Spring 5-8-2020

British Eugenics Failure and Success

Angela Gallagher

BRITISH EUGENICS

FAILURE AND SUCCESS

A Thesis

Submitted to the McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

By

Angela M. Gallagher

May 2020

BRITISH EUGENICS

FAILURE AND SUCCESS

By

Angela M. Gallagher

Approved March 27th, 2020

Dr. John C. Mitcham Associate Professor of History (Committee Chair)	Dr. Andrew Simpson Assistant Professor of History (Committee Member)
Dr. Kristine Blair Dean, McAnulty College	Dr. John C. Mitcham Chair, History Associate Professor of History

ABSTRACT

BRITISH EUGENICS

FAILURE AND SUCCESS

By

Angela M. Gallagher

March 2020

Thesis supervised by Dr. John Mitcham and Dr. Andrew Simpson

The historical narrative of eugenics often focuses on those eugenic societies and movements that 'succeeded' in part or in full in achieving a eugenic society. Less studied are those societies that failed, whether due to social backlash or internal incoherence. The British Eugenic Educational Society as the foundational point of eugenics, has therefore been overlooked as a result of it's perceived lack of contribution to eugenic thought and its failure to pass eugenic legislation. Founded by Francis Galton, the originator of the philosophy of eugenics, the British Eugenic Educational Society should have been successful given it's reputation and the numerous scientific, political and literary luminaries attached to it. By examining the causes of its failure historians may be better able to understand why eugenics never 'succeeded' in the British Isles.

DEDICATION

For my parents, Michael and Maureen Gallagher who taught me to question why things happened and why it mattered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Mitcham and Dr. Simpson for their hard work and support for this thesis from its early stages through its completion. I would additionally like to thank the Vardy family and the Duquesne History Department for their generous financial support for this work. Much of my research was done abroad at the Wellcome, and British Libraries, as well as the Irish National Archives and I would like to thank the helpful staff who worked with me to find my sources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction and Brief Historiography

In the late 19th century, the fields of biology and medicine rapidly professionalized and codified the practice of their fields and social norms. The pseudoscience of eugenics, or the controlled selection of humanity for its betterment, is one of many scientifically driven fields from the era. The legacy of eugenics' beginnings in the British Isles, can be seen in both the American sterilization movement and the consequences of the Nazi party in the Second World War. While contemporary research on the subject has attributed the failure of eugenics in the United Kingdom to social, religious, and governmental resistance, a closer look at recently available archival material suggests a different story. Eugenics in the British Isles failed because of a lack of cohesive identity and purpose. Without a robust identity and coherent ideology, the British Eugenics Educational Society was unable to place itself within the broader professional and scientific field.

Until recently, internal documents from the British Eugenics Educational Society/Eugenics Society/Galton Institute were unavailable for external research. As a result, historical analysis of the subject has primarily focused on works published by the organization and its opposition, leading to a prominent issue of bias and a lack of independent objective research. This embargo on independent analysis of the Eugenic Society archives and published works have resulted in historical works that tell us less about the internal and social processes of the Society and more about how individuals loyal to the Galton Institute saw the eugenic movement. This bias is evident in early works such as Karl Pearson's *The Problem of Practical Eugenics* (1909), Leonard Darwin's *Problems in Eugenics* (1912), and Ellsworth Huntington's *Tomorrows Children*

(1934). While recent publications seem objective such as Robert A. Peel's edited *Essays in the History of Eugenics,* research shows that all contributors are members of the Galton Institute.[1]

Despite this, there is a flourishing subfield of how eugenics intersected with the professionalization of medicine and science, as well as numerous comparative and generallist works on eugenics. Elof Carlson's *The Unfit* is characteristic of the comparative eugenic model as it ties both the British and American eugenics movements into a discussion of eugenic thought and consequences. Integrating archival sources with social history, Carlson, traces the beginnings of eugenics from Social Darwinism to the Galtonian eugenics' movement to the trans-Atlantic 'scientific' attempts to integrate eugenics into society and finally the culmination of eugenic thought in Nazi German social practice.

Carlson states that while originating in Britain, the movement itself was outdated both scientifically and socially in Britain when it began attempting to legislate for the sterilization of the 'unfit.' Despite this, Carlson does note that the Eugenics Society portrayed "the wretchedness of the families and the burdens they have imposed on society" to convince the public to shift from Public Relief to sterilization.[2] This method of combining the economic ideas of Malthus and social policy perspectives became a crucial part of eugenic propaganda.[3] This shift within British and general European

[1] Peel's work argues that the Eugenic Educational Society was part of the progressive liberal movement of the early 20th century and was instrumental in creating the fields of genetics and fertility studies. While this may be true, it is important to note that all contributors to the Eugenic history essays are members of the Galton Institute and have a vested interest in minimizing the negative implications of eugenics.
[2] Elof Axel Carlson, *The Unfit: A History of a Bad Idea* (Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, 2001), 175.
[3] Elof Axel Carlson, *The Unfit: A History of a Bad Idea.*

eugenic societies to political and economic reasons for eugenics lies in the loss of scientific and social support after the first few decades of the movement.

Marius Turda addresses the connection between modernism, eugenics, and the professionalization of science in his work *Modernism and Eugenics.* Arguing that eugenics has reached the "maturity necessary for a comparative and multidisciplinary examination," Turda contextualizes eugenics as both a philosophy and a field in European history.[4] Stating that nationalism in the 19th and early 20th-century European culture is a primary driving force in the eugenics movement, the author then connects eugenic movements to the nationalism of the First World War and the growing professionalization of the biological and scientific fields.

Discussing the concern of eugenic societies with the loss of the 'fittest' of the nation through war, Turda explores how some countries such as Italy saw the survivors of war as less fit while others, including Germany and Austria, saw combat as proof of the survival of the fittest[5]. As a result, Turda contributes to the historiography of the topic in a way that both illustrates the created sense of national unity in the late 19th century as well as the scientific and philosophical contrivance necessary to achieve it. The author's conclusion, wherein he discusses the implications of eugenics and biopolitics in the era of the Second World War, form the basis of modern thought on biological rights within a nation. Citing Foucault Turda argues that the idea of "controlling the national body" has shifted from a theoretical or patriotic phrase to a literal one in the scientific age. [6]

[4] Marius Turda, *Modernism and Eugenics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) 1.
[5] Marius Turda, *Modernism and Eugenics*, 48.
[6] Marius Turda, *Modernism and Eugenics*, 116.

For the Betterment of the Race: The Rise and Fall of the International Movement for Eugenics and Racial Hygiene by Stefan Kuhl continues Turda's analysis through an overview of the transnational connections between eugenic movements and nationalism as seen through racial hygiene. Kuhl offers an intriguing perspective on the scientific backwardness of the negative eugenics movement by the late 1930s, noting that the linkage of negative or reductive eugenics with Nazi Germany ultimately led to the movement as a whole diminishing.[7]

Philippa Levine's *Eugenics: A Very Short Introduction* is a classic example of how these comparative eugenic works meet in the generalist sense within the literature. Covering eugenic history from its inception, Levine attempts to summarize the eugenic beliefs throughout Europe and the Americas through the lens of Social Darwinism and progressivist thought. While intended to be a brief overview of the subject, Levine, like others, concludes that the Holocaust is the natural outcome of the eugenics movements of the early 20th century. Ending in the present with the current state of eugenics in reproductive technology, Levine's most persuasive argument for eugenic homogeneity in Europe comes from her evaluation of how the eugenic movement initially escaped scientific and medical oversight. [8] Through the incorporation of French, Dutch, English, German, and Romanian sources, Levine captures the pseudoscientific consensus of eugenics and its place outside the academy in the early 20th century while also establishing that by the 1930s, eugenics had been discredited in specific locations including Britain in favor of demographics and sociology.

---

[7] Stefan Kuhl, *For the Betterment of the Race: The Rise and Fall of the International Movement for Eugenics and Racial Hygiene.* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016) 3.
[8] Philippa Levine, *Eugenics: A Very Short Introduction* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2017).

This question of why eugenics never became popular on an institutional level within Britain has been a subject of interest within the British Eugenics Educational Society since its failure in the 1930s. It continues to be discussed by the Galton Institute today. One recent collection of conference papers released by the Galton Institute focused on why the English Eugenics movement was less successful than others in Scandinavia and America.[9] Titled *Essay's In the History of Eugenics* and edited by the president of the Galton Insitute, the published collection presents the most recent reflections on both the history of eugenics in Britain, as seen by those involved as well as their theories regarding the cause of their failure.

Alain Drouard, the primary author of the panel, begins his discussion on the failure of British Eugenics by insisting that eugenics are still as vital today as they were in the early 20th century. Stating, "In the first decades of this century genetics undermined the basic assumptions of eugenics" Drouard notes that infertile couples seeking children perform contemporary eugenics enthusiastically.[10] Arguing that eugenics should no longer be taboo despite its connections to Nazis, Drouard's primary focus is how lessons learned from the eugenics programs in France and Scandinavia and past failures of the Galton Insitute can be utilized in the recent shifts in reproductive technology to reinvigorate eugenic practices.[11]

Arguing that French eugenic success was the result of voluntary cultural norms and acceptance of certain eugenic practices, Drouard notes that Britain never had a similar level of cultural awareness or acceptance of eugenics. In contrast, Scandinavian

[9] *John Peel et al., Essays in the History of Eugenics: Proceedings of Conference Organised by the Galton Institute, London, 1997,* (London, England: The Galton Institute, 1998), 183.
[10] Peel, *Essays in the History of Eugenics,* 188.
[11] Peel, *Essays in the History of Eugenics,* 190.

legislation, including a law titled "Social measures toward degenerately predisposed individuals," did not depend on cultural eugenic acceptance to be enforced.[12] This is contrasted to Sweden's "Society for Racial Hygiene" established in 1909, which consulted with Norway's "Mjoen's Consultative Eugenics Committee." Arguing that scientific eugenic sterilization is crucial to understanding the creation of the welfare state in Scandinavia in the 1930s, Drouard states the laws have led to reduced institutionalization, special schools, and poor relief.[13]

The Galton Institute's internal analysis of the policy success and failures of eugenics in Europe as connected to their failure while interesting from an organizational standpoint fails to objectively and historically place their work in context. As a result, current works that focus exclusively on the history of the Galton Institute fail to investigate the internal scientific legitimacy narratives that abound in the historical record surrounding their goals, aims, and practical activities that are often missing from the narrative.[14] The recent move of the Eugenic Educational Archive to the Wellcome Library provides an opportunity to gain new insights with materials ranging from internal memos to interdisciplinary disagreements within the Society. These materials, especially those held by the Wellcome Library, The British Library, and the University College of London, supply a more precise context for the growth and development of eugenics as a pseudoscience as well as a political movement. This thesis objectively utilizes these sources to examine the connections between the failure of the British Eugenics Educational Society/Eugenic Society/Galton Insitute.

[12] Peel, *Essays in the History of Eugenics.*
[13] Peel*, Essays in the History of Eugenics*, 198.
[14] Some material from the Eugenic Educational Society is still restricted due to patient and study information until 2022.

This thesis will first briefly explore the importance of legitimacy and how this drove Francis Galton and Karl Pearson's initial eugenic work. Secondly, this thesis will examine how, after the death of Francis Galton, the British Eugenic movement formally split into the scientific Eugenic Laboratory and the social organization of the Eugenic Educational Society struggling to maintain legitimacy and cohesion. Thirdly, this thesis will examine how the success of the International Eugenics Congress in 1912 enabled the passing of the Mental Deficiency Act as a result of professional and scientific legitimacy. Fourthly this thesis will examine how internal disputes led to a loss of scientific legitimacy following the First World War. Finally, this thesis will examine how the final legislative attempts to pass the sterilization amendments in 1931 and euthanasia legislation in 1936.

Chapter 1: **Eugenic Beginnings**

Francis Galton, polymath and the inventor of the science of fingerprinting and weather mapping, life changed forever upon the publishing of his cousin Charles Darwin's *Origin of the Species*. Following the publishing of his first cousin's work, he gave up outside pursuits to statistically codify evidence of eugenically sound families and to research eugenically defective individuals eventually founding the British Eugenics Education Society in 1907. Although the British Eugenics Educational Society established the field, the Society's inability to create lasting eugenic change has dramatically influenced how historians view the legacy of eugenics within the British Isles.

Eugenics thought in the British Isles did not occur spontaneously. Instead, it was the result of longstanding assumptions and social attitudes within Victorian society. The upper and middle class had a history of interventionism in lower-class life since the mid-19th century, with religious and social charities creating a class culture focused on improving the lower class. [1] The eugenics movement was therefore popular among upper-class notables that included Winston Churchill, John Keynes, H.G. Wells, and George Bernard Shaw.

