second Annual Conference included prominent Americans Herbert Hoover, soon to become the President of the United States, the future governor of Pennsylvania Gifford Pinchot, and the chief psychologist of the U.S. army. Osborn, President of the Conference which took place at New York's American Museum of Natural History, summed up the mood of the Conference when he emphasized the importance of science "in the prevention of the spread and multiplication of worthless members of society."¹⁰⁸

The most effective section of the conference, however, was the Exhibits Committee. Dr. Harry Laughlin, Davenport's right hand man and the superintendent of the Eugenics Record Office, oversaw the creation of the exhibits, consisting of illustrative charts and publications, which were displayed at the Museum during the conference. In a brilliant public relations move he then arranged to have the exhibits displayed at the U.S. Capitol building. For the next three years they remained mounted there as a symbol of the United States leading role in eugenics, and served to remind the political leaders of the United States who passed by every day of the 'inferiority' of many of the millions who had voted them into office.¹⁰⁹

This public relations feat was just one of the many accomplishments of Laughlin, whose remarkable skill as a publicist made him perhaps the most effective eugenicist of his time. It was Laughlin who virtually engineered the campaign to ensure that thirty states and Puerto Rico followed the precedent set by Indiana's law of 1907, which implemented mandatory sterilization of those seen as 'socially inadequate.' During the campaign he used his Model Eugenical Sterilization Law as a strong propaganda tool, distributing copies of it to any and every person of influence in the United States. The Law serves as a good synopsis of the ruthless "scientific" racism espoused by many American eugenicists. Following are a few excerpts:

Persons Subject: All persons in the States who, because of degenerate or defective hereditary qualities are potential parents of socially inadequate offspring.

The socially inadequate classes, regardless of etiology or prognosis [that is, regardless of the cause of the condition or the chances of eliminating it by means other than gelding], are the following: (1) Feeble-minded; (2) Insane (including the psychopathic); (3) Criminalistic (including the delinquent and wayward); (4) Epileptic; (5) Inebriate (including drug-habitueés); (6) Diseased (including the tuberculous, the syphilitic, the leprous, and others with chronic, infectious, and legally segregable diseases); (7) Blind (including those with seriously impaired hearing); (9) Deformed (including the crippled); and (10) Dependent (including orphans, ne'er-do-wells [sic], the homeless, tramps, and paupers).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Henry F. Osborn, cited in Chase, 277.

¹⁰⁹ Chase, 277-278.

¹¹⁰ Chase, 133-134.

Fortunately, not all Laughlin's wishes were followed or a much larger percentage of the American population would have been sterilized.

The damage done through the sterilization laws of Laughlin was, however, small compared to the results of Laughlin's alliance with the Immigration Restriction League. Laughlin was responsible for bringing the full weight of the eugenics movement to bear on the immigration restriction issue and for smashing down the barriers against it. His efforts got off to a quick start in 1920, when he was appointed Expert Eugenics Agent of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization by its Chairman, Albert Johnson. Johnson owed his job to the lobbying efforts of the IRL.

As part of his job as Expert Eugenics Agent, Laughlin began a series of appearances before Congress which he used to pitch his and Davenport's ideas for immigration restrictions. Throughout a four-year period he used his time before to build a supposed 'scientific' base for the necessity of such restrictions. Laughlin's reports drew on IQ tests based on subjective criteria, poorly researched studies claiming the hereditary inferiority of certain families, and alarmist charts based on altered and improperly gathered data. He was supported by other 'experts' who also appeared before Congress. These included Dr. Lothrop Stoddard, a radical anti-Semite who believed he had evidence showing the inferiority of Jews. Stoddard's admirers included the not-long deceased President of the United States, Warren Gamaliel Harding.¹¹¹

Laughlin was helped in his efforts by and drew continuously on the works of author Madison Grant. Grant's most striking and effective addition to the "scientific" racism of the eugenicists was his book *The Passing of the Great Race*. The book was a raging condemnation of any democratic actions that threatened the race of the Nordics, whom he considered the Great Race in America. His book aptly summed up many of the existing theories of race hatred and hatred of the lower classes and ardently advocated radical methods of negative eugenics to preserve the "Great Race." The book ended by noting that:

If the Melting Pot is allowed to boil without control and we continue to follow our national motto and deliberately blind ourselves to 'all distinctions of race, creed or color,' the type of native American of Colonial descent will become as extinct as the Athenian of the age of Pericles, and the Viking of the days of Rollo.¹¹²

Despite the book's lack of proof and outspoken race hatred, it exerted an alarming influence on United States social policies. Its summation of eugenics served to make it a valuable reference book for media leaders across the country. Laughlin, who worked closely with Grant, also ensured that every member of Congress had read the book or had at least heard its message. Grant took an active role in lobbying efforts, winning and dining Albert Johnson to cement his continued support for eugenics. The outcome of their cumulative efforts was the passage through Congress of The Immigration Restriction Act of 1924 (sometimes referred to as the Johnson Act), which implemented a set of immigration restrictions designed to stop the immigration of undesirables from Europe. The act brought sweeping and incredibly drastic reductions in immigration numbers. As a result of the act, in less than a single decade at least six million Jews, Poles, Italians, Hungarians, and others which the Teutonist likes of Grant had designated as inferior types, were denied the sanctuary which quite probably could have saved many

¹¹¹ Chase, 289-301.

¹¹² Ibid, 166.

of their lives from the Nazis' ethnic cleansing.¹¹³ Calvin Coolidge, the President in 1924, had the opportunity to veto the bill and give many poor human beings another chance at life, but Laughlin's propaganda campaign had been successful. President Coolidge declined to veto the bill, saying,

There are racial considerations too grave to be brushed aside for any sentimental reasons. Biological laws tell us that certain divergent people will not mix or blend. The Nordics propagate themselves successfully. With other races the outcome shows deterioration. Quality of mind and body suggests that observance of ethnic law is as great a necessity to a nation as immigration law.¹¹⁴

The eugenicists had won a smashing victory. Millions of potential immigrants were barred from the land of the free and left to the terrible devices of the Nazi eugenicists.

A Surprising Alliance: American Money and German Know-how

American historians often refer to the horrors of the Nazi regime with disgust, but they might be amazed to discover that in Germany there were initially far more barriers to the implementation of eugenic principles than in the United States. Ironically, the eugenics efforts in the United States were instrumental in the breaking down of the barriers in Germany. A devastating legacy of the ideals of the American eugenics movement was the inspiration and support it provided for Nazi Germany.

Stefan Kuhl, in his book *The Nazi Connection*, points to the importance of American financial backing for German projects. Once again the wealthy elite proved to be the backbone of support for the work of "scientific" racists, with the fortunes of American industrialists providing the initial funding for German eugenics research. Kuhl explains:

Underlying the close working relationship between America and Germany was the extensive financial support of American foundations for the establishment of eugenic research in Germany. The main support was the Rockefeller Foundation in New York. It financed the research of German racial hygienist Agnes Bluhm on heredity and alcoholism as early as 1920. Following a European tour by a Rockefeller official in December 1926, the Foundation began supporting other German eugenicists, including Herman Poll, Alfred Gorjahn, and Hans Nachtshiem. The Rockefeller Foundation played the central role in establishing and sponsoring major eugenic institutes in Germany, including the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychiatry and the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, eugenics, and Human Heredity.¹¹⁵

The Rockefeller Foundation continued to support numerous key German eugenics projects with generous grants even after the National Socialists took control. The Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes would later be responsible for collecting evidence "proving" the physical and psychological defectiveness of the Jews. Much of the work done by these institutes laid the foundation for the Nazi ethnic extermination projects. Ernst Rudin, the Director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychiatry supported by the Foundation, would play a leading role in implementing the Nazis' horrific eugenics policies after his appointment as president of the German Racial Hygiene Society in 1933 by the Reich

¹¹³ Ibid, 288-300.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, 175.

¹¹⁵ Kuhl, 20.

