There is good reason to question the notion of a "new eugenics" as presented by Mark Haller and Kenneth Ludmerer. The idea that the old eugenics "collapsed" and a new leadership had "rebuilt" American eugenics is too simplistic and far too extreme. I have traced the development of particular policies with regard to immigration and sterilization within the American Eugenics Society from its earliest days to 1940. Focusing on those two important issues I have shown that there was a good deal more continuity in policy between 1921 and 1940 than is usually supposed in the literature. I have also looked at the society's leadership from 1923 to 1935. It is quite clear that at least up to 1935 there was very little change in the ideology, philosophy, and leadership of the society.

The idea of a "new" eugenics appearing between 1930 and 1940 was not created by Haller and Ludmerer. In the late thirties the AES leadership began to articulate an ideology which they themselves described as new. As we shall see, however, the essentials of the "new" eugenics had clear
roots in the older philosophy and the differences have not yet been clearly articulated.¹

The notion of a "new" eugenics is not entirely without merit. Important changes occurred between 1930 and 1940. In 1934 Charles Davenport retired as Director of the Carnegie Institution's Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor.² Institutional changes as well took place within the AES beginning in the early thirties with the resignations of Davenport, Howe, Campbell, and others. In 1935 major changes in the institutional structure of the Society were inaugurated with the elimination of the advisory council and the reframing of the constitutional structure of the society. At the end of 1938 control of the Eugenical News was transferred from the ERO to the AES.³ By

¹ What has been referred to in the literature as the "new eugenics" was not articulated until the late 1930s. A self-conscious expression of this newer philosophy of eugenics is not found in the AES papers or its publications until after 1935.


³ Minutes, 2/9/39. In February 1939 the Board of the American Eugenics Society met to consider policy regarding the Eugenical News. It was agreed "that a severe editorial policy be adopted in publishing Eugenical News and that definite methods of editorial control be adopted." All future material submitted to the Eugenical News was to be subject to review by at least one of the directors of the society, the editorial committee and an outside authority. Scientific material would be stressed, all book reviews would be signed, biographical statements on the contributors be included, and as soon as possible, the society would begin paying for solicited materials.
the end of 1939 Harry Laughlin was retired by the Carnegie Institution from the Eugenics Record Office which was subsequently closed down.4

Thus, by 1939 Frederick Osborn's position of leadership within the East Coast eugenics establishment had been consolidated and the center of eugenics activity had clearly transferred from the ERD at Cold Spring Harbor to the AES in New York. Osborn served as one of the Directors of the Society, generally presided at the meetings, and either wrote or supervised the composition of the society's most important platform statements. His 1940 monograph, A Preface to Eugenics, was considered the most important statement on eugenics of the period and still stands as the foundation of the "new" eugenics.

Between 1937 and 1939, the AES was intensely active. Membership nearly doubled during these years and finances were stable.5 The AES organized eight conferences on eugenics in relationship to recreation, nursing, education, medicine, publicity, birth control, housing, and the church. AES leaders also participated in fourteen other conferences in which eugenics was included as part of the program.6

4 In January 1940 Laughlin returned to Kirksville, Missouri.

5 Membership was approaching five hundred by 1939. The gross income for 1937-38 was $7,156. The Society maintained two employees.

6 Minutes 14th Annual Meeting (16 May 1940) p. 2. Recreation held January 37; Nursing, February 1937;
Thus, the Society was assiduously engaged in defining its goals in relation to other social issues. A close examination of presentations given by the leadership of the AES during this period will illuminate the essentials of the so-called "new" eugenics.7

"We are at a major turning point in human biology," Frederick Osborn told his colleagues at the New York Academy of Medicine in April 1939. Speaking at a lecture in honor of Herman Biggs, Osborn told his audience that "European peoples appear headed for a serious decline." Between 1650 and 1930 Europeans achieved a "seven-fold increase" from one hundred million to seven hundred million at a time when the world population increased only four-fold. However, Osborn explained, for the past one hundred years the trend in the west had been towards a decrease in the number of births per married woman. This trend was most marked in Europe. By 1935 England had a net rate of reproduction which was 24 percent short of replacement; Germany, France, and Sweden had similar rates.8 By 1932, "for the first time in our history, the women of childbearing age in the United States

---

7 The material that follows has been taken either from AES pamphlets of the period or from statements by representatives of the Society at AES or other conferences.