While these luminaries of politics and the arts initially gave the eugenic movement some social credibility, the connection of eugenics to science and scientific studies of humanity in the 1930s caused their influence to wane. The interventionists,

[1] Gilbert Keith Chesterton, *Eugenics and Other Evils* (London: Cassell, 1922) 180.

whose attitudes were reinforced by Social Darwinism, believed that the 'strong' should govern the weak, a premise supported by the 'strong' upper class of society. [2]

Eugenic science, often confused with Social Darwinism, sought to "deal(s) with all the influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also, those that develop them to the utmost advantage," thereby eliminating the 'random selection' of Darwin's theory of natural selection.[3] Social Darwinism became a standard theory in the latter half of the 19th century, using Charles Darwin's 1859 *The Origin of the Species* to reinforce prevailing attitudes about social order, and was further developed through Galton and other's research. Social Darwinism, however, was never embraced by Charles Darwin, who had concerns for both the statistical likelihood of such a social construct as well as for the "noblest part of our nature." [4] Despite Charles Darwin's preference for non-statistical research, he wrote to Galton regarding what he considered mathematical issues with Galton's modified theory of Darwinism.[5] Darwin additionally had concerns that human compassion and charity would be lost if Social Darwinism became the norm, and as a result, he strongly objected to his work being used to further Galton's ends. While Charles Darwin maintained his familial relationship with Galton until the end of his life, concerns over Galton's use of his work led to a decrease in access to his unpublished research notes. Leonard Darwin, Charles Darwin's son, frequently wrote to Galton in the years before his father's death in 1882 regarding updates to his work and together they

[2] Dan Stone, *Breeding Superman: Nietzsche, Race and Eugenics in Edwardian and Interwar Britain* (Liverpool: Liverpool Univ. Press, 2002).
[3] Endowment draft written by Galton 1904, 2/4/19/9/1, Box 72 Folder 1, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[4] Charles Darwin, *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin, vol. 23. 1875* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), letter of December 18th, 1875.
[5] Correspondence between Francis Galton and Charles Darwin 1875-1879, 3/3/7/16-20, Box 162, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain

agreed to wait until after Charles Darwin's passing to announce the official research field of what Galton called 'eugenics' to maintain family harmony.[6]

The late 19th-century move towards professionalization in science and medicine is essential to understanding the codification of Social Darwinian policy and norms. Professionalization, defined as the creation of standards within a field, occurred in both the medical and academic fields during this period. Meant to restrict and codify the scientific and medical fields to licensed or accredited individuals, one of the earliest examples of professionalization is the British Medical Act of 1840. This act restricted the practice of medicine and its subfields to individuals licensed by a newly created central board after completing the relevant educational standards, allowing patients to " distinguish qualified from unqualified Practitioners" through a central registry.[7]

Similarly, in the 1850s and 1860s, university and academic licensure for practitioners of science began moving from ad-hoc social organizations of gentleman scientists and explorers to credentialed and research-based individuals. The process that Charles Darwin's *Origin of the Species* underwent to become published and scientifically approved is an example of both legitimacy and professionalization in the field of biology. Darwin, a naturalist, first presented his theory to a scientific body before publication to legitimize his approach and then, once approved by his scientific society, published it following their professional norms.

This internal and external acknowledgment of an individual's research became essential within the scientific and medical professions as the societal expectation of

---

[6] Correspondence between Francis Galton and Charles Darwin 1875-1879, Galton 3/3/7/16-20, Box 162, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain

[7] The Medical Act (21 & 22 Vict c 90), *An Act to Regulate the Qualifications of Practitioners in Medicine and Surgery* acessable at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/21-22/90/introduction/enacted

standards rose. In order to argue socially and legislatively for various movements, medical practitioners needed to establish and defend their place in the professional and public sphere.[8] In the context of this thesis, professionalization and legitimacy are crucial to understanding the success and failure of the British Eugenic Educational Society. Galton, Pearson, and other scientific individuals involved in the creation of the Society could claim legitimacy due to both their academic and social credentials.

The legitimization of interventionism among the upper class occurred as a result of the poverty of the Edwardian and Victorian era.[9] This upper-class intervention with the poor, while a consistent factor in culture, became socially and politically legitimated beginning in 1834 with the New Poor Laws, which introduced workhouses and stricter requirements for the reception of public aid. These laws, influenced by theories of degeneracy among the poor as well as practical funding methods, became legitimate socially through religious and social norms. The resulting philanthropic alternatives, run by religious individuals in the post-Poor Law era, continued to apply social science theories introducing spiritual aspects to the treatment and consideration of children in contrast to the birth control movements and societies of the early 20th century. These societies, which promoted birth control among the lower classes, also attempted to discourage it among the 'healthy' upper class.

Amid this shift in 1882, Galton began experimenting with his cousin's theory, merging it with Mendel's genetic theories to create a field he called stripculture in *Nature*

[8] Ivan Waddington, "The Movement towards the Professionalization of Medicine," *British Medical Journal* 301, no. 6754 (1990): pp. 688-690.
[9] Richard A. Soloway, *Demography and Degeneration: Eugenics and the Declining Birthrate in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

Journal.[10] While his initial research concerned moths and plants, he actively collaborated with others to prove or disprove the idea of 'germplasm' and the ability of humanity to pick genetic traits in future generations. A result of this research was an active community of followers in the London area, including later Eugenics Society members interested in proving or disproving the legitimacy of Mendelian Theory concerning Darwinian Theory. Galton's *Inquiries into Human Faculty*, published in 1883, officially establishes a definition of the word 'eugenics,' arguing that it may be used to improve society.[11] Following the success of this book, Galton lobbied for and was successful in obtaining a placement at the International Exhibition in London of 1884. This venue was crucial to his plans as it both gave him scientific legitimacy and allowed him to conduct an 'Anthropometric Laboratory,' where he offered to document exhibit goers' anthropometric characteristics.[12] While primarily meant to spread the ideas of social Darwinism, the exhibit also allowed Galton to collect the data he needed for his following book entitled *Natural Inheritance* and provided a testing ground for the efficacy of his eugenic survey.[13]

The success of the exhibition became the catalyst for Galton's collaboration with both Walter Weldon and Karl Pearson from the University College of London. Weldon, a zoologist, became interested in Galton's work following the publishing of *Natural Inheritance*. Letters between Galton and Weldon show a shift from an isolated correlational theory to the realization that to solve the issue of Mendelism and

[10] Galton memo on research progress 1884, 3/3/6-3/3/7-1-5, Box 161, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[11] Francis Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development* (London: Macmillan and Co, 1883).
[12] Francis Galton *Natural Inheritance* (London: Macmillan and Co,1884).
[13] Similar exhibits and traveling anthropological/eugenic displays would be used throughout both the British and American eugenic movements to subtly collect information on individuals for further research.

Darwinism, the mathematical probabilities of statistical genetic methods were necessary. Weldon's departmental neighbor Karl Pearson quickly filled this niche within their research. Pearson, a statistician from the University College of London, primarily focused on statistics and mathematical economic models but became interested in the statistical and actuarial implications of eugenics in the latter half of the 19th century. Galton, Weldon, and Pearson began working together in an interdisciplinary fashion in 1890 to establish the scientific and practical aspects of eugenic research, modeling the results into actuarial and statistical tables.[14]

The placement of the eugenic field within a broader scientific framework was essential to establishing its legitimacy in the eyes of later 19th-century society. While there was a general interest in the work of Galton and his associates, there was also some debate on where exactly eugenics as a science belonged. Individuals from the University College of London situated it within the mathematical field, while others from the Royal Medical Society placed it within the field of anthropology. Professionals within these emerging fields had both the analytical and scientific knowledge to be catalysts for eugenic change and research. The connections Galton created in these fields led to his nomination as president of the International Congress of Hygiene and Demography held in London in August of 1891.[15]

Galton's nomination and ongoing correspondence during the planning of the Congress is an intriguing exploration of the awareness of the need to create a basis of

[14] Both Galton and Pearson were working to advance statistical models, however, it was Pearson that worked out the mathematical reliability of Galton's eugenic theory of regression in 1898.
[15] Correspondence and memos regarding Congress of Hygiene and Demography, 2/4/19/7/1, Box 73, Folder 2, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

scientific legitimacy for his theories. As a result of his need for legitimacy, the guestlist for the International Congress of Hygiene and Demography was heavily weighted towards individuals with scientific and social connections and credentials.[16] Despite the general interest in both demography and social hygiene, Galton's correspondence while planning the event shows some hesitation to combine the two fields.[17] As one individual stated when declining a position as session chair, "I do not know enough of numerous problems enumerated in the program." [18]

As a result, Galton resolved to promote popular literature and handouts to solidify the connections between demography and social hygiene. This was a decision that became standard with his later work as he believed that knowledge of eugenics was essential to creating cultural acceptance of it. Despite this initial lack of familiarity with the subject, the Congress succeeded in both forging new eugenic connections as well as establishing eugenics as a potential scientific field. Galton's opening address captures this clearly, as the purpose of the conference is in his words to examine "the future betterment of humanity."[19] The connections gained during the Demography Congress enabled Galton to argue for a lecture series given through the University College of London.

This lecture series, conducted through the fall of 1894, primarily sought to educate graduate students on 'applied mathematics' regarding human biology and developed the term biometrics to describe their findings. The success of these lectures

[16] Poore will run the Welsh branch of the Eugenic Society later.
[17] Correspondence and memos regarding Congress 1891 2/4/19/7/1, Box 73, Folder 2, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[18] Correspondence and memos regarding Congress between Galton and Lord Russell, March 6th, 1891 2/4/19/7/1, Box 73, Folder 2, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[19] Opening speech of Congress given by Galton 2/4/19/7/1, Box 73 Folder 2/ File 3, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

prompted Galton, Pearson, and Weldon to begin a peer-reviewed biometric-eugenic journal called *Biometrika* in 1901 to document their findings.[20] The decision to begin *Biometrika* was both strategic and practical, given the necessity of establishing a manuscript and active research presence to obtain university funding. With funding established from the University College of London and supplemented through an endowment by Galton, Pearson's department split into the Department of Applied Mathematics and the Department of Statistics.

The field of eugenics, while utilizing the language of demography, was placed within Pearson's department both as a personal acknowledgment and as a result of its perceived connections to math and biology.[21] Galton, however, was still exploring other fields and gauging both their interest in eugenics and the benefits the field in question could offer to his research. Initially, Galton hoped anthropology might become a home for his work due to his previous experience and familiarity with the field. However, the constraints of age and the location of his primary supporters in the fields of sociology and statistics proved Galton the stability in research partners and the legitimacy of accredited individuals to enable his work to flourish.

Henry Smith and Eugene Talbot, along with Karl Pearson and, Walter Weldon, therefore, gave Galton's work legitimacy not only in the British Isles but in the United States as well. Henry Smith's 1897 *A Plea for the Unborn* is a classic example of this synthesis between Social-Darwinism, eugenics, statistics of the 'unfit.' Using tables based upon Galton and Pearson's work, Smith argues that the solution to criminals, who

[20] Biometrika is still in print and has shifted from biometric and eugenic study to that of applied and theoretical statistics.
[21] Internal paper on the founding of the Galton Laboratory, 'Annals of the Annals' Folder 1, File 3, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

cost society over 10 million pounds per year, is to prevent the creation of criminals via better breeding.[22] Referencing Galton's previous work in Stripculture and contemporary criminal case studies, Smith argues that science has proven that criminals commit crime due to being 'mentally diseased' and, therefore, any attempt to rehabilitate them will fail because they are incapable of reform. Instead, through education and medical advocacy, the state should work to reduce the 'production' of these individuals, as "it is a crime to entail upon children tainted blood."[23] Doctor Eugene Talbot further explores this question of medical and state intervention in his book *Degeneracy its Causes, Signs, and Results*, which is a foundational work in both American and British eugenics. Written in 1898 and citing Galton, Darwin, and Pearson, Talbot argues that the solution to degeneracy is better education within the medical field to enable them to educate parents and educators into eugenic practices.[24] Both Smith and Talbot argue that the result of this education will be the eventual passing of legislation to mandate eugenics.

Francis Galton was not opposed to eugenics becoming legislated; however, he believed that "the power by which Eugenic reform must chiefly be effected is that of Popular Opinion."[25] While this popular opinion was vital to their cause, even Galton cautioned against overstating the scientific basis of eugenics, as the revelation of such inflation harmed its claim to legitimacy. A result of this continued exploration, however, was an invitation to present his eugenic ideas to the Anthropological Institute in 1901 as the Huxley Lecture. In this lecture, titled "The Possible Improvement of the Human

---

[22] Henry Smith, *A Plea for the Unborn: An Argument That Children Could, and Therefore Should, Be Born with a Sound Mind in a Sound Body, and That Man May Become Perfect by Means of Selection and Stirpiculture* (London: Watts & Sons, 1897) 12.
[23] Henry Smith, *A Plea for the Unborn.* 31.
[24] Eugene Talbot*, Degeneracy, Its Causes, Signs, and Results* (London: W. Scott, 1898).
[25] Francis Galton, *Essays in Eugenics* (London: Eugenics Education Society, 1908) 2.