Ministry. In the letter appointing Rudin as president, the minister of the interior stated that,

The theory of inheritance and race hygiene are of the utmost importance for the structure of the Reich and for improvement of the race of the German people; therefore, I would like you to carry through the reconstruction work in closest collaboration with my ministry.¹¹⁶

It is also of significant note that Rudin enjoyed a prominent standing among eugenicists worldwide, including the United States, as evidenced by his role as President of the International Federation of Eugenics Organizations, an organization that included a long list of prominent American scientists, doctors, and academics.¹¹⁷

German eugenics was also influenced by American ideas. The 1933 German law on “Preventing Hereditarily Ill Progeny” largely drew its inspiration from the work of eugenicists in the United States. The first man to attempt to influence the government to implement a sterilization law, physician Gerhard Boeters, exclaimed,

In a cultured nation of the first order – the United States of America, that we strive toward [sterilization legislation] was introduced and tested long ago. It is all so clear and simple.¹¹⁸

In 1935, a representative of the American Committee on Maternal Health visited Nazi Germany and, after discussions with members of the Nazi administration concluded that,

The leaders in the German sterilization movement state repeatedly that their legislation was formulated only after careful study of the California experiment as reported by Mr. Gosney and Dr. Popenoe [members of the Human Betterment Foundation in California]. It would have been impossible, they say, to undertake a venture involving some 1 million people without drawing heavily upon previous experience elsewhere.¹¹⁹

German eugenicists were so impressed with American sterilization laws that almost every piece of medical literature and propaganda written in Germany in support of sterilization referred to the American laws. Various American studies were also an inspiration to the Nazis and, once again, Harry Laughlin played an important role. He attracted attention in Germany when he published an article in the influential German *ARGB* with a detailed account of the American legislative efforts he had supported. Laughlin’s Model Eugenic Sterilization Law, in particular, was greatly admired by the Germans.

The Germans were so impressed with Laughlin that the dean of the faculty of medicine at the University of Heidelberg, Carl Schneider, who later served as a scientific adviser for the extermination of handicapped people in Nazi Germany, officially offered him an honorary degree as doctor of medicine in 1936. The University of Heidelberg, which had become the center for the discussion of racial problems in Germany, offered an honorary doctorate at the same time to Foster Kennedy, an American psychiatrist who advocated the killing of mentally handicapped persons.¹²⁰ The 1933 German sterilization law drew its inspiration directly from Laughlin’s law and it was said that Hitler himself expressed admiration for Laughlin’s work. Otto Wagnere, head of the Nazi Party’s Economic Policy Office from 1931 to 1933, claimed that Hitler said about the Americans:

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 94.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, 20.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, 23.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, 43.

¹²⁰ Drogin, 26.

Now that we know the laws of heredity, it is possible to a large extent to prevent unhealthy and severely handicapped beings from coming into the world. I have studied with great interest the laws of several American states concerning prevention of reproduction by people whose progeny would, in all probability, be of no value or be injurious to the racial stock. I'm sure that occasionally mistakes occur as a result. But the possibility of excess and error is still no proof of the incorrectness of these laws.¹²¹

Where the American eugenicists only succeeded in implementing sterilization on a smaller lever, Hitler quickly implemented a program to sterilize 400,000 Germans.

The Nazis were also inspired by Laughlin's successes with immigration restriction. The United States Immigration Restriction Act of 1924 was lauded by Nazi eugenicists, and Hitler, in his *Mein Kampf*, was also full of praise for the Act's exclusion of undesirables.

Hitler and his eugenicists drew much inspiration from and co-operated with many other leading American eugenicists. In 1934, one of Hitler's own staff members contacted Leon Whitney of the American Eugenics Society asking in the name of the Führer for a copy of Whitney's recently published book, *The Case for Sterilization*. Whitney sent the book and soon after received a personal letter of thanks from Adolf Hitler. Whitney also reported that fanatically racist Madison Grant also received a personal letter of thanks from Hitler for a copy of his book, *The Passing of the Great Race*. Whitney also reported that Hitler proclaimed that "the book was his bible, and concluded that, one could believe it" from Hitler's actions.¹²² The famous paleontologist Henry Fairfield Osborn, founder of the American Eugenics Society, also received an honorary doctorate of science from a German University.

Other American eugenicists visited Germany to view the results of German eugenics policies. The prestige of Lothrop Stoddard, who had written *The Rising Tide of Color Against White-World-Supremacy* and whose writings were featured in Nazi school textbooks, enabled him to meet with top Nazi officials and eugenicists. Stoddard met with Heinrich Himmler, chief of the S.S. and also had a personal meeting with Adolf Hitler. Stoddard, impressed with the comprehensive character of the Nazi race policy, expressed his support with how the Nazis were "weeding out the worst strains in the Germanic stock in a scientific and truly humanitarian way."¹²³ Stoddard also proclaimed that the "Jews problem" is "already settled in principle and soon to be settled in fact by the physical elimination of the Jews themselves from the Third Reich."¹²⁴

Charles M. Goethe, millionaire banker and president of the American Eugenics Research Association in the 1930s, studied the progress of eugenics in Germany. His studies led him to write to Eugene S. Gosney, president of the Human Betterment Foundation in California, about how the United States and Gosney had added to eugenic developments in Germany.

You will be interested to know that your work has played a powerful part in shaping the opinions of the group of intellectuals who are behind Hitler in this epoch-making program. Everywhere I sensed that their opinions have been tremendously stimulated by American thought, and particularly by the work of the Human Betterment Foundations. I want you, my

¹²¹ Kuhl, 37.

¹²² Kuhl, 85.

¹²³ Ibid, 62.

¹²⁴ Ibid, 62.

dear friend, to carry this thought with you for the rest of your life, that you have really jolted into action a great government of 60,000,000 people.¹²⁵

The positive impressions and information which Stoddard, Goethe, and other American eugenicists brought home from their visits to Germany influenced the scientific community and helped shape a positive image of German race policy within the United States. They fought the negative reports brought by the Jewish people and the more conservative scientists who had been driven from Germany by the Nazi's.¹²⁶

Many further associations and collaborations between America and German eugenicists are documented in Kuhl's book, but the sum of it was that the American eugenics movement had both provided inspiration for and strongly supported the devastating work of the German eugenicists. Eugenicists in America and all over the world saw the Nazi policies, which included sterilization, marriage restriction, and exclusion of the "inferior" from government subsidies, as the direct realization of their own goals. Stefan Kuhl explains that "eugenicists recognized that Hitler's steps toward improving the 'German race' represented both the implementation of their practical proposals and, more importantly, the adoption of their basic ideology."¹²⁷

Hitler's Germany was the result of eugenics thinking on a grand scale – for the first time eugenics ideas became the foundation for the organization of a whole state. In 1934 Leon F. Whitney, secretary of the American Eugenics Society exclaimed in admiration that, "Many far sighted men and women in both England and America, have long been working earnestly toward something very like what Hitler has now made compulsory."¹²⁸ Nazi atrocities, revealed by World War II, however, showed the ugly truth of eugenics to the rest of the world, and temporarily hindered the work of the eugenics movement.

The damage to society, the legislatures and the courts, had already been done, however, and the foundations for the massive population control programs in the second half of the twentieth century were laid. The basic doctrines of Malthus' "scientific racism" had been accepted practically across the board by the wealthy, educated, and scientific elite, largely in the radical form called eugenics. Under the influence of the elite, scientific racism had spread through all levels of society and had even been enshrined in American laws on both the state and local levels. A dangerous precedent had also been established by which the wealthy of America used their vast wealth and influence to support the implementation of eugenic principles and to force them on the "unfit." Indeed, the eugenics movement was far from dead after World War II; it was only gathering strength for a more decisive victory. It would return in a more insidious form, and it was Margaret Sanger who would supply it with the tools it needed.

¹²⁵ Paul Popenoe reprinted this letter in the annual report of the human Betterment Foundation for 1935, quoted in Kuhl, 58.

¹²⁶ Kuhl, 63.

¹²⁷ Ibid, 36.

¹²⁸ Whiteyn, quoted in Kuhl, 36.

Chapter Three

The Population Firm

Margaret Sanger and the New Eugenics

The eugenics movement of the early twentieth century had been very successful in implementing many of its policies by influencing the American elite. Perhaps its greatest and most important victory was winning Margaret Sanger to its cause and providing her with the tools and favorable environment in which her initiatives were able to prosper. Sanger, the infamous founder of Planned Parenthood, would serve as one of the key leaders of an elite group of new “scientific” racists, referred to by Stephen Mosher of the Population Research Institute as the “Population Firm.” This group was dedicated to forcing Malthus’ principles on the world through a well-coordinated population control program. The group’s tools would be Sanger’s favorites - birth control, abortion, and sterilization.