8 Frederick Osborn, "The Significance to Medicine of Present Population Trends," Address before the New York Academy of Medicine, 6 April 1939. p. 5.
were failing to replace their own numbers in the next generation. The problem was even more serious than the gross numbers indicated. While the western world as a whole was losing ground to non-European populations, reproduction within the U.S. and Europe was from the worst stocks.

More than one-third of the births annually in the U.S. were occurring in families on relief, or with total incomes of less than $750 per year. Over half of the natural increase was contributed by that third of the population living in the poorest rural areas. In 1930, cities with populations of 25,000 or more inhabitants had an average fertility only 85 per cent of the amount required for replacement. Within each city fertility was highest among the poor, uneducated, and unskilled. "The Nation's new born citizens are somewhat fewer than the number required to maintain a stationary population," said Frank Notestein, a Princeton University demographer, at the AES Conference on Birth Control, "and they are being recruited heavily from


... the most impoverished rural areas of the South and West.\textsuperscript{11}

Warren Thompson, Director of Scripps Foundation and a member of the AES Board, summed up the problem at the AES Conference on Eugenics in Relation to Housing:

The inverse relation between economic and social status and size of family has been found in practically all studies on this point in the United States of which this writer has knowledge. Unskilled laborers have larger families than skilled workers, and skilled workers have more children than professional and business men... Since there is good reason to believe that a large part of those who are on the borderline between hereditary normality and abnormality, as well as most of the hereditarily defective, are to be found in the lower income classes... it seems fair to assume that the groups whose reproduction is of least benefit to the community have larger families on the average than those who are of sound stock....\textsuperscript{12}

Thompson pointed to Swedish studies which indicated that people adjust the size of their families to the size of available housing. He noted therefore, that public housing can have either a eugenic or dysgenic effect on the population. If, for example, we wish to encourage the professional classes to have larger families the society must insure that adequate housing is available within the


\textsuperscript{12} Warren Thompson, "Housing and Population" Paper presented at the AES Conference on the Eugenic Aspects of Housing. Town Hall Club, 1 April 1938. AES Papers.
range of the professional classes. Thompson also concluded that housing policy might help reduce the birth rate among certain groups by maintaining high rents. Thompson hinted at a housing policy which would subsidize the middle class and maintain housing pressures on the unemployed and lower working class.13

The perceived dysgenic trend presented a clear challenge which the Eugenics Society felt had to be addressed on a number of fronts. Birth control, of course, was desperately needed in the rural South and generally in the lower class neighborhoods so that "genetically inferior persons" would be able to "limit their own fertility."14 Furthermore, sterilization was "especially important" in connection with groups such as the Jukes, Kallikaks, and

13 Ibid. Thompson was quite circumspect in his advocacy of this tactic! "I am not saying that it may not be a good thing, under certain circumstances, to seek to reduce the birth rate below maintenance level and that high rents may not be a perfectly proper agency to use to depress the birth rate, but I do maintain that we should know what we are doing and that we should not inadvertently allow a housing program to set up a train of consequences as regards population growth of which we are unaware." After untangling all the negatives and placing the quotation in context, it is clear that Thompson, who was specifically addressing administrators of federal housing projects for the poor, was saying that public housing should not be used to encourage large families among the poor, whom he specifically associates with "hereditary defectives." Rather, public housing ought to be used to encourage large families among the professional classes.