Breed: Under the Existing Conditions of Law and Sentiment" Galton discusses the issue of law and popular opinion concerning possible eugenic research and social change.[26] Arguing that science and statistics would vindicate his work, Galton outlines how it may classify criminals and the worth of children to society.[27] Maintaining that "the brains of the nation lie in the higher of our classes," Galton had a twofold suggestion to increase public opinion and participation.[28] First, the Anthropological Institute should consider drawing up a list similar to the one he was presently working on to explore the relative intelligence and success of its members and children. Second, that the conducting of a larger similar project on the public increased knowledge of their cause and created sympathy for their goals.[29]

This supposition of Galton regarding public support proved to be correct, at least financially, when they obtained their first outside sponsor for eugenics in 1903. This sponsorship came from the Drapers Company who contributed £1000 a year until 1905 with a further £2000 provided yearly until 1910 when they reduced their contribution to £500 due to a lack of eugenic results.[30] With this new source of income, Pearson and Galton began hiring specialized staff, financing more publications in mainstream magazines, and officially established the Biometric Laboratory at the University College of London in 1903, further legitimizing their work. While it is easy to credit Galton's initial success to class and status as well as his financial funding for research, equally

[26] Galton, *Essays in Eugenics*, 10.
[27] Galton *Essays in Eugenics*, 12.
[28] Francis Galton, *On the Inheritance of the Mental and Moral Characters in Man, and Its Comparison with the Inheritance of the Physical Characters*: the Huxley Lecture for 1903 (London: Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 1903) 11.
[29] Francis Galton, *On the Inheritance of the Mental and Moral Characters in Man.*
[30]Endowment draft written by Galton 1904, 2/4/12/9/1, Box 72, Folder 1, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

vital was his engagement with emerging discussions of nature versus nurture and the ultimate causes of social diseases. As a result, Galton's work was not only attractive to those in academia but external parties as well.

Militarily the British Empire had long been interested in the potential for specific races or ethnic groups being predisposed to military service or degeneracy. As a result, the new science of eugenics appealed to military and governmental researchers due to its potential to aid in the expansion and preservation of the empire. To investigate the potential of eugenics as an asset to the military, the Royal College of Medicine established the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration (IDCPD) in 1903. The IDCPD took Galton's idea about the 'cost/benefit' of the lower class and attempted to scientifically apply it to "the allegations concerning the deterioration of certain classes of the populations."[31] Contrary to Galton and Pearson's hopes, however, the over 800-page memorandum on the study became a damning debunking of their scientific ideas. The study examined research conducted from 1873 to compare it to present populations in the British Isles, hoping to prove both the degeneration of the Empire's population as well as the expense the supposed degenerate population was costing society. Noting, "the extreme seriousness of the danger caused to the 'Empire by the unhealthy condition of Manchester…cannot be realized," the document outlines how the presumed information validated concerns that the population of Manchester and other English towns were a eugenic threat to the empire.[32]

[31] Fitzroy William, ed., *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* (London: Darling & Son, 1905) 3.
[32] Fitzroy William, ed., *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* (London: Darling & Son, 1905) 220.

The introduction of the study explains both the scientific and social purpose of its research.[33] While the lack of a suitable or able army was the primary concern of the inquiry, a substantial portion was devoted to how the British recruitment rates compared to German recruitment, concerns regarding the health of the empire and the ability of the nation to support the 'degenerate' without sacrificing its goals. The study also sought to discover if there was, as alleged, a higher rate of lunacy in the British Isles due to this degeneration and explored the issue of urbanization and rural communities moving to the city with the presumed connection that urbanization as a causal link has worsened eugenic standards. The subsequent study initially supported some aspects of the study's thesis; however, the continued objection and conditionality of results by the Royal College in the official memorandum is noteworthy.

The professionalization of the scientific and mathematical fields led to increased standards regarding sample sizes, similar demographics, and follow up within scientific studies. As a result, the findings of the IDCP were considered conditional due to the variance throughout their findings. One example of this reconsideration is the declaration that a previous survey which purported to show that "factory children of factory parents…compared unfavorably with children in non-factory districts" was invalid due to unrepeatable data.[34]

This invalidation of previous and even current demography surveys was attributed to the studies' lack of repeat data and small sample sizes. In the case of the factory or non-factory populations, there was no way to determine if it was exclusively the factories that were causing the population to become degenerate. Another portion of the study

[33] Fitzroy, *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*, 223.
[34] Fitzroy, *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration,* A2.

conducted from 1878-1883, with a sample population of 53,000 persons examined heights throughout the British Isles. However, the medical and scientific members note that the skewed population towards Englishmen is a flaw of the sample. An additional study conducted at various points from 1874-1902 examined the average heights of men in Aberdeen, Banff, Elgin, and Nairn, and while noting an overall increase in height during the period also stated that the study "is not conclusive as there is no guarantee that the racial type and class" measured were the same during the period.[35] Despite this failure to establish eugenic principles as the roots of degeneracy in the British Isles, Galton still saw the study as a success as it determined future scientific norms for the study of the population. These norms were applied immediately to Galton and Pearson's research and internal memorandums of the laboratory moving forward.

The IDCPD study also brought Galton's work to the attention of the Sociological Society at the University College of London, which at the behest of Pearson invited Galton to their series of talks at the London School of Economics.[36] The primary purpose of the talks, establishing the scientific field of Sociology, speaks to the perceived importance both of Galton's ideas and his and Pearson's scientific credentials. Galton's speech given in support of the Sociological Society in 1904, titled "Eugenic Scope and Aims," outlined eugenics as being an essential part of almost every scientific and cultural discipline from mathematics to psychology. In particular, however, Galton believed that incorporating eugenic ideas into sociology externally from its established connection at the University College London was essential as sociology heavily relied upon statistical

[35] Fitzroy, *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*, 4.
[36] Francis Galton " Eugenics It's Scope and Aims" May 16th Galton 2/4/19/9/,1 Box 72, Folder 8, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

health trends in populations. As a result, Galton urged external academics to welcome eugenics into their research as the University College London had to legitimize the subject externally.[37]

Pearson, who chaired the lecture series, expressed some concerns related to the ability of Eugenics as a field without a central founder besides Galton. While Galton was a financial and intellectual figurehead of the movement, Pearson noted that to the real success of a movement would be proven following Galton's stepping away from it.[38] Pearson, therefore, suggested that he may be considered Galton's heir and that he too endorsed the connection between eugenics and sociology. As a result, the Sociological Society published not only his lecture but also his list of Royal Society families and the achievements of their children, testing the public's reaction before agreeing to fund and research Galton's suggested "Golden Book of Thriving Families."[39]

While Galton's lecture was accepted as scientifically groundbreaking by the members of the Sociological Society, some members noted that eugenics was not only a scientific proposition but also a societal one. As a result, it was argued that for eugenics to impact society and be a source of lasting change, affiliation between eugenics and religion or other social organizations would be needed.[40] Interestingly, in the published version of Galton's speech, the Sociology Society included numerous endorsements from medical and social luminaries regarding Galton's idea of eugenics. Some such as Dr. Leslie Mackenzie and Bernard Shaw became members of the later Eugenic Educational

[37] Francis Galton " Eugenics It's Scope and Aims" May 16th , Galton 2/4/19/9/1 Box 72, Folder 8, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[38] Pearson 's reflection on " Eugenics It's Scope and Aims" May 16th , Galton 2/4/19/9/1 Box 72, Folder 4, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[39] Empherma from the Sociological talk containing reviews of Galton's speech 2/4/19/9/1, Box 72, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[40] ibid

Society, while others such as H.G. Wells gave support but remained unofficial associates of the Society.

Given the need to both legitimize the work of the Sociological Society in the scientific field and Galton's need to professionalize and legitimize the field of eugenics, it is little wonder that a partnership formed in 1904 between the two schools of thought. The issue, however, remained of resolving accusations of the unscientific basis of Galton's work, some of which the Sociological Society published in efforts to be transparent. Some concerns raised included the small sample sizes and self-selecting nature of Galton and the Sociological Society's research.

The speech Galton delivered to the London School of Economics was the catalyst for broader eugenic thought outside of the academic and medical communities. Correspondence between Galton and a variety of non-academic individuals following the lecture led him to begin holding informal eugenic meetings in his home in 1905. The goal of this new Eugenics Record Office was "to propose and thoroughly discuss suitable subjects for eugenic research including time, cost, the persons who might undertake them, and the value of the expected results; and that other topics connected with Eugenics might afterward be discussed, preference was given to those that bear on the future work of the Office."[41] The inclusion of 'other topics connected with eugenics' enabled Galton to incorporate interdisciplinary ideas surrounding human heredity, and therefore, the Eugenics Record Office enabled networking between individuals involved in the subject, both scientifically and socially.[42] Some such as Cora Hodson were social workers looking

[41] Memo on Eugenics Records Office Advisory Meeting, October 30th 1905, KP/234: Pearson Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[42] Private Correspondence Galton October 1905 regarding Advisory Meeting, 2/4/12/1/3, Galton Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

to correlate patterns they saw in their work. Others, such as Dr. Caleb Saleeby, Alexander Carr-Saunders, and Leslie Mackenzie, were scientific professionals looking for solutions to the increasing number of children and women with venereal and congenital diseases. A few, such as George Bernard Shaw and Bernard Mallet, had a nonscientific but social interest in the 'improvement' of society. [43] As Galton stated in his outreach to potential members, the first meeting of the organization was intended to "propose and thoroughly discuss suitable subjects for eugenic research" in an informal setting.[44]

As a result of this shift from solely scientific aims, the Eugenic Records Office was renamed to the Eugenic Educational Society. Initially, a loose confederation of individuals with widely varying aims the Eugenic Educational Society united these individuals under the inspiration of Francis Galton, who called for cooperation between the scientists of the lab and the social workers and elite of the society.[45] A result of this was an immediate divergence of opinion on what were 'suitable subjects' for eugenics. Pearson and scientists such as Dr. Leslie Mackenzie and Carr-Saunders hoped to continue eugenic research in the biological, Mendelian, and statistical fields. In contrast, others such as Hodson and Saleeby, hoped to apply eugenic ideas to a variety of social hygiene subjects, including birth control and venereal disease.[46]

These disagreements, namely the lack of any clear definitions, goals, or admission criteria, set the stage for future conflict between factions and personalities, each operating with their vision of eugenic success. Unlike some Edwardian social movements, Galton

[43] Memo to UCL from Galton 2/3/12, Box 92, Folder 3r, Galton Collection,University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Galton Lab Internal Memos 2/3/12, Box 92, Folder 3f, Galton Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[46] Galton's Will and Endowment Memos, 2/4/12/1/1, Box 8, Folder 10r, Galton Collection,University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

and the Eugenic Society never defined who was the 'fit' or 'unfit' of society. While some individuals such as alcoholics or the chronically poor were unfit, others who were poor or sick, but 'brilliant' deserved aid to help them achieve their eugenic purpose.[47] The result was a very case by case and generalist definition or eugenic fitness or unfitness, which changed according to the member and the individuals with whom they studied or worked. Despite this concern, some, including Montague Crackanthorpe, President of the Eugenic Educational Society from 1909-1911, believed that Galton's endorsement had led to the "recognition of the society by responsible scientists and medical men."[48]

This ambiguity in definitions contributed to the British Eugenics Education Society's lack of overarching goals for its research. While other eugenic organizations such as the American, German, or Nordic societies had clear targets detailing those they sought to remove from the gene pool and a unified end goal, the British Eugenic Educational Society had neither. Galton's hope was for a 'better Britain' never clarifying what that meant. To some such as Saleeby, a better Britain extended inpatient rehab centers and charity; to Pearson, it eliminated the people who required charity entirely. An additional concern was that unlike other eugenic movements, admission to the British Eugenic Educational Society was extended beyond men of science to the general public. The result was an organization filled with both ordinary individuals and luminaries of science and the cultural arts, all examining everything from venereal disease to alcoholism to mental illness as personal inclination allowed.

---

[47] Francis Galton, *On the Inheritance of the Mental and Moral Characters in Man, and Its Comparison with the Inheritance of the Physical Characters*: *the Huxley Lecture for 1903* (London: Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 1903).
[48] "Obituary of Montegue Crackentrhrope," n.d., https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2987002/pdf/eugenrev00372-0060.pdf

The more scientific members of the Eugenic Educational Society coalesced around Pearson, leaving the more social-minded to work with Galton. Galton's endowment at the University College of London established the Francis Galton Eugenics Laboratory. This split temporarily solved the issue of scientific research and broad civilian participation by enabling Pearson and the scientifically inclined to focus on sorting data and statistics from information gathered by others in the Eugenics Educational Society. As a result, early Eugenic Educational Society work primarily focused on revising and standardizing Galton's eugenic records and creating a eugenic pedigree code to separate the fit from the degenerate. They then took the pedigree charts with them and gave talks to other social workers and interested parties.