Born in 1879, Sanger’s first exposure to Malthus came from her radical freethinking father who had an interest in the eugenics movement’s favorite bogus “science” of phrenology. She next encountered Malthus in the person of Emma Goldman, a famous and militant utopian with connections to Malthusians in France. Goldman’s main contribution to Margaret’s life, however, was to convert her to the principles of the sexual revolution. Sanger became devoted to the sexual revolution and began to search for means to liberate women from what she considered sexual bondage. This search led to her initial interest in birth control. She soon decided that birth control was an essential component of sexual liberation for women and began to champion the birth control cause.¹²⁹

Sanger’s support of sexual liberation and birth control, which was illegal in most countries and had little popular support, quickly got her in trouble. She was forced to flee to England in 1914 when her explicit depictions of birth control techniques in her own newspaper led to indecency charges. It was there that the influential sexologist, Havelock Ellis, properly introduced her to the Malthusianism and eugenics to which he was devoted.

With Ellis’ introduction, she met many prominent eugenics supporters, such as H.G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw, and quickly embraced Malthusianism. The various offshoots of Malthusianism, all of which she was willing to adapt to her cause, presented the “scientific” grounds upon which to justify her radical sexual liberation views and to argue for birth control. Eugenics, in particular, captured her imagination and changed her view of the human race.

Her mission to spread these ideas was to be incredibly successful because of her complete confidence and determination that they must be shared by the rest of the world at all costs. She was willing to use whatever methods were needed to bring the hopes and

¹²⁹ George Grant, *Killer Angel* (New York: The Reformer Library, 1995), 23-37.

dreams of the eugenics movement to full fruition. Birth control or contraception, voluntary or involuntary, inherited from her sexual liberation interests, was her new favored method, but she also came to favour their close correlatives, abortion and sterilization.¹³⁰

Motivated by her combined principles of sexual freedom, a feminism developed from Freiderich Engels' ideas of the "emancipation" of women from the family, and Malthusianism, she soon founded a magazine called *The Birth Control Review* in 1917. It rapidly gained influence among the intelligentsia and hosted the articles of her prominent eugenicist and utopian friends, including H. G. Wells, Pearl Buck, Julian Huxley and Havelock Ellis.¹³¹ She continued to expand her association with the mainstream eugenics movement as she sought to convince them that birth control was the perfect eugenics tool.

Many prominent eugenicists, such as Ernst Rüdin, close friend and advisor to Sanger and director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychiatry in Munich (see Chapter 2), filled the pages of her various publications with their radical racist ideology. She worked closely with almost every leading eugenicist of her time, including Harry Laughlin and Lothrop Stoddard, writer of the fascist book *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy*. Her close ties with these men, especially some Nazi eugenicists, indicated that she, like much of the mainstream eugenics movement, was supportive of the German eugenics programs – a fact that she and her publicists would later deny.

Sanger's own words in the *Birth Control Review* are the best indication of her commitment to the "scientific" racism of Malthus, Spencer, and Galton. Most notable was her 'Plan for Peace' in which she advocated the creation of a Population Congress to study and act upon "population problems." As part of her solution to these "problems" she advocated a plan for segregating those considered unfit that involved the establishment of institutions resembling re-education or concentration camps. She explained her plan saying,

The first step would thus be to control the intake and output of morons, mental defectives, epileptics.

The second step would be to take an inventory of the secondary group such as the illiterates, paupers, unemployables, criminals, prostitutes, dope fiends; classify them in special departments under government medical protection, and segregate them on farms and open spaces as long as necessary for the strengthening of moral conduct.

With the future citizen safeguarded from hereditary taints, with five million mental and moral degenerates segregated, with ten million women and ten million children receiving adequate care, [likely forced sterilization or at least enforced use of birth control] we could then turn our attention to the basic needs for international peace.¹³²

¹³⁰ Ibid, 69-73

¹³¹ Ibid, 39-65.

¹³² Margaret Sanger, *Plan for Peace*, *Birth Control Review*, Volume XVI, Number 4 (April 1932), 107-108. Cited on Birth Control Review Quotes from 1932 [internet]; can be found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_1932.html

Early Publicity for the Culture of Death

Sanger's most revealing statements appear in her book, *The Pivot of Civilization*. Written in 1922, it was filled with evidence of her "scientific" racist sentiments. The book presents birth control, sterilization and abortion as Sanger's methods for changing the world and solving its social problems. She devotes endless pages to heart-wrenching descriptions of human misery among the poor and lower classes and claims that these miseries are really caused by "irresponsible and chance parenthood."¹³³

The problem, she explains, is that the government has stood by and allowed the lower classes to breed with abandon and has even gone so far as to aid them in this task. She suggests an active and harshly enforced governmental system of negative eugenics to repair this problem. Echoing Malthus, she strikes out against "the cruelty of charity" which she claims threatens to hasten the deterioration of the human race and put a great, wasteful strain on humanity's resources.¹³⁴ She rejects charity and benevolence saying:

The most serious charge that can be brought against modern benevolence is that it encourages the perpetuation of defectives, delinquents and dependents. These are the most dangerous elements in the world community, the most devastating curse on human progress and expression. Philanthropy is a gesture characteristic of modern business lavishing upon the unfit the profits extorted from the community at large. Looked at impartially, this compensatory generosity is in its final effect probably more dangerous, more dysgenic, more blighting than the initial practice of profiteering.¹³⁵

Sanger was repulsed by the poor working "race," which she thought had been created by the Industrial Revolution. She saw them as even worse than what she considered the sub-human Negro.

Sanger made no secret of her eugenic plans and of the methodology by which she intended to accomplish her eugenics goals. She made it clear in a 1930's article entitled "*A Code to Stop Overproduction of Children.*" In it she described eight articles by which she hoped to purify the human race. These included:

Article 3. A marriage license shall in itself give husband and wife only the right to a common household and not the right to parenthood.

Article 4. No women shall have the legal right to bear a child, no man shall have the right to become a father, without a *permit* for parenthood.

Article 5. Permits for Parenthood shall be issued to married couples upon application, providing the parents are financially able to support the expected child, have the qualifications needed for proper rearing of the child [which qualifications, presumably, would be decided by eugenicists' criteria, as happened later in Germany].

Article 8. Feeble-minded persons, habitual congenital criminals, those afflicted with inheritable diseases, and others found biologically unfit [i.e., Jews] should be sterilized in

¹³³ Elasa Drogin, *Margaret Sanger: Father of Modern Society* (New Hope, Kentucky: Cul Publications, 1979), 48.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 48-49.

¹³⁵ Grant, 66.

cases of doubt and should be isolated [i.e. concentration camps] so as to prevent the perpetuation of their afflictions by breeding.¹³⁶

In essence, Margaret Sanger was the culmination of a long- line of “scientific” racism leading back to Malthus. George Grant synthesized her ideals saying of Sanger,

She was thoroughly convinced that “the inferior races” were in fact “human weeds” and a “menace to civilization.” She really believed that “social regeneration” would only be possible as “the sinister forces of the hordes of irresponsibility and imbecility” were repulsed. She had come to regard organized charity to ethnic minorities and the poor as a “symptom of a malignant social disease” because it encouraged the profligacy of those “defectives, delinquents, and dependents she so obviously abhorred.

She yearned for the end of the Christian “reign of benevolence” that the Eugenic Socialists promised, when the “choking human undergrowth” of “morons and imbeciles” would be “segregated” and ultimately “sterilized.” Her greatest aspiration was “to create a race of thoroughbreds” by encouraging “more children from the fit, and less from the unfit.” And the only way to achieve that dystopic goal, she realized was through the harsh and coercive tyranny of Malthusian Eugenics.¹³⁷

Sanger’s Eugenics in Action - The Birth of Planned Parenthood

Brilliant, ruthless, and tireless, Sanger pushed her cause with the zeal of a religious crusader. She founded organizations, started birth control clinics in underprivileged areas, and drew on the resources and work of the eugenicists before her. She rallied all supporters of women’s liberation and birth control under her leadership in the American Birth Control League, founded in 1914. She won over most of the eugenics movement to her side and strengthened her ties with eugenicists by hosting the First American Birth Control Conference in 1921, in New York.