Nams. These "scattered groups of defective families in rural areas present a special and difficult problem."\textsuperscript{15}

There were marked differences in approach to sterilization in this period. Society literature in the 1920s assumed that feeblemindedness, epilepsy, mental illness, and criminal tendencies were genetic in origin. Eugenic sterilization was seen as a direct method of reducing these genetic disabilities. By 1935 this position was no longer tenable. Advances in the mechanisms of heredity made by T.H. Morgan at Columbia, H.S. Jennings at Johns Hopkins, and others were discrediting the simplistic notions of human heredity propagated by Davenport.

The Society leadership now freely admitted that if these problems did have a genetic element it was probably recessive, and sterilization could not eliminate recessive hereditary defects from a population within any reasonable period of time. Nevertheless, the leadership of the Society still insisted that sterilization could "substantially reduce the proportion of defectives from generation to generation."\textsuperscript{16} This reduction would not come about as a result of the decrease of defective genomes; it would result

\textsuperscript{15} "Practical Eugenics: Aims and Methods of the American Eugenics Society" (New York 1938) p. 19. AES Pamphlet, AES Papers.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 13. In other words, the "new" approach was to freely admit that there was little certainty with regard to the genetic transmission of human character traits. Sterilization was defended despite these uncertainties.
from a decrease of families incapable of providing an environment suitable for the nurture of normal children. Osborn noted in 1933 that "the relation between genetics and eugenics" had been "over-stressed". Eugenic sterilization could be justified without recourse to genetics.

The AES recommended that sterilization be applied even in cases where "there is no certainty that the traits of the parents will be passed on to their children through heredity." Sterilization was recommended on social rather than specifically eugenic grounds since "mentally deficient or defective parents cannot provide a home environment suitable for rearing children." The emphasis was placed on the humanitarian character of sterilization. Individuals were "afflicted" with hereditary disorders and sterilization was a medical treatment which people "deserved." Thus, it was stressed that sterilization ought to be "available" to "afflicted" groups just as medical care generally ought to be available to all citizens in need of such care. It should be voluntary as much as possible and should not be imposed on those who oppose it from a religious or ethical standpoint.

provided the friends or co-religionists of such people furnish the means of effective segregation at their own expense...19

Nevertheless, among those afflicted with defects some were a "menace to society." This group could not be trusted to refrain voluntarily from having children. For them, sterilization was preferable to segregation since most of those sterilized could still lead "normal, useful, self-supporting" lives.

While, the Society praised laws in Nebraska and South Dakota which provided for the registration of the feebleminded and prohibited the issuance of a marriage license "to any defective" except on proof of previous sterilization.20 The emphasis in these years was on the legalization of "voluntary sterilization" which was "a natural consequence of the fact that sterilization is not a punishment but a protection." Handicapped people "eagerly sought" sterilization, and most of those in need of sterilization "could not or should not be committed to State institutions for the feebleminded." Restriction of legal sterilization to such institutions deprives a class of citizens of appropriate health care. "Every State should adopt the necessary legislation, authorizing hospitals supported by taxpayers to accept patients who request to be sterilized." Widespread legalized voluntary sterilization

20 Ibid.
is a "highly valuable protection for people who for any reason ought not to have children."21

Throughout the literature of this period one finds sterilization described as a right which should not be denied to those at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder simply because they could not afford it. With proper education and incentive the dysgenic elements of the population would flock to sterilization centers. Thus, what distinguished the old eugenics from the new with regard to sterilization was not so much orientation as emphasis. In the twenties the Society was pushing for the initial passage of eugenic sterilization laws. By the thirties many states already had such laws although few sterilizations were actually being performed. By the late thirties the society still supported eugenic sterilization but also began to stress the benefits of sterilization for the individual sterilized rather than the necessity of sterilization for the society at large. The only thing really new in this position was the emphasis on voluntary sterilization. Studies in the early twenties touted the benefits of sterilization as a cure for masturbation and prostitution.22

In the twenties, the benefits were mentioned as an

21 Ibid., p. 15.

22 See, for example, the work of Harry Sharp and Hoyt Pilcher. They claimed that sterilization was of great benefit to the individual. For a review of this literature see Phillip Reilly, "Involuntary Sterilization of Institutionalized Persons in the United States: 1899-1942," M.D., Thesis (Yale 1981).
afterthought. In the thirties, they were given a more prominent position in sterilization advocacy.