This outreach created enough momentum to start the *Eugenics Review* in 1909 with Galton giving 50 Pounds towards it and writing the forward. The goal of the journal was twofold, with the primary purpose of aiding communication between the two eugenic groups, and secondarily it helped eugenics "reach a wider circle than that of the present members of the society."[49] This first issue of the *Eugenic Review* creates a compelling picture of the contemporary state of the Eugenic Education Society. Among the topics included are "Some Moral Aspects of Eugenics," an examination of "Poor Law Commission Report," an article on the "Psychology of Parenthood," and a brief overview of the "Eugenic Field." As a result, it is clear that the founding of the *Eugenic Review* was less for the interests of the society but in the words of Dean Inge (author of 'Some

[49] Francis Galton, "Forward," *The Eugenics Review* 1, no. 1 (1909) 1.

Moral Aspects of Eugenics') "to educate public opinion" and avoid internal and external ignorance by members.[50]

Public opinion, and the lack of it, was a struggle for the Eugenic Education Society throughout its early years. While Galton, Pearson, Crackenthrope, Davenport, and others regularly wrote opinion pieces to the *Times***,** their viewpoints did not always mesh, causing slight rifts that later turned into internal divisions. In one such case, Saleeby authored an article criticizing the London City Council for closing "The Home for Chronic Inebriate Women," which contradicted the editorial written by Pearson in support of them. While Saleeby argued that his experience working with such individuals led him to believe that venereal disease and other eugenic issues were inevitable results of the closure of these homes, Pearson stated that closing the homes would "allow nature to take its course upon the wretched."[51] As newspaper, disputes became more frequent, Galton called for unity and accord between the social worker/doctors and the science/statistics groups to keep public opinion on a positive note.[52] In Carr-Saunders' view, however, the publicity the Eugenics Education Society and Lab received both positive and negative was beneficial as it allowed them to spread their ideas further regardless of agreement from themselves or the larger British population. [53]

Following Galton's death in January of 1911, the Eugenic Educational Society and Laboratory were forced to consider their future as a scientific and social body. While some difficulties were evident such as the continued funding of the organization

[50] Memior written by Lady Chamberlin 'Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' SA/EUG/B.11, Box 3, Folder 6/7, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[51] Letter from Galton to Society discussing money, 3/3/7/20-22, Box 163, Galton Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[52] Series of letters between Galton and Pearson regarding Saleeby and the article, 3/3/7/2 Folder 718r, Galton Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[53] A. M Carr-Saunders. A criticism of eugenics. *Eugenics Review*, 5(3), (1913). 214–233.

following the death of its founder and financier, there was also a more significant problem of legitimacy both socially and scientifically following Galton's death.

Financially, Galton's death complicated the funding situation of the Eugenic Educational Society while establishing the funding of the Eugenic Laboratory. After his family, he had bequeathed the remainder of his assets to the Galton Laboratory at the University College of London, endowing it with the funds to carry on after the death of its benefactor. However, likely as a result of on-going differences in personality and previously established funding by Galton, the Eugenic Educational Society was not a beneficiary in Galton's will as they had expected to be. This resulted in both a drive for membership (as dues would help their finances) and an increased need for outside sponsors. The question of which organization was scientifically and professionally legitimate became increasingly contentious following Galton's death. While the Eugenic Educational Society had scientific members and an impressive list of social contacts, the Eugenic Laboratory remained the center of applied and research eugenics.

Chapter 2: **Galton's Death and Reorganization**

In January of 1911, Francis Galton died after a long decline in health, having been cared for by Pearson as well as caretakers, including his nephew. While Galton's death was a personal and scientific loss to his friends and scientific associates, it was also the end of unity between eugenic factions. In the months before his death, Galton had withdrawn from the Eugenics Educational Society's board, remaining only as their 'honorary' president while Montague Crackenthrope and a committee of over 14 vice-presidents ran the Eugenic Educational Society.

While the reasons for Galton's withdrawal were documented as health and age, there were also escalating difficulties between Pearson and members of the Eugenic Educational Society. Despite this, Galton still attended Society events up until his death and worked to bridge differences of opinion between Eugenic Educational Society members and the Eugenic Laboratory. Following his death, his will was primarily oriented towards funding the future of eugenics in the British Isles.

The primary benefactor of Galton's will was, therefore, Pearson both through personal assignations as well as an endowment for the University College of London if Pearson was guaranteed a position as chair. While Pearson was initially secure in his reputation as a scholar and department head as a result of Galton's endowment, he was forced to confront the results of his insular scientific approach when he attempted to obtain other patrons. Socially, following Galton's death, both the Laboratory and the Society were faced with the need to legitimize their existence outside of their relationship to Galton and his family's name.

This need for social legitimacy became tied to legitimacy in the scientific sense in the decade after Galton's death. Galton's name and connection to Leonard Darwin, Julian Huxley, and Karl Pearson did much to establish Eugenics, at least as a potential field before his death. Following his death, however, the Eugenic Educational Society and Laboratory were forced to justify themselves in the field. This sense of primacy in the field was especially crucial as eugenics had spread to other countries, including Germany, France, and the United States in 1910, and while most acknowledged Galton as the originator of their ideas, they also had profound disagreements with Pearson's scientific views. As a result, English eugenics, at least in Pearson's laboratory, became out of touch with broader scientific developments in the field. As a result, the Eugenic Congress of 1912 and advocacy for the Feebleminded Act beginning in 1910 became critical factors in the future of the Eugenic Educational Society.

Following Galton's death, Pearson obtained exclusive control over the Eugenic Laboratory and a chair position contingent on the University College of London sponsoring a 'Professorship of Eugenics' with the exclusive right to appoint a successor.[1] Consequently, in the months following Galton's death, Pearson attempted to consolidate the Eugenic Laboratory and Society around himself as the heir to Galton's work and trust. Members of the Society, including Leonard Darwin and Montague Crackenthrope, immediately challenged this consolidation, arguing that their separate charter, finances, and membership made them socially and legally separate from the Laboratory. The

[1] Galton's Will and Endowment Memos, 2/4/12/1/1, Box 8, Folder 10r, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Society's increased political advocacy following Galton's death and Pearson's withdrawal from politics became the justification for this differentiation.

This separation became problematic for Pearson, as his place at the University College London was dependent on keeping the Eugenics field scientific, united and worthwhile within the University system. As a result of this continued need to maintain legitimacy academically, Pearson began to lobby the University College London for funding to build a separate building to house the eugenics laboratory and to hold lectures. Research work Pearson conducted at this time was focused on expanding Mendalian theories of genetics while also reducing or increasing herditable traits in his experimental subjects. Using a paid staff to maintain the animals and plants for the laboratory as well as graduate student staff who need not be, Egon Pearson notes that while the laboratory had enough work for at least two professors at this time.[2] Despite this, the University College of London was hesitant to commit to such funding as there seemed to be no external British connections to applied eugenics.[3]

While, Galton's will provided enough to pay Pearson and two laboratory staff a salary, as well as covering the endowment for a graduate student, the creation of an environment where external applications of eugenics could be made required additional funding to purchase laboratory materials, fund publication, pay for travel and hire more office staff.[4] Pragmatically it may be assumed that Galton thought that as the Eugenic Educational Society was providing much of the publication, travel, and secretarial work,

---

[2] Egon Pearson, *Karl Pearson: an Appreciation of Some Aspects of His Life and Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938) 76.
[3] Egon Pearson, *Karl Pearson: an Appreciation of Some Aspects of His Life and Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938) 80.
[4] Paradoxically Pearson's endowed students would unanimously move to the Society after the issue with his published paper. Havlock Ellis was one of these individuals.

they would continue to do so after his death.[5] Pearson's break with the Eugenic Educational Society was, therefore, ironically personally detrimental as it required him to increasingly rely on academic and scientific legitimacy instead of social patronage to fund his work.

As a result, Pearson's funding requests were frequent in the years following Galton's death, and by the fall of 1911, he succeeded in obtaining some funding from the University College of London through an official public appeal for funds to build and equip the 'Francis Galton Laboratory.' While the funds were quickly raised, in part due to funding by a Eugenic Educational Society member named Herbert Bartlett, the location of the building was not conducive to a breeding laboratory as Pearson had hoped. Despite this, the development of an official Galton building was encouraging to Pearson, and in a personal letter in 1912, he stated, "we can go forward to the other things I dream of!" as at least the building and separate laboratory now existed. [6]

With the future of his position secured, Pearson sought to establish common ground with the Society and to further promote eugenics to the scientific and medical establishment through a public lecture series.[7] As part of this, Pearson hoped that his 1910 paper, published with Galton before his death, cemented the scientific credibility of the Eugenic Laboratory. However, his article titled the "Influence of Parental Alcoholism," had a variety of mathematical irregularities and was contested not only by

[5] Correspondence between Francis Galton and Pearson Galton 3/3/7/20, Box 163, File 716 R, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain
[6] Karl Pearson correspondence to Florence Weldon the wife of the first Galton Eugenic Scholar, December 25th 1912, reproduced in Egon Pearson's, *Karl Pearson: an Appreciation of Some Aspects of His Life and Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938) 77.
[7] To read more about Pearson's funding and the story of the eugenic laboratory see Lyndsay Andrew Farrall, *The Origins and Growth of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865-1925* (London: Ucl Department of Science and Technology Studies, 2019)

the mathematical academia but the sociological and reform academy as well.[8] In one instance, a value of 1.4 was dismissed as unconvincing when it disproved his thesis, but a value of 1.1 supporting a hereditary explanation for alcoholism was seen as incontrovertible proof.[9]

As a result, there is a general backlash to Pearson's work with individuals moving over to the Society in the aftermath. The *British Medical Journal* and *Nature* were Pearson's and other scientists' primary battleground. However, the move of the academic argument to the '*Times* in the latter half of 1911 exacerbated the already increasingly personal nature of the dispute and threatened his position at the University College of London.[10] The resulting years-long debate through academic journals and semi-retraction of the paper was a sign to Charles Davenport, co-founder of the American eugenic movement, as well as others that Pearsonian eugenics was not the best way to argue for legislative change.[11] Pearson, on the other hand, firmly believed that his scientific and personal eugenic beliefs were valid and the only legitimate eugenic path forward for the movement and the world.

As a result, Pearsons strongly resisted attempts by Charles Davenport and Montegue Crackenthrope to make Galton's work accessible to the broader public. As the sole copyright holder to all of Galton's works, Pearson's refuse became a stumbling

[8] Ethel M. Elderton and Karl Pearson, *A First Study of the Influence of Parental Alcoholism on the Physique and Ability of the Offspring* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1910).
[9] Mary Sturge and Victor Horsley, "On Some of the Biological and Statistical Errors in the Work on Parental Alcoholism by Miss Elderton and Professor Karl Pearson, F.R.S," *British Medical Journal* 1, no. 2611 (1911): pp. 72-82.
[10] Lyndsay Andrew Farrall, *The Origins and Growth of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865-1925* (London: Ucl Department of Science and Technology Studies, 2019) 272.
[11] Pearson and his coauthor Ethel Elderton rewrote/partially retracted the work multiple times. "A second Study of the influence of Parental Alcoholism on the Physique and Ability of offspring" published late 1910, "An attempt to correct some of the misstatements made by Sir Victor Horsley and Mary Sturge in their criticisms of the Galton Laboratory"(1911)," and "Alcohol and Degeneracy" (1911 winter).

block to publications by the Eugenic Educational Society for several decades. While this may be seen in his later lectures in 1911, it was most evident through his resistance to joining eugenic legislative attempts even casually. As a result, the Eugenic committee led by Crackenthrope and Darwin that met with members of Parliament, including Winston Churchill in the Fall of 1910, was absent Pearson's support. Letters to Pearson from the Eugenic Educational Society show that he rejected requests to speak at events or endorse their work multiple times in the two years.

The continued attempts to contact Pearson and integrate him into their work following Galton's death speaks both to the Eugenics Educational Society's respect for Pearson's work despite the intellectual disputes between the organizations as well as their need to access his scientific and mathematically knowledge. This access to scientific knowledge and external university credentials was crucial in the months following Galton's death. Letters to Galton from the Society before his death show that the Eugenics Educational Society was "clearing their expenses" but that there was a seeming demand for lectures from Birmingham to Cardiff, which required an additional amount of funding via a "lecture fund."[12] As a guarantor for the Eugenic Educational Society and its Honorary President, the hope was that Galton would contribute to the funding they felt was needed to begin lectures in support of laws against the reproduction of the "Feebleminded." While there is no currently available evidence that Galton aided them financially with this lecture fund, others such as Edgar Schuster and the Huxley's contributed to the financial needs of the Society.