At her 1925 International neo-Malthusian and birth control conference, also in New York, she secured the complete support of the Eugenics movement for the birth-control movement and created a strong alliance between the two. There she engineered a loose federation of “race hygiene societies,” “birth control leagues,” “family planning associations,” and “social eugenics committees,” to make a more united and concerted eugenics effort. This federation laid the foundations for what would become International Planned Parenthood.¹³⁸

In 1931, she also founded the Population Association of America with Henry Pratt Fairchild, formerly the secretary-treasurer of the American Eugenics Society, at its head. Fairchild, a leading racist and anti-Semite, wrote *The Melting Pot Mistake*, a book that severely denigrated Jews.¹³⁹ Sanger was quickly becoming the primary leader of a new eugenics movement, one built on the foundations of the old, but one that was much better organized and had a broader vision.

¹³⁶ Margaret Sanger, *A Code to Stop Overproduction of Children*. Cited in Drogin, 70-71. (Square brackets added).

¹³⁷ Ibid, 70.

¹³⁸ Grant, 79-81

¹³⁹ Drogin, 77.

Following a trend set by her predecessors, Sanger went after the rich disciples of Malthus for help. As always, she took the efforts of her eugenic predecessors to a whole new level. She went after every grant, foundation, and philanthropic organization that existed. The money came pouring in from the likes of the Rockefellers, who funded the Birth Control League as early as 1925, the Fords, and the Mellons. By 1964 the Rockefeller and Ford foundations would give Sanger's organizations over 100 million dollars.¹⁴⁰

She immediately put their money to work establishing her first birth control clinics among the communities of the poor ethnic peoples of the supposed "dysgenic races." Her first clinic was established in a poor neighborhood in Brooklyn, New York. The Margaret Sanger Research Bureau also financed the development of the birth control pill, and Sanger financed and engineered the immigration into the United States of Germany's Dr. Ernst Graefenburg, one of the pioneers of the IUD.¹⁴¹

Planned Parenthood's current President, Gloria Feldt, seems correct in her claim when she says, "Occasionally, history connects the right leader with the right movement. Margaret Sanger, who 87 years ago opened the first family planning clinic in the United States, was such a leader."¹⁴² Sanger had created an organization well on its way to becoming the flag bearer for "scientific" racism in the second half of the twentieth century.

Sanger simply excelled at promotion, an ability shared with the likes of Davenport and Harry Laughlin, and it was this ability that accelerated Planned Parenthood into a position of prominence. Using her almost unlimited financial backing, she threw her efforts into a massive public relations campaign that became a rolling tidal wave of success engulfing the medical community, myriads of politicians, and every charity organization that had money available. She began to build up a strong base of support which would be used to pry open closed doors and build a vast political machine to topple all resistance to her birth control and abortion policies.

She was incredibly successful:

By the thirties, corporation grants and foundation bequests began to pour into her war chest. By the forties, she had won the endorsements of such notables as Eleanor Roosevelt and Katherine Hepburn. By the fifties, she had attained international renown and counted among her supporters Julian Huxley, Albert Einstein, Nehru, John D. Rockefeller, Emperor Hirohito, and Henry Ford...Before her death she received enthusiastic endorsements of former Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower.¹⁴³

Planned Parenthood especially owed a debt of gratitude to Presidents Eisenhower and Truman. During Eisenhower's presidency when Truman was the only other living ex-President, they both agreed to serve as co-chairman of an Honorary Council for Planned Parenthood of America. General William Draper expressed his delight with the situation saying, "the two of their names and their influence and their later statements, from time to time, were of tremendous help in raising the whole level of the Planned Parenthood

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, 79-81

¹⁴¹ Ibid, 11

¹⁴² Planned Parenthood Federation of America, *About Us:Gloria Feldt* [internet], can be found at: [c http://www.plannedparenthood.org/about/thisispp/president.html](http://www.plannedparenthood.org/about/thisispp/president.html)

¹⁴³ Ibid, 94

and world population movement to a much higher level.”¹⁴⁴ It is amazing that an ex-President and a current President of the United States both effectively served as officials of the radically racist, pro-eugenic Planned Parenthood.

Racial Genocide Via The “Negro Project”

One of Sanger’s more successful projects was her “Negro” project of 1939. She decided to undertake the project in response to requests from some southern public health officials. She believed that the “mass of Negroes” breeding in the south was a “dysgenic horror,” and, therefore, decided to pay off three or four “colored Ministers, preferably with social service backgrounds, and with engaging personalities,” to propagandize birth control in various areas with high concentrations of African Americans.¹⁴⁵ She explains her strategy as follows:

The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population and the Minister is the man who can straighten out the idea if it ever occurs to any of their rebellious members.¹⁴⁶

Her campaign was a concerted effort to swindle African Americans into participating in their own extermination. Unfortunately, she met with much success. Birth control clinics began springing up in black communities all over the south, beginning a process that would continue until today. The long term-result of her work was that, by the 1980’s, Planned Parenthood could take pride in the fact that three out of every four abortions in the United States were black abortions – a trend that has continued into today.

Planned Parenthood Takes on the World

When World War II exposed the horrors of eugenics, Sanger and her brilliant tacticians realized that they had to act swiftly to separate themselves from their close ties with the eugenics movement. Because of their combined efforts, the birth control movement had become almost inseparably associated with the eugenics movement. Sanger, as always, quickly adapted by setting out to give the eugenics and birth control movement a new face.

In 1942, her Birth Control League was replaced with the much softer sounding and more socially acceptable Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Sanger immediately gathered her resources and began an aggressive affiliation program to repair the damage done by the war, bringing myriads of organizations under her wing. With the support of the Brush Foundation and the Osborn Family, she soon established International Planned Parenthood in 1948.

¹⁴⁴ William H. Draper, *Oral History Interview with General William H. Draper Jr. from the Truman Presidential Library and Museum*, [internet], accessed at <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/draperw.htm>.

¹⁴⁵ Grant, 73

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, 74.

After all the pieces of that monolith called Planned Parenthood were in place, its campaign to force eugenics on the world and rid the world of inferior peoples went into overdrive. Massive resources united under the Planned Parenthood banner could now be used to create the movement that would fully usher in the deadly population control programs of the late twentieth century.¹⁴⁷

The leaders of Planned Parenthood stretched every ounce of their political influence, great wealth, and talent to bring abortion and contraception to the entire world in order to reduce the numbers of the “inferior.” They had an enormous task before them, since almost 70% of the American population fell into the undesirable sections of the population according to Margaret’s guidelines. Planned Parenthood achieved devastating results using the legal challenges, protests, civil disobedience, strong-arm tactics, and sophisticated propaganda campaigns that Sanger and her predecessors had perfected.

The results were spectacular. In 1938 Sweden became the first free nation in Christendom to permit abortion and to institutionalize Planned Parenthood sex-education and family limitation programs. Between 1949 and 1956, abortion was legalized in another eleven European nations, each at the behest of Planned Parenthood. In 1958, various United Nations agencies began to subsidize Planned Parenthood projects and programs throughout the developed world.¹⁴⁸

Sanger’s scientific racist goals, however, were too much even for Planned Parenthood to accomplish on its own. To force their policies on the world Planned Parenthood’s leaders needed some powerful allies, and the Malthusian forces would provide them with the help they needed.

John D. Rockefeller and Hugh Moore

One of the most necessary allies needed by Planned Parenthood and the eugenics movement was the United States government. Once again, the main effort would come from the elite, in this case two very wealthy men and their allies. The first of these men was John D. Rockefeller III, great grandson of the famous oil tycoon, and one of the richest men in the world.

Rockefeller followed in the footsteps of his great grandfather, becoming a strong believer in the ideals of Malthus. His journeys in Africa and Asia convinced him that population growth had to be stopped. Steve Mosher explains that after his journeys Rockefeller “came away convinced that Western efforts to check what he saw as runaway population growth must take precedence over economic development.”¹⁴⁹ Unable to completely convince his fellow Rockefeller Foundation trustees to sign on to his new radical venture, he began to use his own fortune to satisfy his population control fervor. He first funded the creation of the new Population Council in 1952. It was set up with the help of Fredrick Osborn, the well-known eugenicist who sat on Margaret Sanger’s Advisory

¹⁴⁷ Drogin, 80

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, 86

¹⁴⁹ Steven Mosher. “The Malthusian Delusion and the Origins of Population Control,” *Population Research Institute Review* 13, no. 1 (January-February 2003), 5.