It is quite extraordinary that throughout the eugenic literature of the twenties and thirties, one finds almost no recognition that sterilization might be perceived by those sterilized as a violation and a punishment. In fact, until Carrie Buck was interviewed by Gary Robertson, a reporter for the Richmond Times-Dispatch, in February 1980, no one had ever asked the question, "what ever became of the victims of involuntary sterilization?" Carey Buck told Robertson of her life-long desire to have have children. At the age of 76 she still suffered from the injustice done to her. Regarding the sterilization she said, "they done me wrong. They done us all wrong." Another victim described the dissolution of his marriage. His wife "could never accept the fact we couldn’t have children."

After 13 years, I’d lost everything I’d worked for. She could just never bring herself to talk to me about her feelings. It was terrible. ... they took alot of my life away from me. Having children is supposed to be a part of the Human race. Sometimes I feel there’s a part of me that I’m missing.23

It is quite telling about the ethics, not only of the eugenics movement, but more generally of the academic

establishment, that so little thought has been given to the perspective of the victims of eugenic sterilization.

Osborn believed that Americans would shortly awaken to the reality of population decline. The new eugenics was devised to deal with this "new" reality. In the 1920s there was really no solid evidence of overall population decline in the west. The sophisticated demographic analysis did not come until the early thirties. Nevertheless, as is clear from the pronouncements at the Second International Congress of Eugenics, the leaders of the twenties held very pessimistic views about the future of western civilization. Statements were specifically made with regard to the eventual extinction of the Mayflower stock and the "rising tide of color." The difference between the statements of the twenties and those of the thirties and forties is not in substance. It is rather in tone, language, and emphasis.

Osborn was confident that Americans would awaken to the problem of population decline just as the Europeans had. In fact, in France, Germany, England, and Scandinavia population decline was a major issue and governments all over Europe were taking steps to increase their birth rates in the thirties. Osborn was particularly fearful that Americans might simply demand "large families indiscriminately in order to stem the decline in population."
Before this stage is reached public opinion must be educated to demand that the large families be born to couples with a desirable biological inheritance.24

This then was the basic outline of the eugenics situation in the latter half of the 1930s. The perception of an "unparalleled" situation in which the European peoples were in decline, combined with a dysgenic trend in birth ratios, was hardly different from the gloomy fears of Henry Fairfield Osborn and George Vacher de LaPouge nearly two decades earlier. While references to "race suicide" and the "complete destruction of the white race" no longer appeared, the basic elements were substantially the same. The tone of the forties, however, was much more subdued. There was little in the way of hyperbolic pronouncements. Underlying the eugenics of the forties was a faith that, despite gloomy appearances, western civilization would muddle through. In this respect, eugenics of the forties was somewhat more sober than the eugenics of the earlier period. Osborn realized by 1940 that eugenics was not going to sweep the world as a new religion and save civilization. Eugenics might have an influence on housing, medical education, and population policies, but it was not going to play the kind of central role that his uncle Henry Fairfield Osborn had hoped it would.

24 "Practical Eugenics" p. 6.
As early as 1935 and certainly by 1940, Osborn and other leaders of the eugenics movement in America had faced enough defeats and frustrations to realize that eugenics faced powerful and deeply entrenched opposition in American society. In 1926 the AES leadership believed that eugenics would become an integral part of American education, law, health care, and politics. After working closely with Congress on the passage of a eugenically oriented immigration bill the AES leadership believed further advances would be forthcoming, including extension of the immigration quotas to the western hemisphere. The AES legislative program called for numerous legislative initiatives on both the state and federal levels. For example, the society wanted the U.S. census to carefully record peoples ancestry more carefully so that a eugenical record of the entire population could be kept. They failed in this endeavor as they did in numerous other initiatives during the period 1924 to 1935.

Eugenics simply was not an idea that caught people's imaginations. Instead there was stiff resistance to eugenics. Intellectuals and social prophets might see eugenics as the ultimate reform but among the mass of the literate and voting population it simply was too radical.