[12] Letter from Galton to Pearson discussing Eugenic Educational Society, 3/3/7/20, Box 163, File 616, Galton Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Latching onto Darwin and Social Progressivism following Galton's death, the Eugenic Educational Society expanded their social and scientific networks into educational and religiously sponsored organizations. Following Galton's death and the newspaper disputes between their members and Pearson's laboratory, the British Eugenics Educational Society became increasingly aware of the need to achieve positive public opinion. Initial informal surveys seemed to indicate that this would be a relatively easy endeavor, utilizing patriotism as well as 'common sense' propaganda to be handed out to the lower class. Despite the concern for the fitness of the country in 1903, and the increasing social criticism of the Poor Laws and charity aid for the long term "degenerates," the interest in their work was still less than had been anticipated in 1910. This may be a result of eugenics being "ideology of the professional middle class," a tendency which led to the Eugenic Educational Society members often speaking within an echo chamber of class.[13] The class aspect of eugenic support is clear when looking at the membership lists of the Society from its creation through 1912 when a substantial portion of the British Eugenics Educational Society was comprised of professional academics, doctors, and lawyers.[14]

Many of the original members of the Eugenic Educational Society were members of 'The Moral Educational League, the Fulham Ethical Society, and participants in the International Moral Education Congress prior to the eugenic movement, likely contributing to the prevailing view of eugenics as middle-class ideology.[15]

[13]Donald Mackenzie, "Eugenics in Britain," *Social Studies of Science* 6, no. 3-4 (1976): pp. 499-532.
[14] Donald Mackenzie, "Eugenics in Britain," *Social Studies of Science* 6, no. 3-4 (1976): pp. 499-532.
[15] The range of social connections is explored in primary documents from the Eugenic Educational Society held at the Wellcome Library as well as published in the first issue of the Eugenic Review published in 1909 to show the diversity of membership and the ways they hoped to affect society.

While some individuals such as Cora Hodson worked to spread eugenic thought via lecture tours and teacher education presentations, other entities such as the Committee for the Feebleminded and a committee on birth control worked with parliamentary members and eugenic supporters such as Marie Stopes.[16] The result was an extensive list in the Annual Reports of the Eugenic Educational Society from 1910-12 of the places lectured at and the societies with whom the eugenics committees had interacted.[17] This proliferation of interests and community outreach became vital to the Eugenic Educational Society's survival following Galton's death as it offered continued funding and social connections. An additional result of this interest was the formal codifying of societal structure with a legal auditing process for financials and an accepted method of establishing external branches in the British Isles.

This expansion saw their first intersection with legislation as the Eugenic Educational Society began to advocate for eugenic policies in the British Isles. Following the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration's declaration in 1903 that the rate of Lunacy had increased in Ireland, the Eugenic Educational Society, as well as other organizations, began to advocate for a change in laws. Key to the report's argument for the increase in mental illness was the argument that 'healthy' Irish individuals had migrated to the United States in the late 19th century, leaving the poorer and unhealthy to repopulate the land.[18] This issue of repopulation is critical, as they cite

[16] The Eugenic Educational Society began forays into parliamentary intervention in 1907 but were unsuccessful until the summer of 1910 in obtaining actual invitations to present to parliamentary members.
[17] The Eugenic Society had 69 invited lectures and meetings in 1909, 47 in 1910 with the creation of 4 new branches and an unspecified number of lectures at universities,61 in 1911 with 5 new branches including one in New Zealand and 57 with 4 college courses and a summer school course in 1912 in addition to the International Eugenics Congress they sponsored. Annual Reports collection, SA/EUG/A/1/2. Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[18] Fitzroy William, ed., *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* (London: Darling & Son, 1905) 38.

Huxley and other eugenic members as arguing that those that had remained who were of 'good stock' avoided childbearing as it inconvenienced them, leaving the 'lesser of society' to overpopulate Ireland.[19]

This question of repopulation and what to do with the current 'unfit' population of a region became central to both internal policy and external research following the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration's findings. Splitting the main field of eugenics into positive and negative aspects theorists both within Britain and outside began researching which approach was eugenically best for the nation. Positive eugenic propaganda was pro-natalist with a focus on improving the quantity of 'good' individuals through health programs and education. Negative eugenics conversely sought to act through the removal of 'bad' individuals from society through sterilization, birth control, or segregation of populations. While some regions in the early portion of the 20th century, including Scandinavia and Germany, focused on negative eugenic policies to control populations while creating a national identity, others sought to use a mixture of positivist and negative methods to increase the 'good' birthrate while decreasing the 'bad.'

As a result, a study by William Chapple in New Zealand sought to correlated this information as it applied to the colonial population. Noting that the mentally unfit were unable or unwilling to control their reproduction like the mentally sound Chapple believed that New Zealand and the Empire itself was at risk of being overrun by the mentally disabled. These concerns led to the establishment of the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded, which in 1908 began endorsing a semi-eugenic approach to feeblemindedness while also calling attention to\

[19] Fitzroy ed., *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*, 4.

odern social programs which had permitted unfit children to live until adulthood.[20]

These lobbying efforts led to a partnership between The National Association for the Feeble-minded and the Eugenics Educational Society, which worked together to draft an 'explanatory memorandum' to gauge public and social interest in the 'Feeble-Minded Control Bill.'[21] The memorandum outlining their plan to segregate the feebleminded from society and reproduction was widely distributed at both societies' meetings as well as through a mailing campaign to parliamentary members. Essential to the Eugenic Educational Society and the National Association for the Feebleminded's plan was the endorsement of the bill by physicians and other medical professionals. While the organizations were able to obtain a meeting at the House of Commons in 1910, the Eugenic Educational Society was forced to confront the fact that without substantial public approval, the legislation was unlikely to pass. Regardless, prominent members of the National Association, as well as the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded, became members of the Eugenic Educational Society between 1910 and 1913.

Alfred Tredgold, a doctor of neurology and psychiatry and member of thethe Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feevle-minded was one of these useful members the Eugenic Educational Society gained in this period. As a known expert in the care and control of the mentally disabled, Tredgold aided the Eugenics Educational Society petition to the Royal Society of Medicine for official acknowledgment of their aims and support for their planned sessions on Venereal Disease. While the Royal

[20] *Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-Minded, Minutes of Evidence* (London: Darling and Son, 1908) vii.
[21] Proposed feebleminded control bill memorandum, SA/EUG/B/3, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Society of Medicine was interested in the possibility, they were concerned with how their association with the Eugenic Educational Society was perceived as not all members of the Society were medically qualified, unlike the typical individuals within the Royal Society of Medicine. Despite this, through Tredgold's advocacy, both Societies parted on amenable terms allowing for future petitions from the Eugenic Educational Society.[22]

While their scientific and social members were establishing legislative connections, the internal board of the Eugenic Educational Society was also changing. Calls for greater transparency from affiliate organizations led to a resolution during the 1912 board meeting to allow up to 40 members of the Society to create a governing board instead of the previous smaller hierarchy.[23] This governing board featured individuals with social and medical titles allowing the Eugenic Educational Society to claim further legitimacy publishing these members names prominently on their official letter heading. Following Galton's death, the subjects of the *Eugenic Review*, the organization's primary publication, increasingly became scientifically focused and oriented toward gaining general public support.

Written primarily by members of the English organization, the *Eugenic Review* was also essential to networking with the international eugenic scene.
The *Eugenic Review,* while originally simply another mouthpiece for the Eugenic Educational Society, became international in scope in the months following Galton's

[22] It's worth noting that the Eugenic Educational Society would primarily focus on VD education during World War I and were in fact commended by the Royal Society for their work. (Wellcome Library War Years file)
[23] Leonard Darwin become president at this time as well there is a tendency of sitting presidents of the Society to remain president for a long period of time. Darwin, was the longest sitting president of the organization at 18 years. Other presidents were then selected from a consistent inner circle including Huxley, Carr-Saunders, Charles Darwin II and Bernard Mallet. SA/EUG/A/1/4 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

death. While still publishing the epigrams (family trees) of the degenerate and the research the Eugenic Educational Society was conducted on such family lines, the *Eugenic Review* also began evaluating and reprinting outside published works from across Europe.[24]

Increasingly following Galton's death, the *Eugenic Review* also contained op-eds and political arguments for eugenic legislation written predominantly by Saleeby, Tredgold, and Ellis. These arguments primarily centered on a dual restriction of charity to the poor and feebleminded as well as their segregation from society. One such article titled "The Eugenic Principle and the Treatment of the Feeble-Minded" stated that heredity was a factor in poverty and mental disabilities. As a result, actions to reduce the spread of this hereditary 'taint' were essential to consider. Noting that legislation to restrict the reproduction of such individuals has already been passed with "completely satisfactory results" in America, the remainder of the article draws on ideas found in transnational societies on eugenics. [25]

The transnational connection between eugenics and potential legislation is unsurprising as Galton, Pearson, and the members of the Eugenic Educational Society maintained an ongoing scientific and social friendship with transnational eugenic societies from the beginning of their formal organizations. This correspondence nurtured the origins of numerous organizations, and international congresses held in the early part of the 20th century were sponsored or attended by members of the Eugenics Educational

[24] While a complete survey of topics covered has not been conducted, in the four issues from 1912 there were at least 3 articles or reviews of material in each issue from a French, German, or British Colonial possession such as New Zealand.Issues were published in January, April, July and October. January's issue had 3 foreign works, April had 5 , July had 3 and October had 3. See the Eugenic Review Archive for further information.

[25] Committee Appointed to Consider the Eugenic Aspect of Poor Law Reform "The eugenic principle and the treatment of the feeble-minded" *Eugenic Review* 2, no. 3 (1910)178–185.

Society or Galton and Pearson. As a result, there was an established circle of individuals, including Charles Davenport which participated in the beginnings of the English movement while creating movements of their own.

American eugenics, led by Charles Davenport, initially followed many of the beliefs of Galton and Pearson regarding heredity and nature versus nurture. Davenport's extended time studying with Galton cultivated respect between the two that lasted until Galton's death. Upon his return to the United States in 1910, Davenport began working to establish the Cold Harbor laboratory writing to Galton "the seed sown by you is still sprouting in distant countries…there is great interest in Eugenics in America".[26] Following Galton's death, however, there was a split between Pearson and Davenport regarding the use of Mendelian hierarchy charts within eugenic work as well as inevitable disagreements over correlation equaling causation of degeneracy. Still, in 1911 enough correspondence and friendship existed between the American Eugenic community and the British Society that Henry Goddard of the American organization was invited to write for the Eugenic Society on the 'Heredity of Feeble-mindedness.' An essential contribution of this work was to be the refinement of both the British and German eugenic surveys as well as pedigree charts.[27]

More significant trends of European eugenics focused in Italy, France, Germany, and Scandinavia also flourished in this period. Not yet nationalist in focus, these other eugenic movements built upon Galton's work while blending it into their socio-cultural frameworks. This led to the beginning of an 'International Federation of Eugenic

[26] Davenport Correspondence with Galton Oct. 26, 1910, Francis Galton Collection, File 235, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[27] Henry Goddard, "Heredity Of Feeble-Mindedness," *Eugenic Review* 3, no. 1 (1911): pp. 40-46.

Organizations' to further research between the separate movements. This organization provided social and scientific connections between eugenic researchers until its disintegration in the postwar era following the leadership of primarily Nazi researchers.

As a result of their outreach to European and American eugenics organizations, the Eugenics Educational Society created a subcommittee in 1910 dedicated to transnationally publicizing its scientific and social connections to advance its aims further. Headed by Cora Hodson, this branch began a letter-writing and lecture campaign intending to educate the public about the need for eugenic legislation. Hodson and Ellen Pinsent's work was designed to appeal to the reader's 'common sense' in advocating the restriction of reproduction among the mentally defective.[28] This common-sense plea seems to have been effective given the numerous letters of support the Society obtained in 1910. However, while generally supportive, the letters also demonstrate a sense of 'feeling out' if others supported them. One characteristic letter by Frank Howard then running for parliament as a Liberal Party candidate states that while he supports the Eugenics Society's goals in legislation, he has concerns regarding the general public approval of such laws and required confirmation before moving forward with advocacy.[29]

The Eugenics Educational Society changed both structurally and philosophically following Galton's death. Following Galton's death, the Eugenic Laboratory led by Karl Pearson continued to distance itself from the Eugenic Educational Society resulting in further division within the British Eugenic Field. Without the real connections to research and academic laboratories and non-hard science members, the Eugenic Educational

[28] Edward J. Larson, "The Rhetoric of Eugenics: Expert Authority and the Mental Deficiency Bill," *The British Journal for the History of Science* 24, no. 1 (1991): pp. 45-60.
[29] Feeblemindedness letters and memorandums, SA/EUG/G.1-20, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Society began focusing on the educational portion of eugenics instead of the applied practice of it. As such, the legislation as advertised to the public became less scientifically based and more opinion centered. This approach differentiated the Eugenic Educational Society from the majority of other eugenic organizations at the time a difference that the Eugenic Educational Society later regretted.