Council, and whose family had helped Sanger create the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

The Population Council soon joined Planned Parenthood's population control clique and began working towards the same goals. With Rockefeller's money it began the Malthusian task of telling the countries of the world how to control their populations. Rockefeller, who Mosher defines as the world's first real "population control technocrat," served as the first President, and later as the Chairman of the Council. Under his influence the Council built a global network of population experts and began some of the first steps towards instituting full-scale population programs all over the world. These programs helped to drastically increase the supply of contraceptives to undeveloped countries. Perhaps Rockefeller's most influential role, however, was the intense behind the scenes lobbying that he and his organization began in order to convince the U.S. government to join the population control forces.¹⁵⁰

It is unlikely, however, that even Rockefeller would have been successful in his attempt to win over the U.S. government without the efforts of another wealthy man, Hugh Moore, owner of the multi-million dollar Dixie Cup Company.¹⁵¹ Moore was converted to Malthusianism by a population scare book written by William Vogt, a national director of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America in 1955. Moore quickly became, in the words of Steve Mosher, the "showman-salesman of population control" by throwing his vast resources into convincing the American voters, the policy makers, and pretty much anyone else he could about the dangers of overpopulation. Like the other members of the population control movement, he focused many of his efforts on developing a system of advanced organizations to further his goals.

Moore organized the Population Action Committee and funded and increased the work of the Population Reference Bureau. He also took over and renamed the United State's leading sterilization society, the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, while greatly increasing its publicity and the breadth of its activity (today this organization is Birthright, Inc.). In 1961, Moore brought about a merger of Margaret Sanger's Planned Parenthood Foundation with his own well-funded World Population Emergency Campaign to form the new Planned Parenthood-World Population society. He officially proclaimed the merger at a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria, at which Margaret Sanger made her last public appearance.¹⁵²

Most effective, however, was Moore's propaganda crusade. Convinced that people needed to be shocked into realization of the dangers of population growth, Moore created great controversy with his massive 'Population Bomb' media blitz. Playing on the atomic bomb fears prevalent after World War II, he inundated politicians and influential people with his pamphlet, screaming about the dangers of the 'Population Bomb.' Moore's biographer, Lawrence Lader explains that Moore's "methods were often designed to stimulate controversy and thereby focus attention... With time running out people have to face the raw facts... A warning had to be shouted from the rooftops."¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ Ibid,5.

¹⁵¹ Ibid, 5-7.

¹⁵² Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975) 382-383.

¹⁵³ Lawrence Lader, *Breeding Ourselves to Death*, quoted in Mosher, 7.

Afraid that overpopulation threatened to destroy the world, Moore inundated the public at large with a series of advertisements until he had virtually ingrained his frightening images of mushroom clouds of people exploding on the earth into the public consciousness. Moore's campaign captured the imagination of much of the American populace, convincing them to support and co-operate with programs and ideas designed to reduce their own fertility.

Moore's propaganda also caught the attention of butterfly expert Paul Ehrlich, who would later use the title of Moore's pamphlet, *The Population Bomb*, for his influential book in 1968. Ehrlich's book did much to keep the overpopulation scare in the public eye after Moore's propaganda campaign slowed down. The first paragraph of Ehrlich's book epitomizes the message that Moore sought to convey to the public. It declares:

The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970's and 1980's hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now. At this late date nothing can prevent a substantial increase in the world death rate, although many lives could be saved through dramatic programs to "stretch" the carrying capacity of the earth...but these programs will only provide a stay of execution unless they are accompanied by determined and successful efforts at population control. Population control is the conscious regulation of the numbers of human beings to meet the needs not just of individual families, but of society as a whole.¹⁵⁴

Ehrlich's hysterical statements mirror closely Malthus' statements about the necessary checks that must act on the population when it overproduces. They also mirror Malthus' ignorance of scientific progress and available data and his grossly inaccurate predictions. None of Ehrlich's dire predictions have yet come true (see Foreword), but his book is still often cited as an authority by population controllers.

Malthusianism Becomes Official US Policy

Thus, Hugh Moore almost single-handedly created a population panic in the United States. It was on the crest of this panic that he began to put pressure on the United States government. When his friend, William H. Draper, was appointed by President Eisenhower to chair a committee to study foreign aid, Moore used his influence and his propaganda to help mold the Draper Report of 1959 into the first official U.S. government report to endorse population control in the context of foreign aid.¹⁵⁵ It is of note that this same Draper would later serve as Honorary Chairman of the Population Crisis Committee in Washington, would be on the Governing Body of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, would be an Honorary Vice-Chairman of Planned Parenthood America, and would also be appointed by President Nixon to act as the United States representative to the United Nations Population Commission.¹⁵⁶

When the United States Congress began considering a major foreign aid bill in 1961, Moore's campaign went into high gear. He began a series of advertisements to put pressure on the administration and sent Draper to Congress to lobby for his cause. Steven

¹⁵⁴ Paul Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb* (New York: A Sierra Club/Balantine Book, 1968), xi.

¹⁵⁵ Mosher, 8.

¹⁵⁶ William H. Draper, *Oral History Interview with General William H. Draper Jr. from the Truman Presidential Library and Museum*, [internet], accessed at <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/draperw.htm>.

Mosher explains that, “With Rockefeller and his colleagues also working behind the scenes to encourage federal intervention, these wealthy men were about to impose their will on the U.S. Congress. It would in turn impose its will on the world.”¹⁵⁷

Although Moore and Rockefeller were not close friends and disagreed on the methods by which to achieve their similar goals, their cause united their efforts. As a result of Moore’s and Rockefeller’s efforts, the United States Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 enshrined the doctrines of Malthusianism as official U.S. policy. The bill effectively mandated that population control was now the basic aim of foreign aid. It did so based on clever reasoning supplied by Rockefeller and Moore. They had led Congress to believe that the growing populations around the world presented a threat to the United States national security and, therefore, aid should be given only to those countries that controlled their populations. The bill stated:

Development Assistance...shall be concentrated in countries which will make the most effective use of such assistance...the President shall assess the commitment and progress of countries...by utilizing criteria, including...control of population growth.¹⁵⁸

Even more radically, the bill incorporated the use of all U.S. aid programs from education and health to rural developments as methods to be used to “build motivation for smaller families through modification of economic and social conditions supportive of the desire for large families.”¹⁵⁹ In essence, American aid was no longer about feeding the hungry and helping the sick or about promoting economic development, which aims were opposed to Malthusian goals, but rather was all about fertility reduction in the undeveloped countries.

The bill was indeed a smashing victory for the forces of Malthusianism. Moore and his allies had convinced Congress that in decreasing the births of foreign babies they were fighting Communism and other evils, but in reality they were implementing a modern version of Malthusianism. Congress had enshrined as American policy two new basic tenets of the Malthusian population controllers: that population growth is a national security issue and that foreign aid should be given chiefly to countries that control it.¹⁶⁰

These ideas in the bill quickly became official United States foreign policy and were adopted in a more striking form by President Gerald Ford in 1975. Ford accepted Henry Kissinger’s basic plan to use control of food resources to control foreign populations. The plan was set forth in Kissinger’s *National Security Study Memorandum 200*. The Memorandum stated that:

Since population growth is a major determinant of increases in food demand...the allocation of scarce PL480 [food] resources should take account of what steps a country is taking in population control as well as food production.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ Mosher, 8.

¹⁵⁸ *United States Foreign Assistance Act*, quoted in Mosher, 9.

¹⁵⁹ Mosher, 9.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 9.

¹⁶¹ “National Security Study Memorandum 200”, quoted in *NSSM 2000: blueprint for de-population* [article on-line]; available at <http://www.lifesite.net/interim/july98/20nssm.html>; Internet; accessed on 4 June 2002.

Now, those countries that did not control their population would be denied food resources by the United States as part of the move towards maintaining United States hegemony – this was a far cry from the humanitarian ideals that had first inspired foreign aid.

Rockefeller and Moore continued to assert a strong influence on U.S. foreign policy. In 1970, Rockefeller was appointed chairman of the US Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. For the first time in the history of the United States, the President and the Congress had established a Commission to examine the growth of the American population and the impact it would have, and a Malthusian had been placed at its head. In proposing this Commission in July 1969, President Nixon said: “One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man’s response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today.”¹⁶² The 1972 Report of the Commission talked extensively about “the population problem” and further ingrained as American policy a dedication to reducing the world’s population. Whether America’s response to the growth of population was a cause for despair or for pride in the year 2000 is up to the reader to decide.