---

25 They lobbied for the inclusion on a) the name and racial descent of the father, b) maiden name and racial descent of the mother, and as far as possible, the racial descent of each parent by listing the predominating race of each grandparent. See Minutes, 6/1/29. AES Papers.
It is for this reason that the society was trying to avoid controversy during this period. Osborn believed that eugenics went against an ingrained American individualism. The idea that people are born with innate limitations went against fundamental American beliefs as expressed in the Hortio Alger myth. In America, it was thought, anyone could succeed with a little luck and pluck. It was for this reason that eugenics in the late thirties avoided the issue of race and class and stressed the individual. The society was groping for a eugenic ideology which would be more acceptable to the American people.

The society was particularly interested in expanding its efforts to bring the clergy into the fold. In May 1939 the AES held a conference on eugenics in relation to the church. The conference was attended by over 135 religious leaders as well as numerous leaders of eugenics, birth control, and philanthropy. It was clearly recognized that one of the staunchest bastions of opposition to eugenics was from conservative religious leaders of all stripes. Eugenics clearly did not go over well among rural Baptists and urban Catholics. A particular effort was made to bring leaders of these groups into the society and thus reduce the tensions between eugenics and the church.

On numerous occasions in these years society literature disavowed the overt racism of a few years earlier. The official position of the society was that all racial and
social groups were of value and that genetic differences between such groups were small compared to difference within each group. Therefore the society believed that a eugenic policy must aim at all sectors of American society, not at one group. The emphasis was constantly placed on the fact that talent was distributed throughout the population. It was a serious mistake of the earlier eugenicists to label whole groups as inferior. While the literature still refers to "inferior stocks" these were identified only as a generic category. This was somewhat ingenuous since the degenerates referred to were still within the usual groups. Thus, for example, the society still fought vigorously against Mexican immigration and still regarded degeneracy as being more frequent among the poor.

In fact, the racism of the eugenicists was only thinly veiled beneath the surface. Nowhere in the literature was there a concern for the declining Negro population, nowhere was concern expressed over the three centuries of differential fertility in which the European populations were growing at a rate nearly twice that of non-white peoples. On the contrary the rapid expanse of the European population throughout the world and the expansion of European imperialism was consistently regarded as part of the progressive advance of humanity. The "problem" of "differential fertility" was a code for the decline of white, Northern European stock.
The early signs that European population growth had come to an end was the focus of eugenicists' fears. Concern was expressed over the "differential fertility" of the rapidly growing Indian and Mexican populations in the United States. There were only a few hundred thousand native Americans left in the United States after nearly three centuries of population decline. One would expect a eugenicist who truly believed that there were valuable qualities in all races to welcome the renewed vigor of Indian and Mexican populations. On the contrary, Osborn saw only problems in the differential growth of Indian populations. While society literature was ostensibly color-blind in these years, it repeatedly expressed concern over the differential fertility among the "genetically inferior" populations of the rural south and west. The "genetically inferior" populations in question were predominantly black, Indian, and Mexican.

It is clear that Frederick Osborn fervently believed that eugenics had developed an entirely new outlook by the late thirties. During the discussion period following the presentation of papers at the Conference on Eugenics in Relation to the Church, Frederick Osborn burst into an uncharacteristic polemic. He was "more bitterly discouraged" than he had ever been in his career in eugenics. He found that the keynote speeches contained nothing "that might not have been written, or said, 20 years ago." Yet since that time, "the whole movement of eugenics
has changed." The "whole emphasis of eugenics today" is on "an unexpected and unparalleled situation" confronting "this vaunted civilization of ours." Our best and finest families are "25 to 50 per cent short of having enough children to replace themselves in another generation." Osborn had hoped that the religious leaders invited to present papers would have spoken to the problem of disintegrating family values among our best stocks. Instead they all tended to focus on sterilization and the ethical issues around negative eugenic efforts. Osborn ended with an apology. Obviously he had been shaken. He said he was embarrassed and had not intended to make such a speech, but "If the Churches cannot teach us the true value of life... where are we going to learn this lesson?"26