Chapter 3: **Legislative and Congress Planning**

At the close of 1911, the Eugenic Educational Society had survived the loss of its founder and refocused on forging new connections and passing legislation. Led by Leonard Darwin and other social luminaries, the Eugenic Educational Society had succeeded in establishing clubs throughout the British Empire, creating a robust network of eugenic correspondence. The Eugenic Congress, to be held in the summer of 1912, was a significant step towards achieving this alongside continued advocating for eugenic legislation against the feebleminded. While the Eugenic Society had primarily shifted to common sense appeals to the public, outreach to the medical and legal establishment continued to be scientific.

As a result, the Society created several subcommittees in the fall of 1911 to handle the different tasks necessary to move forward as an organization. Largely a formality, and often comprised of the same members, these committees headed by Leonard Darwin, now the president of the Eugenic Educational Society and Cora Hodson secretary and lecturer, worked to orchestrate the Congress and legislative goals. Cora Hodson's committee, however, was also tasked with forging connections with universities and lecture halls to spread their ideas. Hodson's interpersonal skills and connections were vital to the Eugenic Educational Society's plans and surprisingly often succeeded when others failed. A key example of Hodson's vital work is her appeal to Pearson, which resulted in acceptance after years of rebuffing the Eugenic Educational Society.[1]

[1].Cora Hodson Correspondence SA/EUG/C.158, Box 16, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

This series of lectures sponsored by the Galton Laboratory and funded by the Eugenic Educational Society members were open to students and medical professionals interested in eugenics. While the Eugenic Educational Society members, including Dr. Carr-Saunders, Dr. Saleeby, and Dr. Sturge, had low expectations for the lectures, the hope was that clarity on the issue and publicity for the general Eugenic movement would be obtained through the series. Breaking from his previous refusal to engage with the Eugenic Educational Society, Pearson justified his involvement by noting that his lectures were not oriented towards a popular audience or even the Eugenic Educational Society itself. Instead, his lectures were to be given to medical professionals and students who may or may not have been considering legislative eugenics. While this distinction seems contrived, the Eugenic Educational Society accepted Pearson's terms as they hoped his lectures would persuade medical and scientific professionals to join their cause. Contrary to the Eugenic Educational Society's belief, however, Pearson's presentations were highly focused on negative eugenics, explicitly against their social goals and oriented to the professional class.

One characteristic presentation from the series titled the "Cavendish Lecture" even called for the consideration of euthanasia. Written for an audience of medical professionals, the "Cavendish Lecture" both asserted Pearson's legitimacy as Galton's heir and pushed for the social and legislative change eugenics would need to succeed. Acknowledging the failure of the charities which have attempted to help the 'unfit,' Pearson argues that medical professionals must be willing to intervene to both boost the birthrate of the British Isles and to prevent the repopulation of the Isles by those 'unfit.'[2]

[2] Karl Pearson, *Darwinism, Medical Progress and Eugenics: The Cavendish Lecture, 1912, an Address to the Medical Profession* (London: British Eugenic Educational Society, 1912).

To achieve this intervention, he argues that medical professionals must join the legislative campaign for the segregation of the mentally unfit and a national register for the insane while also extending personal influence on their patients.[3]

Utilizing epigrams made by the Eugenic Educational Society and the Laboratory, Pearson created a narrative of consistent familial failure among the 'degenerate' that requires intervention, not by social activists such as Cora Hodson but measured medical response. Pearson argued that while euthanasia was considered taboo in society, medical professionals needed to admit their culpability in allowing the 'unfit' of society to remain healthy despite their assumed perspective that it would be "better it had not been born."[4] Given this, however, Pearson's second point was that medical professionals had an obligation to reconsider Darwin's principles of evolutionary selection. He admitted that these principles had mostly gone out of favor among scientists who had shifted to Mendelian science, and pointed to the survival of individuals who would have previously died or not reproduced because of their medical condition as the critical problem facing the British Isles.[5] Arguing that the increased survival of the disabled had upset the 'natural balance' of society, Pearson concluded with the hope that the medical professionals attending the lecture would agree on the scientific basis of the need for eugenic legislation.

While Pearson worked to inform medical and scientific professionals on the importance of eugenics Cora Hodson, Sybil Gotto, Leonard Darwin, and Ronald Fisher began a public appeal through the press and circular letters to individuals running for

[3] Karl Pearson, *Darwinism, Medical Progress and Eugenics: The Cavendish Lecture, 1912, an Address to the Medical Profession* (London: British Eugenic Educational Society, 1912) 28.
[4] Pearson, *Darwinism, Medical Progress and Eugenics*, 16.
[5] Pearson, *Darwinism, Medical Progress and Eugenics*, 11.

office as well as local administrators of poor aid. This appeal was primarily conducted through editorials written by Arnold White and Caleb Saleeby, who had previously had regular editorials in the *Morning Post.* The success of these editorials may be seen through the Eugenic Educational Societyobtaining the sponsorship of Mr. Henry Twitchin, who "left the bulk of his fortune to the Society" and had begun to donate 1,000£ annually to the Society beginning in 1911.[6] As a result, the Eugenic Educational Society began to press harder for the legislative consideration of a 'Feeble-minded control bill' and succeeded in obtaining initial legislative meetings in the spring of 1912.

The Eugenic Educational Society's Mental Deficiency Act of 1913 was derived from previous legislation regarding the mentally ill, including the Idiots Act of 1886. Passed as a result of social and scientific shifts in the recognizance of the mentally disabled, the Idiots Act split the disabled into 'lunatics' 'idiots' and 'imbeciles.'[7] While 'lunatics' were those who fit the standard definition of mental illnesses likely to be defined now as schizophrenia or bipolar disorder 'idiots' and 'imbeciles' were considered intellectually disabled and in the case of 'imbeciles' criminal as a result. Crucial to the Idiots Act was the re-categorization of the mentally disabled from 'inmates' of an institution into 'patients' with the rights accorded as such. While the Mental Deficiency Act still considered institutionalized individuals to be patients, it also sought to remove some of the rights and protections of patient-hood from them.

This clarification of the patient's rights despite their mental or physical disabilities became essential to the Eugenic Educational Society's future work. Following

[6] Memoir written by Lady Chamberlin 'Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' SA/EUG/B.11, Box 3. Folder 6/7 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[7] N.A."Idiots Act, 1886." 1887. *Journal of Mental Science* 33 (141). Cambridge University Press: 103–8. doi:10.1192/bjp.33.141.103.

the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration's declaration in 1903 that the rate of Lunacy had increased in Ireland, the Eugenic Educational Society, as well as other organizations, began to advocate for a change in laws. Critical to the report's argument for the increase in mental illness was 'evidence' that 'healthy' Irish individuals had migrated to the United States in the late 19th century, leaving the poorer and unhealthy to repopulate the land.[8]

This issue of repopulation is critical, as the Eugenic Educational Society began petitioning Julian Huxley and other scientific eugenic members for solutions centered on birth control and sterilization of the unfit. Arguing that those that had remained who were of 'good stock' avoided childbearing as it inconvenienced them, the Eugenic Educational Society pointed to the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deteriotation's statistics to show that the 'lesser of society' had overpopulated Ireland.[9] A parallel study conducted by Dr. Chapple in New Zealand argued that the mentally unfit were unable or unwilling to control their reproduction like the mentally sound. These concerns led to the establishment of the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded, where Ellen Pinsent led the endorsement of a semi-eugenic approach to feeblemindedness while also calling attention to new social programs which had permitted unfit children to live until adulthood.[10]

By the Eugenic Congress of 1912, the importance of controlling the birthrate of the 'unfit' was such that it even made its way into the Presidential Address of Leonard

[8] Fitzroy, William, ed., *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* (London: Darling & Son, 1905) 38.
[9] Fitzroy ed., *Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*, 4.
[10] *Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-Minded, Minutes of Evidence* (London: Darling and Son, 1908) vii.

Darwin. Stating that "to study the laws of heredity and practically to apply the knowledge thus acquired to the regulation of our lives" would be crucial to the future of not only Britain but the world. [11] This movement away from the theoretical social and scientific aspects of eugenics to the legal and concrete advocacy of eugenics marked the final break between the Eugenics Educational Society and the Eugenic Laboratory. This shift in rhetoric and advocacy created later difficulties in maintaining legitimacy. Stating that "these self-proclaimed eugenicists so mixed scientific and social concerns that policies were, in fact, often rejected for moral rather than eugenic reasons" Larson notes that this trend can be seen throughout the Eugenic Educational Society's lobbying efforts for the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913.[12]

These lobbying efforts became tied to religious appeals for the reconsideration of marriageable partners within the religious bodies of Britain. This was something that Galton had advocated for as early as 1905 when he argued for the restriction of marriage to 'healthy' individuals based on custom and science to subtly and popularly achieve eugenic aims. While he theorized that one day the church itself would be able to limit marriage to eugenically suitable matches, these aims would require "a revision of our religion, to adapt it to the intelligence and needs of the present time."

Attempts, therefore, to revise religion began slowly in 1911 through an invitation to British Eugenics Educational Society events and outreach to Christian and non-Christian social organizations. As a result, the British Eugenics Educational Society began petitioning various religious bodies to allow them to present lectures on eugenics

[11] Leonard. Darwin, 'Presidential Address', SA/EUG/A/82, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[12] Edward Larson,. "The Rhetoric of Eugenics: Expert Authority and the Mental Deficiency Bill." *The British Journal for the History of Science* 24, no. 1 (1991): 45-60.

to their clergy and then their congregations. The scope of outreach included religious institutions, including the Salvation Army and Episcopalian Church, as well as general religious aid societies. Interestingly, while the available letters from the Eugenics Educational Society seem to indicate general awareness from religious figures, there was resistance to a public alliance with the organization and a general questioning of the 'scientificness'(sic) of their society. One such letter from the Salvation Army argued that environmental and religious forces more tangibly shaped the moral and social character of individuals.[13] An argument against eugenics that would become more common in the later years of the Eugenic Educational Society's outreach.

When these subtle overtures were unsuccessful, the British Eugenics Educational Society was forced to recognize that religion, while it may have been 'modernized' in the Edwardian age, was still a traditionalist influence in the general populace's life. This remaining traditionalism became a stumbling block to the Eugenic Educational Society's work as although theories of nature and nurture had become standard parts of social advocacy, religious charity persisted.

What marginal success the Eugenic Educational Society found came from a minority of the Anglican church, including social luminaries such as Bishop Charles D' Arcy. D'Arcy, who was the most successful convert to eugenic principles by the British Eugenic Educational Society and the Anglican Bishop of Ireland, eventually established and become the president of the Belfast British Eugenics Educational Society in 1911. Interestingly while cited by the Society as a successful merging of religion and eugenics,

[13] Approaches to Religious Bodies, "Salvation Army", Box 60, Folder 1, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London England.

D'Arcy's Eugenics Educational Society would rapidly diverge from the standard organization's theories.[14]

With D'Arcy at its head the Belfast branch of the Eugenic Educational Society independently came to acknowledge two critical issues within the broader Eugenic Educational Society. Noting that both custom and religion were obstacles in promoting eugenics legislatively within Ireland, the Belfast Eugenic Society instead argued for the withdrawal or provision of social support to the deserving. They argued that Poor Laws and social welfare measures, by their existence, perpetuated and sustained the unfit of society by enabling them to reproduce and pass on their unfitness. This opinion became popular in Ireland through its spread in D'Arcy's sermons and letters in which he argued: "it was a sad thing, but it was true, that much of their charitable and social life was but aggravating the evil."[15]

These lobbying efforts led to a partnership between The National Association for the Feeble-minded, religious bodies and the Eugenics Education Society, which worked together to draft an 'explanatory memorandum' to gauge public and social interest in the 'Feeble-Minded Control Bill.' The memorandum outlining their plan to segregate the feebleminded from society and reproduction was widely distributed at both societies' meetings, as well as to parliamentary members by way of a mailing campaign. The Eugenic Educational Society and the National Association for the Feeble-minded plan relied on the endorsement of the bill by physicians and other medical professionals. While the organizations were able to obtain a meeting at the House of Commons, the

[14] Greta Jones, "Eugenics in Ireland: The Belfast Eugenics Society, 1911–15," *Irish Historical Studies* 28, no. 109 (1992).
[15] Greta Jones, "Eugenics in Ireland: The Belfast Eugenics Society, 1911–15," *Irish Historical Studies* 28, no. 109 (1992).

Eugenic Society was forced to confront the fact that without substantial public approval, the legislation would be highly unlikely. The 1912 Eugenic Congress was, therefore, vital to the Eugenic Society's goals of general knowledge and acceptance for their legislative aims.