USAID, The UN and The World Bank Join The Population Firm

The implementation of the new U.S. foreign policy began on a large scale with the creation of the United States Agency of International Development (USAID) in 1966 by the United States Office of Population. The directorship of USAID until 1979 was given to one of the population controllers own, Dr. Reimert Thorolf Ravenholt, a fervent Malthusian. Like Margaret Sanger he believed that birth control was the “key to public safety, freedom from hunger, and development,” and wanted to sterilize at least a quarter of the world’s population. Speaking about public health programs in Africa, he mirrored Malthus’ views by proclaiming that such programs “are enormously harmful to African societies when the deaths prevented thereby are not balanced by prevention of a roughly equal number of births.”¹⁶³

Dr. Ravenholt, an extremely intelligent man, set about his task by building on the work already done by those in the population control movement. He quickly collaborated with groups like the International Planned Parenthood Foundation and the Population Council, giving them funds to carry out his family planning programs in overseas countries with the infrastructures these organizations already had in place. Driven by an almost religious belief in Malthusianism, Dr. Ravenholt began establishing an efficient structure for purchasing, distributing and perhaps most importantly, advertising and propagandizing the use of contraceptives and abortifacients in the undeveloped countries of the world. An extraordinary number of such devices were distributed. Amazingly,

From 1968 to 1995 the Office of Population shipped more than 10.5 billion condoms, over 2 billion cycles of abortifacient birth control pills, more than 73 million abortifacient IUD’s and over 116 million vaginal foaming tablets to the “undeveloped countries of the

¹⁶² *The Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future* [internet], can be found at, http://www.population-security.org/rockefeller/001_population_growth_and_the_american_future.htm#Preface; accessed on January 16, 2004.

¹⁶³ Mosher, 10.

Third World”...[and, in doing so] spent more than \$1.5 billion to buy, test, store, ship and deliver contraceptives and abortifacients.¹⁶⁴

It is no surprise that the majority of USAID’s efforts were focused on sections of the world populated by those who Francis Galton would have included among the unfit, for the small group of wealthy educated elite who effectively defined USAID’s policies were direct descendents of the eugenics movement and firm believers in the Malthusian heritage that defined it.

The elite group which lead the population control forces needed just one more major addition to build its power base and make it the ultra-effective, loosely collaborating set of organizations that Steven Mosher refers to as the Population Firm.

The Population Firm’s last and greatest allies were the World Bank with its many billions and the powerful United Nations. The Firm’s new alliance with these organizations was the inevitable result of a series of world events. Around the same time as Margaret Sanger had been re-establishing her forces under the Planned Parenthood banner, the U.N. had been founded in 1945 with its headquarters in New York. The International Bank for Reconstruction – or the World Bank – also was established in Washington, D.C., in 1945. Thus, the two centres of the world’s political and financial power were both established with their headquarters in the United States. As the world’s richest nation and the largest contributor to the UN and a major player in the World Bank the U.S. had a strong influence over UN and World Bank policy.

The same forces at work in the United States Congress, therefore, would have a strong influence at the UN and World Bank. It came as no surprise that, when the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) was formed in 1945, one of their first steps was the formation of a Population Commission to review population issues.¹⁶⁵ In 1948, in an article titled UNESCO: Its Purpose and its Philosophy, Sir Julian Huxley, the President of the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) showed how much Malthusianism had invaded the ranks of U.N. leaders when he explained that:

Thus, even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy of controlled human breeding will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much is unthinkable may at least become thinkable.¹⁶⁶

UNESCO immediately began using its education mandate to spread Malthusianism far and wide. The wealthy nations belonging to the World Bank and the UN were well on the way to following in the foreign aid footsteps of USAID. While USAID was beginning its expansive population control programs, the administration of Lynden B. Johnson was furthering the new U.S. foreign policy with the help of Planned Parenthood

¹⁶⁴ Mosher, 12.

¹⁶⁵ Winifride Prestwich, “The Conference on World Population in Bucharest, in 1974,” *The Interim* (Aug. 1994).

¹⁶⁶ Winifride Prestwich, “You Were Asking about Cairo,” *The Interim* (August 1994), 11.

by pressuring various United Nations and other international organizations to make family planning (meaning the reduction of families) a priority.

Johnson's administration won a great victory when in 1966 the UN fully joined the Population Firm when its General Assembly passed a resolution by unanimous vote that called for special aid for governments who were willing to make efforts to decrease population. A year later, in 1967, the population control wing of the UN, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), also referred to as the United Nations Population Fund was established. The Population Firm had another powerful ally.¹⁶⁷

UNFPA was to be funded by voluntary contributions from countries that supported birth control and was to serve as a way of properly controlling and using population control funds. The UNFPA would become a massive and powerful proponent and executor of Malthusian Population control on the rest of the world. It began a trend that saw more and more UN efforts towards population control with various other agencies such as UNESCO, UNDF (UN Development Fund), and UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Education Fund) providing support services for their effort. The UN had become an extremely important wing of the Population Firm.¹⁶⁸ UNFPA takes great pride in its claim to be "the world's largest international source of funding for population and reproductive health programs." Since 1969, the Fund says it has provided nearly \$6 billion in "assistance" to developing countries. It also enthusiastically claims that, "We advocate for close attention to population problems and help to mobilize resources to solve them."¹⁶⁹

IPPF's positive treatment at the hands of the UN provides strong evidence of the UN's new leanings toward population control. In 1971 the IPPF was awarded full State Status and was recognized as an international non-governmental associate with the UN Economic and Social Council, UNICEF, and the World Health Organization. As part of its new privileged position IPPF could now sponsor projects with the financial backing of the World Bank.¹⁷⁰ IPPF had thus received the full endorsement of the UN and would continue to receive financial support from the various UN organizations that used the IPPF to further its population control activities.

One of the Firm's greatest victories came with the appointment of another Malthusian, Robert McNamara, as President of the World Bank in 1968. With Lynden Johnson's urging, the World Bank quickly followed the United States in making population control the main goal of its foreign aid. It began forcing underdeveloped nations to accept family planning (birth reduction) programs if they wished to keep their loans, and it began to provide loans for new family planning and population reduction projects. As a result, by 1976 the National Security Council was able to praise the World Bank for being "the principal international financial institution providing population programs."¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷ Prestwich, "The Conference on World Population in Bucharest," in 1974."

¹⁶⁸ Prestwich, "You Were Asking about Cairo."

¹⁶⁹ UNFPA: About the United Nations Population fund [internet]; can be found <http://www.unfpa.org/about/index.htm>; accessed on January 16, 2003.

¹⁷⁰ Prestwich, "You Were Asking About Cairo."

¹⁷¹ Steven Mosher, "McNamara's Folly: Bankrolling Family Planning," *Population Research Review* 13, no. 2. (March/April 2003), 2.

The World Bank itself recently reported that in the last twenty-five years it has spent over \$2.5 billion to support 130 reproductive health (increased access to contraception and abortion) projects in over 70 countries. Jacqueline Kasun explains, however, that “Given the conditions which the Bank imposes on its lending, the entire \$20 billion of its annual disbursements is properly regarded as part of the world population control movement.”¹⁷² The massive wealth of the developed countries of the world was now harnessed into a concerted population control effort. The Malthusian forces had won a victory that brought it well on its path towards fulfilling the goals of its original leaders such as Margaret Sanger.

The Population Firm Today

The members of the Population Firm used their growing influence to bring more organizations into the fold. Population controllers attained positions of importance in various non-governmental organizations at the UN, changing the policies of groups such as the ILO (International Labour Organization) and the WHO (World Health Organization) to support their efforts. As the Population Firm grew and continues to grow today, much of its financial support came through a small consortium of some of the most influential and wealthy men in the world. These men now put more funds towards population control than the U.S. government. The world’s newest wealthy men, many of them such as Bill Gates, Warren Buffet, and Ted Turner belonging to the exclusive billionaire’s club, have joined their wealth with the wealth of their Malthusian predecessors to support the many efforts of those in the Population Firm.