Despite Osborn's clear sense that he was speaking for a "new" eugenics, his speech carried both the intensity, emotional tone, and ideology of the earlier eugenics. In 1921, according to George Vacher de Lapouge, the human race "was facing a swift descent in the scale of civilization, because the better strains were losing ground."27 According to Lapouge the world was suffering from a shortage of "minds

26 F. Osborn, "Round Table Discussion at the Conference on the Relation of Eugenics to the Church," 8 May 1939. AES Papers.

big enough to deal with its problems." The poorer races and classes were threatening the more advanced and there was little hope for the future unless action were drastic and immediate. There is hardly any difference here in tone and emphasis. Osborn's call for more babies and bigger families among the better stock was as old as the eugenics movement itself.

What Osborn himself considered new in American eugenics relied heavily on European models. There were in Europe two models of interest to Americans. The first was that of the totalitarian states of Italy and Germany. The Germans had developed a eugenics program fit for a totalitarian society and both the Germans and Italians had developed policies to encourage population growth. While there was initial interest and enthusiasm in Nazi and fascist programs, by 1938 one begins to see open criticism of "totalitarian" eugenic policies published in the *Eugenical News*. These programs were now criticized as unworkable. A successful eugenics program was as only possible within a democratic society. Sweden, on the other hand, presented a model of eugenic policies for "democratic" societies.

It is not difficult to understand why this change in attitude should have occurred between 1938 and 1940. As late as 1937, Osborn and the Society were praising the Nazi

---

28 At the time the official publication of the American Eugenics Society.
eugenics programs. The later critiques were not aimed so much at specifics of the Nazi program as at the idea of eugenics within a totalitarian society. In fact, criticism of Italy and Germany were lumped together despite very large differences between the two countries with regard to their eugenics programs. Americans had initially responded benignly to European fascism. It was only in the late thirties that antagonisms arose. The Eugenics Society was particularly sensitive to these criticisms in this period precisely because it was striving for acceptance.

Furthermore, only by the late thirties were there actually two "models" of eugenic programs developing in Europe. The Americans were looking to Europe for leadership and they found it in the Swedish program.

The main elements of the Swedish eugenics program aimed at encouraging larger families through state subsidies for housing, free school lunch programs, a nationwide system of nurseries, and maternal care and other social welfare benefits. The American leaders believed even more could be done with nationally subsidized recreation and health care, salary scales based on size of family, and a tax system which favored the large family over the small. The idea was to tax the bachelor to pay for the large family and to tax the wealthier sectors to aid the poorly paid professional classes and other eugenic elements in the society. Social welfare benefits had to be targeted at those who ought to have large families. As the Eugenics Society saw it, the
contemporary trend was to tax the eugenic elements to pay for the care of the dysgenic elements, and this was a trend that had to be reversed.29

The American leaders took pains to introduce the Swedish program to Americans, to follow its progress, and to report the results of demographic studies which showed its success. The "new" eugenics was based on a belief that by creating a model welfare state the dysgenic trend would be reversed. Osborn dubbed this new view the "eugenic hypothesis." Stated simply, the hypothesis was that within a free society with a combination of widespread social welfare and universally available birth control of all types a eugenic trend in births would naturally ensue. The "eugenic hypothesis" included the acceptance of compulsory sterilization for those elements of the population which were a "menace" but focused on the broad main body of the population, claiming that sterilization was only a minor aspect of eugenic policy.

There was very little solid evidence for the "hypothesis" and Osborn himself admitted that it was only a "hypothesis." It served, however, as a method of leading eugenics out of the mire of criticism that had grown up around the movement. The new face of eugenics was positive,

optimistic, and as Ludmerer stated, "in tune to a changed America."^30

In a democratic society the eugenics program would run without coercion. A eugenic trend in births would be the natural result of conditions which stressed family values and aided those who wished to have large families. "Except in cases of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency" should attempt to "define the 'fit' or the 'unfit,' nor would any arbitrary power determine who should have children."^31 This was the major problem with the older eugenics programs and with eugenics programs in totalitarian societies. The eugenic hypothesis was a sort of religious faith that the best will out without strict control.