The 1912 Eugenic Congress brought together the diaspora of eugenic thinkers from across continental Europe and the Americas. Chaired by Leonard Darwin and a variety of vice-presidents, including Alexander Graham Bell and Winston Churchill, the goal was to both normalize and legitimize eugenic thought on an international scale. As a result, the represented countries and organizations presenting at the Eugenic Congress of 1912 attempted to forge connections between intercontinental eugenics groups and legitimize eugenics among the externally flourishing eugenic community. While hopeful of these broader goals, the Eugenic Educational Society also sought to establish itself as the heir to Galton's work and a contributing member of the broader eugenic community during the Congress. To achieve this, the Eugenic Educational Society strove to make the Congress accessible not only to researchers but to "all who are interested in the various aspects of Eugenics and Social Reform." [16]

This accessibility was driven not only by practical concerns but also by a desire to reach the widest audience possible. The planned exhibition, in tandem with the Eugenic Congress, included not only charts and dioramas of a eugenic nature but also "relics of Charles Darwin, Sir Francis Galton, and Gregor Mendel."[17] The exhibition was designed to allow all, even the most uninformed or unfamiliar with eugenics, to be able to follow

[16] Eugenic Congress Invitation Circular SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72, File 1, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[17]Eugenic Congress Invitation Circular SA/EUG/J/17, File 7 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

the ideas within it. The use of language such as 'relics' in regards to Galton's items can be seen as elevating Galton to the scientific and even moral level of Darwin and Mendel.[18] For their part, other eugenic societies, including the American Eugenic Society, did recognize Galton as a paternalistic founder of their field. While the intentionality of the language is debatable, the implications of the association between Galton and the other accepted scientific luminaries clearly shows an attempt by the Eugenic Educational Society to reassure others that their work was just as scientific and worthy. As part of this, the Eugenic Educational Society opened its extensive library of eugenic practices to the public at this time and announced at the Congress that it would begin offering informal 'training courses' in eugenics to those who wished to learn.

Besides the social and exhibit portions of the Eugenic Congress, there was also a series of lectures given and complied with the Eugenics Educational Society's edited collection from the conference, *Problems in Eugenics*, to provide the philosophy and science behind their actions. The British Eugenics Educational Society hoped "to allow those engaged in the scientific study of this question, of meeting together and conferring."[19] Papers such as "The Psycho-Physical Elite and Economic Elite," "The Fertility of Marriages according to Profession and Social Position," and "Hereditary and Eugenics in Relation to Insanity" which the Eugenics Educational Society noted were heavily attended, illustrate if nothing else, the scope and focus of the conference.[20]

[18]Lyndsay Andrew Farrall, *The Origins and Growth of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865-1925* (London: Ucl Department of Science and Technology Studies, 2019)
[19] Leonard Darwin, ed*., Problems in Eugenics Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress Held at the University of London ; July 24th to 30th, 1912* (London: Kingsway House, 1913). B
[20] Darwin, ed*., Problems in Eugenics,* D.

Presented by Achille Loria of Turin, "The Psycho-Physical Elite and the Economic Elite" attempted to isolate through eugenic principles why the so-called 'psycho-social elite' is not always the 'economic elite' of the nation. While the conclusions reached amounted to differential birth rates and expectations among the elite of society, interestingly, Loria also concluded that the current upper class 'elite' was "at present comformable(sic) to eugenic principles" and therefore needed no 'propaganda' but that of encouraging birth rates.[21] This trend continues in Lucien March's "Fertility of Marriages According to Profession and Social Position," who argued, "The comparative study of the fertility of marriages is one of the most important…in the science of eugenics."[22] Of primary concern was the issue of the 'least fit' having the highest birth rate in both French and British surveys. After exhaustive statistical references, it was concluded that "the intellectual nature" of certain professions leads to later marriages and "anxiety for the future of the children" among the intellectual elite.[23]

Outside of the general publication of lectures from the Eugenic Congress, the Eugenic Educational Society also published an appendix to the conference where the organizers discussed general eugenic ideas, including the difficulty of convincing the public of the eugenic necessity of sterilization and birth control for the poor. The appendix, framed as a roundtable discussion of the obstacles and successes of promoting eugenics in their home countries, was meant to aid collaboration and provide context for eugenic success and failure between 1903 and 1912. The Eugenics' Education Society

[21] Leonard Darwin, ed., *Problems in Eugenics Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress Held at the University of London ; July 24th to 30th, 1912* (London: Kingsway House, 1913). *Problems in Eugenics*, 183.
[22] Darwin, ed., *Problems in Eugenics* 208.
[23] Darwin, ed., *Problems in Eugenics*, 213.

notes resistance to their ideas by "law officers of the state" who are hesitant due to issues of constitutionality and public opinion. In contrast, other organizations, including the American and French societies, noted opposition to eugenics stemming from religion.[24] This opposition was explicitly associated with the Roman Catholic Church as the Anglican Church, the Unitarian community, Methodists, and other Christian denominations had members related to eugenics.[25]

Holistically the Eugenic Congress enabled the Eugenic Educational Society to establish itself among similar societies from around the world free from the negative associations of the Eugenic Laboratory. With over 800 attendees and presenters, the Congress was able to create the Permanent International Eugenics Committee later named the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations. Charles Davenport and Leonard Darwin would be the primary leaders of the organization in the early stages, although other members of the Eugenics Educational Society, such as Cora Hodson, would act as representatives over the years.[26] The International Eugenics Federation, like the other eugenic movements, would undergo a split in the 1920s as a result of increasing division over positive and negative eugenics programs. It would ultimately collapse as a result of the mostly German influence on the board in the 30s, leading to further division with the 1936 meeting, as documented by Cora Hodson, which focused on German eugenics groups castrating the mentally ill.[27]

---

[24] Leonard Darwin, ed., *Problems in Eugenics Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress Held at the University of London ; July 24th to 30th, 1912* (London: Kingsway House, 1913). *Problems in Eugenics*, *Problems in Eugenics*, 477.
[25] Darwin, ed., *Problems in Eugenics*,478.
[26] General Correspondence and Meeting Notes by Cora Hodson, SA/EUG/G/21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[27] Cora Hodson, "International Federation of Eugenic Organizations: Report of the 1936 conference". *Eugenics Review*. 28 (3): 217–219.

The productive and scientific connection the Congress created enabled the Eugenic Education Society to call it a success, noting in their internal memos the positive press coverage and commissioning photo memory books of the event. As a result of the Eugenic Congress, the Eugenic Educational Society permanently made its library open to the public. While predominantly intended for members, records show that public use of the materials within the library was routine throughout the next decade.[28] The use of the library by members and non-members led to the creation of a monograph which offered over 80 works by the Society for a low subscription fee. When examined, the works not written by Galton and Pearson are primarily focused on alcoholism and proper family tree strategies for society.

Between the publicity associated with the Congress and public knowledge of eugenics becoming more common, membership in the Eugenics Educational Society peaks in 1913. While there was a steady increase in membership from 1909's total of 341 associated and full members, the society diversified with a relatively equal amount of female and male members in 1913, contrary to previous years.[29] The preeminence of the Society by 1913 can not be understated, while the general membership of the society remained that of upper-middle-class individuals by 1913 there were at least 47 international social luminaries including First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister A.J. Balfour and economist John Maynard Keynes who became part of the organization.[30] A large portion of the members were political or religious

[28] Eugenic Library Catalouge and Reading Records SA/EUG/J/3, Box 71, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[29] Membership roll from 1913 shows 341 male members and 372 female members' in contrast to earlier heavily male membership, SA/EUG/L/18, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[30]Lyndsay Andrew Farrall, *The Origins and Growth of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865-1925* (London: Ucl Department of Science and Technology Studies, 2019) 213.

figures, but the fields of medicine and science were also heavily represented in the 1913 membership roll. Scientific members tended towards the fields of biology and psychology.[31]

As 1912 ended, the Eugenic Educational Society had successfully reintegrated into the larger eugenic field. Records from the fall indicate that internal growth and support had increased enough to allow for the Society to move to a larger building, insure its materials and begin to allow other individuals such as Marie Stopes to use their premises for their activities.[32] With new facilities and their sudden global social legitimacy, the Eugenics Educational Society began to lobby in earnest for influence in legislation. Lobbying members of the organization to utilize their connections, the council voted to see 'if pressure could be brought to bear on the Home Secretary" to place the proposed Mental Deficiency Bill before Parliament again before the end of the year.[33] The creation of an educational subcommittee within the organization, invitation to create a year's course at the Imperial College of Science, and the acceptance of the proposal for a eugenic survey by the New Zealand Board of Health promised a prosperous and effective new direction for the Society.

As part of this new direction, the Eugenic Educational Society continued its public and educational appeals to Parliament and educational institutions. With over 500 letters sent to parliamentary members in support of the Mental Deficiency Bill, it was

[31] Oddly despite it roots in the sociology field by 1911 the eugenic movement had lost enough support that L.T. Hobhouse a leading sociologist of the time began writing academic criticism of the group.
[32] Marie Stopes became an official member of the Society in 1912. While she operated out of their facilities for a time and willed a considerable amount of archival and copyright materials to them as well as her clinic she never really got along with them as she felt the men did not listen to her as they should have and gave her the 'cold shoulder' Marie Stopes letter to Cora Hodson, 24 March 1934 (British Library, London, Marie C. Stopes' Papers').
[33] Council meeting December of 1912 SA/EUG/L.2, Box 80 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

readmitted for consideration in 1913. Arguing that the segregation of the mentally disabled from society would not only prevent the expansion of the said class of individuals but would also remove a vector of crime, disease, and poverty. The Eugenic Society used materials from Saleeby and others who had worked with families of the mentally disabled to further their cause. The Galton Laboratory was notably absent from the lobbying efforts, as was Pearson due to academic requirements preventing public lobbying as well as increased tension between the Eugenic Educational Society.[34] Despite Pearson's official absence from lobbying, it is clear that members of the Association for the Control and Care of the Feebleminded were in contact with him as were individual members of the Eugenic Educational Society, including Hobson, despite his official absence from the legislative paper trail.[35] This contact came primarily in the form of requests to proofread or evaluate proposed legislative changes as well as petitions for feedback on published works surrounding the legislation.

Without the public support of Pearson and the Eugenic Lab, the Society began to rely on the support of medical doctors and professionals such as Montague Crackenthorpe, Caleb Saleeby, Havelock Ellis, and Ellen Pinsent. While Crackenthrope, Saleeby, and Ellis had previously written widely in the scientific sense on eugenics, they shifted to a more practical aspect as well. Arguing that the biometric lab had proven criminality and insanity were hereditary, Crackenthorpe stated that he wished to "drive home some of the facts which men of science have gathered to exhibit these facts in a

[34] Lyndsay Andrew Farrall, *The Origins and Growth of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865-1925* (London: Ucl Department of Science and Technology Studies, 2019)
[35] One characteristic letter comes from Ida Darwin December 12th of 1912 asking Pearson to evaluate her suggested revisions to legislation. KP/673/5, Pearson Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

popular form."[36] Saleeby's statement of their hopes for the bill similarly combined popular with 'compassionate scientific eugenics' toward the mentally disabled as he noted said: "We are sorry for you, will do our best to make life easy for you, will provide hospitals and asylums for you, but in return we expect you to refrain from burdening future generations with your infirmities."[37]

Ellen Pinsent, who had been the only female member of the Royal Commission for the Feebleminded, joined the Eugenics Society following the results of the commission. As such, she was an influential member of the Eugenics Society's committee to pass the Act in 1913 and was later appointed to the propaganda committee. Taking inspiration from Saleeby and Crackenthrope, Pinsent and Hodson began producing pamphlets and lectures which used tragic case studies and photos of the most disabled to illustrate why the laws were necessary.

The success of this shift from scientific charts and medical lectures to library and church functions was such that the Anglican Church Congress published her address from 1910 in the *National Review*.[38] As a result, by 1913, even without the parliamentary bill, the Eugenic Educational Society had campaigned and encouraged the passing of 800 resolutions in local communities throughout the British isles that defacto separated mentally disabled individuals from their wider communities. Pinsent's work was, therefore, effective in establishing eugenics as non-scientific public health and political movement. This shift from science to general public appeals and sentiment caused the Eugenics Society to diverge from the path followed by the United States, Sweden, and

[36] Montague Crackenthrope, " 'Eugenics as a Social Force'," *The Nineteenth Century* 63 (1910): pp. 962-965.
[37] Eugenic Council"Legislation for the Feeble-Minded," *Eugenic Review* 2, no. 2 (1910) pp 2-4.
[38] Elllen Pinsent, "'Social Responsibility and Heredity'," *National Review* 56, (1910) pp. 508-511.