In America the top contributors to abortion and reproductive rights organizations and dedicated population control supporters who have spent millions in support of population control goals in the last few years include the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Buffet Foundation, the John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, The Mellon Foundation and the Turner Foundation.¹⁷³

Almost all of these same foundations have joined the familiar Rockefeller foundation, the Bergstrom Foundation, and many other organizations such as the World Health Organization and UNFPA in providing large amounts of financial support for International Planned Parenthood.¹⁷⁴

The support of these foundations propelled the growth and influence of other population control and abortion organizations that have long joined in Planned Parenthood’s efforts. The Population Council, for example, continues to do the work begun by its founder, John D. Rockefeller, with the help of funds from the foundations. The group’s website sings the praises of its founder and explains that, as of 2002:

¹⁷² Ibid, 3.

¹⁷³ Matt Kelley, “Reproductive Rights Gets Buffet Foundation Help,” [Internet] *Omaha World-Herald.com*; found at http://www.Omaha.com/index.php/u_np=0&u_pg=36&u_sid=804706. Accessed on July 24, 2003.

¹⁷⁴ International Planned Parenthood Federation Financial Statements 2001 [internet]; found at http://www.ippf.org/about/pdf/Financial_Statements_2001.pdf; 6,19, accessed on August 18, 2003.

The Population Council has come a long way from operating 50 years ago primarily as a funding agency with a professional staff of fewer than ten and an annual budget of less than \$1 million. In 2002, the Council has an annual budget of \$86 million, operates offices in 18 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East, in addition to the United States, and conducts research and programs in more than 70 countries.¹⁷⁵

International Planned Parenthood continues to act as a leader of the population control movement and to exert great worldwide influence. Planned Parenthood publicists have attempted to gradually downplay Sanger's eugenics ideology in an attempt to preserve, what Planned Parenthood today calls the "unassailable reputation of PFFA and the contemporary family planning movement."¹⁷⁶

For instance, Faye Wattleton, President of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) from 1978 to 1992, claimed that, "No one can really interpret what Sanger meant because she's dead."¹⁷⁷ Yet, the organization has gone to great lengths to memorialize Sanger's name with PPFA by naming its most prestigious award after Margaret Sanger, naming its last major fundraising drive in 1996 "Maggie's Millions," placing a photo album devoted to her life on its website,¹⁷⁸ and writing on its website in glowing terms about Sanger's "visionary accomplishments as a social reformer" and her "outreach to the African-American Community."¹⁷⁹

Planned Parenthood's leaders have expressed their devotion to Sanger. Alan Guttmacher, who immediately succeeded Sanger as President of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, exclaimed that "We are merely walking down the path that Mrs. Sanger carved out for us."¹⁸⁰ Margaret Sanger's grandson, Alexander C. Sanger, the current chairman of the International Planned Parenthood Council, proclaimed while in charge of Planned Parenthood of New York City in 1991, "Right now, we have three clinics in this city and I want ten more. We currently have a small storefront office in central Harlem, and it is my first priority to see if we can transform that into a clinic... With all her success, my grandmother left some unfinished business, and I intend to finish it."¹⁸¹

Faye Wattleton, President of PPFA from 1978 to 1992 proclaimed on May 2, 1979, "I believe Margaret Sanger would have been proud of us today if she had seen the directions that we have most recently in this organization taken."¹⁸² She also said that Planned Parenthood is proud to be "walking in the footsteps of Margaret Sanger."¹⁸³

¹⁷⁵ Population Council: Fiftieth Anniversary Homepage [internet]; can be found at <http://www.popcouncil.org/pc50/Panels/Historytext.html>; accessed on January 16, 2004.

¹⁷⁶ Planned Parenthood Federation of America, *About Us: Margaret Sanger* [internet], can be found at: <http://www.plannedparenthood.org/about/thisispp/sanger.html>

¹⁷⁷ Faye Wattleton, New York City Tribune, February 23, 1988, 1. Cited in Human Life International's Anti-Life quote Archive [internet]; can be found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_intro.html

¹⁷⁸ *Human Life International's Anti-Life quote Archive* [internet]; can be found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_intro.html

¹⁷⁹ Planned Parenthood Federation of America, *About Us: Margaret Sanger* [internet], can be found at: <http://www.plannedparenthood.org/about/thisispp/sanger.html>

¹⁸⁰ Alan Guttmacher, cited in Drogin, 102.

¹⁸¹ Alexander C. Sanger, cited in Human Life International's Anti-Life quote Archive [internet]; can be found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_intro.html

¹⁸² Faye Wattleton, address at luncheon in St. Louis on May2, 1979. Cited in Human Life International's Anti-Life quote Archive [internet]; can be found at http://www.hli.org/bcr_intro.html

¹⁸³ *Ibid*, 102.

Planned Parenthood has followed in Sanger's footsteps by continuing to fight for Sanger's Malthusian goals all over the world. It was instrumental in the toppling of anti-abortion laws in almost every single Western country and continues to use whatever means necessary to reduce the world population. Nearly 20 million sterilizations, for example, were performed in Planned Parenthood's field clinics in Brazil despite the illegality of the procedure.¹⁸⁴ Today, Planned Parenthood has grown into literally one of the most powerful organizations and largest abortion providers in the world. In 1995, Elasa Drogin reported of Planned Parenthood that:

It has expanded dramatically into a multi-billion-dollar international conglomerate with programs and activities in 134 nations on every continent. In the United States alone, it has mobilized more than 20,000 staff personnel and volunteers along the front lines of an increasingly confrontational and vitriolic culture war. Today they handle the organization's 167 affiliates and its 922 clinics in virtually every major metropolitan area, coast to coast.

Boasting an opulent national headquarters in New York, a sedulous legislative center in Washington, opprobrious regional command posts in Atlanta, Chicago, Miami, and San Francisco, and the officious international centers in London, Nairobi, Bangkok, and New Delhi, the Federation showed \$23.5 million in earnings during fiscal year 1992, with \$192.9 million in cash reserves and another \$108.2 million in capital assets. With an estimated combined annual budget – including all regional and international service affiliates – of more than a billion dollars, Planned Parenthood may well be the largest and most profitable non-profit organizations in history.¹⁸⁵

Planned Parenthood officials have served in high-ranking positions in many of the important organizations of the Population Firm and have developed a complex system of networking and political leverage that gives the organization extraordinary international clout. That clout has allowed it to influence almost all the nations of the world. The involvement of IPPF officials in leading positions in other powerful international organizations, as well as in most of the important population control organizations, illustrates the remarkable degree of cooperation among the various population control elite and provides a testament to their enormous influence.

For example, from April 1987 to December 2000, Dr. Nafis Sadik, a strong supporter of China's coercive population control program, served as Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Dr. Sadik was also appointed as Special Adviser to the United Nations Secretary-General in 2000, served as the Secretary General of the 1994 International Cairo Conference on Population and Development, worked with the IPPF and, among others, received the Hugh Moore Award for leadership in the field of family planning in 1994 and the Margaret Sanger Award from the Planned Parenthood Federation in 1995.¹⁸⁶

Fred Sai chaired the Preparatory Committees and the Main Committee for the same 1994 Cairo Conference. Before that he worked as a Senior Population Advisor to the World

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, 84.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, 84.

¹⁸⁶ Nafis Sadik, *From Impasse to Breakthrough* [internet] can be found at <http://www.un.org/events/women/iwd/2003/sadik.html>

Bank and served as President of the IPPF 1989-1995.¹⁸⁷ Dr. Attiya Inayatullah, who recently concluded her term as Chairman of the UNESCO Board of Governors and was inducted as a member of the National Security Council of Pakistan in November of 1999, was twice elected as Chairman of the IPPF.¹⁸⁸ James D. Wolfensohn, the current President of the powerful World Bank, served as Chairman of the Finance Committee and as Director of both the Rockefeller Foundation and the Population Council.¹⁸⁹ Ingar Brueggemann, who served as the Director-General of IPPF from 1995 to 2002, worked in a number of senior positions at the World Health Organization and represented the Director General of WHO at the United Nations from 1989 to 1993.¹⁹⁰ Daniel E. Pellegrum, the President and CEO of Pathfinder International, received the United Nations Population Award in 1996 and served on various boards of directors, including the Planned Parenthood League of Massachusetts.¹⁹¹ Finally, Dr. Gordon W. Perkin, the Director for the Reproductive and Child Health Program of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, spent 14 years working for the Ford Foundation, served as a consultant to the WHO, traveled extensively in China on behalf of the United Nations Population Fund, and served as a board member of both the PPF and the Alan Guttmacher Institute. The further list of well-connected population control advocates is extensive.¹⁹²

The close associations among and the positions of influence held by the leaders of the Population Firm are remarkable. Despite the different circumstances of their formation, the similarity of interests and the sharing of personnel among the leading organizations of the Population Firm can likely be attributed to their foundations in similar sets of ideals – ideals that were all descendants of the same Malthusianism. All these organizations exhibit a devotion to their cause based on an ideology – some form of “scientific” racism, descending from Malthus, which assumes the inferiority of vast numbers of unfortunate people.