In January 1939 Frederick Osborn published a short article on the "Social Implications of the Eugenic Program," in Child Study.^32 Osborn began by stating that "today the women of child bearing age in the United States are not having enough children to replace their own numbers." "It is evident," Osborn observed that we need both more births and "a more eugenic distribution of births." Osborn stressed that such a program must be based on individual differences.

---


32 Ibid., pp. 95-97.
A eugenic program based on social class, economic or racial distinctions would be contrary to the scientific knowledge now available.

The differences in average heredity between racial and class groups in the United States are small compared to the individual differences in hereditary capacity within each group. "Eugenics should therefore be concerned with individual differences."

The first step to an effective eugenics program was to further equalize the freedom of all parents to have as few or as many children as they would like. We must increase the availability of contraception and reduce the economic handicaps to raising children, Osborn noted. "Measures for reducing the cost of children may be eugenic or dysgenic, depending on how they are applied."

In Sweden, Osborn went on, eugenic programs take the form of free services and subsidized rent payments. In Germany and Italy they take the form of cash payments. In these latter countries population policies were adopted in 1934 that aimed chiefly at increasing the number of children, and the bonuses were distributed without regard to quality. The Swedish program, on the other hand, was

---

33 This is clearly a distortion of the German marriage loan program. There were strict guidelines under the Nazi program defining those who could qualify for the loans. Osborn was well acquainted with the program which he praised just two years earlier. It's not clear why he distorts it here.
framed "with the hope that they would appeal to the more responsible type of parents." In Sweden there were subsidies for housing, extensive day nurseries, and free public education supplemented by free meals in the schools.

Osborn pointed to recent studies in Stockholm which showed "that the upper professional and business executive groups are having more children than those in the lower economic groups, the skilled laborers more children than the unskilled laborers." This was the reverse of trends that existed in the U.S. and was evidence when birth control is universally available "size of family tends to vary to some extent directly instead of inversely both with income and with the proven abilities of the parents.

There are "powerful dysgenic factors" at work in American society making for a "disproportionate population increase in people with below-the-average hereditary capacities." Conditions must be established for "a natural and unconscious process" favoring "those genetic types capable of developing their own culture to its highest point."

---

Except in the case of hereditary defectives, no eugenic agency would attempt to define the "fit" or the "unfit," nor would any arbitrary power determine who should and who should not have children. Eugenic efforts would be directed to the creation of environmental conditions under which parents would tend to have children in proportion to their mental and physical health...35

Thus, the question of values, which had plagued the eugenics movement, had to give way to a simpler formula of improving the environment for all individuals. However, the dysgenic effects of unequal availability of birth control and the economic hardships of raising large families had to be reversed before attempts to improve the environment generally would be successful. That is, once the conditions for a more eugenic distribution of births was in place, then a general effort at raising the social welfare of all classes would be successful. But in absence of a eugenic distribution of births American society might well "fail to produce" enough people able to take advantage of the improved environment. In that case we would end up subsidizing the prevailing dysgenic trend.36

This then was the new eugenics that emerged between 1935 and 1940. There were, of course, other elements which have not been discussed here. By 1940 eugenics was already taking a back seat to the birth control and population

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
control movements. The AES began to focus its activities on holding conferences to bring experts from various fields together and to insert eugenic concerns into a wide variety of social movements. It began a concerted effort to encourage the teaching of genetics in medical schools and the establishment of genetic counselling clinics. The war, of course, interrupted this trend, but by 1945 the new direction for the American Eugenics Society was already set. So was the stage for the resurgence of eugenics. As early as the 1960s voices could already be heard questioning the accuracy of the "eugenic hypothesis." What after all must one conclude if in fact the dysgenic trend in population were not reversed by the "new eugenic" approach.