Their devotion to the ideals of Thomas Malthus helps explain the continuing insistence by the Population Firm on the importance of population reduction in an era in which it has long been proven that a reduction of population growth is unnecessary (See Foreword and Conclusion). Motivated by their ideals the Population Firm has been willing to use coercion, misinformation and blatant lies to achieve their goals (as documented by the Population Research Institute and many other). Its members have brutally exploited the weight of the world’s most powerful countries and organizations to assert their goals regardless of the rights of others.

Their devotion to Malthus has led the Firm to spend, as of 1991 according to UN estimates, a yearly sum of \$4.5 to \$5 billion on population programs in developing countries – a figure that has grown significantly since then with the infusion of resources

¹⁸⁷ Eamonn Keane, 3.

¹⁸⁸ “Who’s Who Among South Asian Women, Attiya Inayatullah” [internet]; can be found at <http://www.umiacs.umd.edu/users/sawwwweb/sawnet/bios3.html>

¹⁸⁹ “The World Bank Group, James D. Wolfensohn” [internet]; can be found at <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/ORGANIZATION/PRESIDENTTEXT/RNAL/0,,contentMDK:20061985~menuPK:252552~pagePK:139877~piPK:199692~theSitePK:227585,00.html>

¹⁹⁰ IPPF Biography Page, Ingar Brueggemann [internet]; can be found at http://ippfnet.ippf.org/pub/IPPF_delhi2002/bio.htm#bloom

¹⁹¹ IPPF Biography Page, http://ippfnet.ippf.org/pub/IPPF_delhi2002/bio.htm#bloom

¹⁹² Ibid.

by the world's wealthy.¹⁹³ Malthus ideals have indeed wrought great mischief on the world. Allan Chase's summary, twenty-five years ago, of Malthus' effect on the world, still holds true today:

It has been the philosophy of Malthus – rather than of the creators of what is finest and most enhancing in our moral, medical, and cultural heritage – that has most influenced the values and actions of many of those among us who today are directly involved in the major societal decision dealing with everything that makes us human, or as inhuman, as we are capable of becoming as adults.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹³ Mosher, *McNamara's Folly: Bankrolling Family Planning*, 10.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 84.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that Malthusianism with its various offshoots such as eugenics is still alive and well today. Historian Allan Chase expressed sadness at the continuing influence of Malthus' ideas saying:

Malthus' harsh judgments of the poor and the middle classes as subraces of the population, and his strictures against coddling these subhumans with such spoiling mechanisms as higher wages, free education, healthier housing, the right to vote, remedies for and the prevention of ravaging diseases, are, alas, still shared in many powerful governmental quarters. They have remained the raw materials from which are presently forged the insights and the value judgments of far too many of the educated men and women who in this century have designed our governmental policies concerning public health, mass education, and all general welfare.¹⁹⁵

The elite, the wealthy and powerful of the world, continuing to be captivated with the ideas of Malthus, regardless of all evidence to the contrary, and have shown little willingness to slow their population control efforts. Rather, the last ten years have seen a redoubling of the Population Firm's efforts and have seen the Firm at its strongest, reaping the fruits of its stranglehold on the world's political and financial powers. Their efforts have met with some striking success as indicated by fertility statistics from the world's thirty most populous countries:

Twenty-three of these countries have suffered a steep (one-third or more) drop in fertility since 1965, and the average weighted drop in fertility in these countries, which account for 79 percent of the world's population, is 57 percent. The People's Republic of China (PRC), the world's most populous country, has suffered a 73 percent decline in its fertility rate since 1965, from 6.3 children per family to 1.7 children per family, largely as a result of its coercive population program. The world's second most populous nation, India, has had a 51 percent decline in its fertility from 1965 to 2001, from 6.1 children per family to 3.0 children per family.¹⁹⁶

Population control has also drastically reduced the overall world population growth rate. It has declined from 2.1 percent per year during the period 1966-1970 to a projected 1.3 percent per year during the period 2001-2005.¹⁹⁷

The enormous population control programs engineered by the Firm in the latter half of the 20th century have without doubt had a devastating effect on the world's population, but greater dangers yet loom for humanity. Recent rapid scientific advances have produced amazing new biotechnologies and have led to experimentation in human cloning, stem cell research, embryo selection, and various reproductive technologies. These new technologies have presented the Population Firm with far more effective and far less obvious methods for fulfilling their eugenic goals.

¹⁹⁵ Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus*, (New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 1977), 83.

¹⁹⁶ Brian Clowes, *The Facts of Life* (Front Royal, Virginia: Human Life International, 2001), 305-309.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 309.

Methods such as embryo selection provide the ultimate form of negative eugenics and processes like cloning provide the ultimate method of race improvement and purification. No longer do the disabled, mentally handicapped, or those with diseases or physical weaknesses have to be sterilized or shut up in institutions – instead they can now be eliminated in the earliest stages of their lives, when they are unprotected embryos. Embryo selection is routinely practiced in IVF clinics around the world and it is no surprise that the same foundations and organizations that funded the eugenics research in the early half of the twentieth century have funded the research into and advocated the use of embryo selection and the application of many other biotechnologies.

The forces of Malthus have always been willing to use and abuse science to further their goals. While the world was looking the other way, the use of the new biotechnologies for eugenics has become a powerful tool in the hands of an advanced generation of “scientific” racists.

Yet, there is hope that the Malthusian tidal wave can be stopped and has in fact reached its peak. The success of the Population Firm may soon be its own downfall. The Population Bomb scare is quickly being replaced by a Population Implosion scare. Many countries, including most of the Western world, which embraced birth control and abortion are now experiencing fertility rates which are far below replacement levels. For the first time in history, in many of these countries more people are dying each year than are being born – Europe has begun to experience a negative birthrate!

European populations are literally beginning to die off and their governments, previously supportive of the population control movement, are suddenly encountering a host of new social problems, such as disproportionate levels of the elderly and labour shortages. Developed countries are beginning to realize that the Population Firm has swindled them out of their greatest resource: people.

In a surprising turn of events the efforts of the Firm may have completely have backfired – their propaganda has led many of the populations that eugenicists would consider part of the ‘superior’ class of humanity on the road towards extermination through minimal fertility rates. At the same time, although the Firm’s efforts have reduced fertility among the minority and poor populations who were the primary target of their efforts, these populations, especially in the countries of the Third World, continue to resist the full implementation of the Firm’s population programs. Thus, because the birthrate of the developed nations has decreased so rapidly while that of the undeveloped nations has decreased by less, the poor ethnic populations of the world now seem more likely to outgrow those in the wealthier developed nations than when the eugenics movement began its efforts at the beginning of the 20th century.

While the implosion of the developed nation populations is occurring, it is becoming more difficult for the Population Firm to refute the ever-increasing amount of evidence proving them wrong. The lack of food shortages and population problems that they promised have not happened (see Introduction).

The evidence has begun to produce results. The United States took a major step towards reducing spending on coercive population control and abortion overseas when Congress first set limits on population control activities in 1998. The current administration in the

United States has strongly resisted spending on coercive population control programs and its efforts have had a major impact at the UN.

The developing nations themselves are beginning to strongly resist foreign interference in their affairs and are beginning to see through the predatory policies of the Population Firm. Various religious and political organizations today are also speaking out against population control. It is unlikely that the Population Firm will give up the “scientific” racism that is its rallying call, but there is great hope that the tide can be turned against it.

It is up to each and every individual to do what they can to make sure that in this new century man’s common sense and respect for human life will prevail over the ignorance of the “scientific racists” to finally lay Malthus to rest.