Germany, which had used scientific advocacy to achieve eugenic legislation as early as 1907.[39]

This shift away from scientific eugenic reasoning for the Mental Deficiency Act is seen throughout the parliamentary debates surrounding it. When comparing the earliest drafts of the Feebleminded/Mental Deficiency Act to the passed legislation, clear trends of minimizing the scientific and eugenic language are seen.[40] This minimization was such that it was even commented on at the time by authors/publishing companies who published copies of the new legislation.[41] One major difference was the shifting of responsibility for institutionalization from a sole physician/medical diagnosis to a board and judge system. As stated by a contemporary analysis of the change in language, "the comparison [of the versions] demonstrates that the Act is much more restricted in its operation than it would have been."[42]

This restriction came as a result of the backlash to the failed earlier bill, which had been criticized for prioritizing the community/human body over the care and rights of those seen as mentally deficient. The Eugenics Society's failure to achieve support from social reformers and eliminate accusations of the infringement of the rights of man resulted therefore in a Mental Deficiency Bill, which did "not represent any experiment with eugenics."[43]

---

[39] Edward J. Larson, "The Rhetoric of Eugenics: Expert Authority and the Mental Deficiency Bill," *The British Journal for the History of Science* 24, no. 1 (1991): pp. 45-60.
[40] Feebelminded Bill correspondence and meeting notes, SA/EUG/B/3, Box 2, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[41] Robert Leach, *The Mental Deficiency Act of 1913* (London: Macmillan and Co, 1914).
[42] Leach, *The Mental Deficiency Act of 1913* vii.
[43] "Mental Deficiency Bill." Mental Deficiency Bill. (Hansard, 28 May 1913). https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1913/may/28/mental-deficiency-bill#column_221.

The withdrawal of clear eugenic purpose from the Act carried into the parliamentary debates surrounding it's passing. Proponents of the Act including conservative party representative Gershom Stewart and liberal party MP Willoughby Dickinson explicitly do not mention eugenics or the Society in their arguments before Parliament. In contrast, opponents to the Act, including Josiah Wedgewood, based their arguments on eugenics and the Society creating the perception of paranoia as the Act explicitly mentioned neither despite their arguments.[44]

While the Mental Deficiency Act passed in Parliament in 1913, Josiah Wedgewood's commentary on the motivations for the Act summarizes well the concerns that some lawmakers had regarding the intervention of government in the reproductive lives of citizens. Stating, "It is a spirit of the horrible Eugenic Society which is setting out to breed up the working class as though they were cattle." Wedgewood and others began to lay the groundwork to prevent further eugenically sponsored legislation.[45] This opposition began targeting scientific and research institutions to obtain their opinions of the scientific merits of the Eugenic Society, which continued to drift from scientific evidence into common sense arguments for eugenic legislation.

[44] "Mental Deficiency Bill." Mental Deficiency Bill. (Hansard, 28 May 1913). https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1913/may/28/mental-deficiency-bill#column_221.
[45] Jayne Woodhouse, "Eugenics and the Feeble-minded: The Parliamentary Debates of 1912-14," *History of Education* 11, no. 2 (1982).133.

Chapter 4: **Eugenics developments of the inter-war years and the crisis of legitimacy**

With the passing of the Mental Deficiency Act in 1913, the Eugenic Educational Society seemed assured of future success. Despite the purposeful removal of their endorsement and terminology from the final draft of the Act, the Eugenics Educational Society used the Act throughout their information and recruitment pamphlets in the next two decades. The shifting of eugenics from science to popular rhetoric seemed to be the future direction of the Eugenics Educational Society.

As part of their new approach of popular rhetoric, the Eugenic Educational Society created an organizational holiday centered on Sir Francis Galton celebrated around the world by organizations including in Australia, and the United States.[1] While Francis Darwin gave the first lecture for Galton Day, other lecturers included Julian Huxley. Pearson was repeatedly invited to speak at Galton Day events but remained committed to his avoidance of association with the Eugenic Educational Society. With popular public events, the Eugenic Educational Society was enabled to obtain sponsorship to present a lecture series by Alfred Binet, creator of the IQ test and eugenics supporter to the British Royal Society of Medicine.

The Eugenics Educational Society, as part of its new public approach, increasingly looked at German and American eugenic contests and public events for inspiration. As part of this approach, the Eugenic Educational Society collaborated with the Solvay Institute of Brussels to provide accessible translations of eugenic literature by Galton and others. As part of this communication and exposure to worldwide eugenic trends, the Eugenic Educational Society began to reconsider the Educational Society's

[1] Memoir written by Lady Chamberlin 'Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' SA/EUG/B.11, Box 3 Folder 6/7 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

stance on the use of eugenics to prevent venereal disease. Despite support from individuals including Leonard, "the council was divided on the wisdom of their undertaking themselves such work" due to the heavily female and non-medical membership of the Eugenic Educational Society.[2]

Eventually, Douglas White, who had previously worked with lock-hospitals for infected prostitutes, successfully formed a separate all-male sub-committee in the Eugenics Educational Society to examine the prevalence of venereal disease and its eugenic impact in the population. This subcommittee led by White 'made representations' to the Royal Society of Medicine and, after advocacy by Leonard Darwin, was given an appointment in the spring of 1914 to form a committee of inquiry, a precursor to a Royal Commission.[3] As a result, the Eugenic Educational looked forward to 1914 as a year for their advocacy to continue to expand transnationally and locally.

What they could not anticipate, however, was the First World War. Between 1914 and 1918, the Eugenic Educational Society informally disbanded with members joining the service contributing to the war effort in a variety of ways. While the conflict was largely popular among the members of the Eugenic Educational Society, it was noted to be an unfortunate event as "owing to war various phases of active propaganda had a serious setback."[4]Among these setbacks was the canceling of an international meeting in the spring of 1915 to discuss the Permanent International Committee on Eugenics and the resignation of a significant portion of the leadership leading to the Eugenic Educational

[2] Memoir written by Lady Chambers 'Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' SA/EUG/B.11, Box 3 Folder 6/7 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.17
[3] Lady Chambers, Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society'.
[4] Lady Chambers, Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society'.

Society being led by Carr-Saunders [5] Individual members of the Eugenic Educational Society while prevented from international and organizational work did connect with governmental and health organizations across the British Isles.

Working with the War Office and with local family agencies members including Cora Hodson, secretary of the Eugenic Educational Society advocated for 'war relief' to the wives and families of eugenically fit professionals who had entered the service. Additional eugenic efforts during the war included "an active part in a press campaign to draw attention….in the light of the huge casualty lists and infant mortality caused by the war."[6] Ideas put forth by the campaign included tax incentives for the professional class to bear more children to replenish the nation and to penalize divorce. With the blessing of the War Office, the Eugenic Educational Society was also able to sponsor over 1,000 lectures to military members on the dangers of venereal disease and the importance of sound sexual partners as well as eight courses on venereal disease to female nurses.[7]

With the armistice in 1918, the Eugenic Educational Society hoped to build upon their war connections to continue their governmental and military associations. Eugenic priorities following the war shifted from simply negative, restrictive eugenics placed upon the poor to pro-natalist eugenics. This pro-natalism was a result of concerns that arose concerning future military preparedness in the postwar period and the significant loss of life in the First World War. In a paper titled "The need for widespread eugenic reform during reconstruction," Leonard Darwin argued that the number of casualties from

[5] Memoir written by Lady Chamberlin 'Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' SA/EUG/B.11, Box 3 Folder 6/7, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain, 18.
[6] Lady Chambers, Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' 20.
[7] Lady Chambers, Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' 21.

the war and the loss of 'the best of our time' the British Isles faced a crisis of population failure and the over-population of undesirable individuals who had not fought in the war due to their disabilities.[8] As a result, he suggests that the Eugenic Educational Society should begin considering the practicality of birth control advocacy in line with Marie Stopes's work. As a result, letters were sent in 1919 to request information about birth control and eugenic policies in Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and Ireland, with mixed results.[9]

While Canada had embraced eugenics, it was based on ethnic and intelligence criteria and was more aligned with the American movement. While discussed in correspondence, the Eugenics Educational Society concluded that while ethnic and intelligence-based eugenics were ideal, they were unenforceable and unpopular in the British Isles given the current population. Similarly, differences of priorities emerged among closer aligned eugenic organizations such as the Belfast Eugenics Society, which was advocating for eugenic examinations of issues including alcoholism and prostitution regardless of class.[10] The resistance of Irish eugenicists to align themselves with the Eugenics Educational Society was rooted both in nationalism and increased philosophical differences with the main society as the native Irish had been labeled inherently unfit in the Eugenic Educational Society's literature. As a result, in the mid-1930s, the newly

[8] Leonard Darwin "The need for widespread eugenic reform during reconstruction," *Eugenic Review* 10(3) (1918),145–162.
[9] Letter from Dublin Minister of Public Heath March 16th 1932, DFA/2/3/35, File 3, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin , Ireland.
[10] Letter from External Affairs Commissioner, DFA/2/3/35, File 4, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin , Ireland.

created Irish Free State refused to work with the British Eugenic Society and, in fact, petitioned other newly created post-war countries and colonies to do the same.[11]

Despite their failure to attract participation from British affiliated eugenic organizations in the interwar period, the Eugenic Educational Society continued their work. In an attempt to encourage future participation from external organizations, the Eugenic Educational Society expanded its research and goals in 1918. As a result, the aims of the Eugenic Educational Society were revised from the general improvement of humanity in Britain into eight different areas and eleven different means. These areas included research on : Human Qualities/Defects, Population issues, Social issues, Family record-keeping, Birth control, Fertility, Artificial Insemination, Race Mixing, Migration/immigration, Economic/Social Policies with approaches of Early Marriage, Childbearing cost help, Family Allowances, Taxes, Housing, Birth Regulation, Sterilization, Abortion, Health Certificates.[12]

While supportive of these new overarching goals of the Eugenic Educational Society, some members, including Saleeby, became concerned at this time at the continued proliferation of sub-committees among the society. Arguing that the splitting of attention into lobbying for 'income tax as applied to eugenics,' and national insurance, had split them from their real purpose, these members began to lobby for a reconsideration of what exactly their Society was meant to do.[13] In particular, some

[11] Letter from Dublin Public Health Office declining participation and acknowledging letters received, DFA/2/3/35, File 11, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin, Ireland.

[12] Memo titled "Eugenic Aims and Means" SA/EUG/D/5, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

[13] Mallet Correspondence regarding internal disputes, SA/EUG/I/5, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

members were concerned that the Eugenic Educational Society had shifted from being a 'learned society' and into a political and social movement. If so, this would create tax and funding difficulties as the Society had incorporated as a non-profiting learned organization. As a result, Leonard Darwin tried to assuage fears of tax and organizational discontinuity through continued advocacy of educational and non-political events.

While expanding its goals, the Eugenic Educational Society also definitively moved towards ignoring questions of nurture versus nature and environmental factors of poverty/degeneracy at this time. This disinterest stemmed both from continued discussions about positive and negative eugenics during the period as well as the feeling that the cleaning up of slum areas and the evaluation of the damage done by psychological factors were best left to "the innumerable existing bodies already striving to improve human surroundings."[14]

Working to diversify its outreach and aims, the Eugenic Educational Society began preparing for the Second International Eugenics Congress in 1921. Led by prominent American eugenicists including Henry Osborn and Alexander Graham Bell and featuring Leonard Darwin as their keynote speaker, the Congress was meant to encourage friendship between eugenics organizations. While attended by a wider geographic spread of professionals than the First International Eugenics Congress, the work presented at the Congress was overwhelmingly American, with 41 out of the 53 presentations being made by the American Eugenics Society.[15] Conversely, the British

[14] Eugenic Fabians pamphlet on Eugenic Educational Society's goals and aims, DFA/2/3/35, File 9, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin, Ireland.
[15] Harry Hamilton. Laughlin, The Second International Exhibition of Eugenics: Held September 22 to October 22, 1921, in Connection with the Second International Congress of Eugenics in the American Museum of Natural History, New York (Baltimore, M.D.: Williams and Wilkins, 1923))

contributions to the Congress were minimal, and Pearson was not invited at all, a snub that was lamented as indicative of the lack of communications between the two organizations.[16]

The Second International Eugenics Congress surveyed a variety of topics essential to eugenics with a shift in focus to birth control, sterilization, nature versus nurture, and the importance of encouraging the 'fit' to have larger families. Exhibits such as "The Average Young American Male" utilized composite portraiture and sculpture to show the physical degeneration of American men in the last decades. Saleeby, who attended the Congress with Darwin to represent the Eugenic Educational Society, wrote a book on the eugenic difficulties that emerged as a result of the Congress focusing primarily on the issue of nurture versus nature.[17]

Caleb Saleeby, who was a founding member of the Eugenic Educational Society, had previously worked with the temperance movement in Britain and advocated for the creation of the British Ministry of Health to advocate for Public Health needs. As such, Saleeby had consistently questioned the importance of nurture and environmental factors in the creation of 'degenerate' individuals and advocated for eugenic research on the issue. Despite this, the Eugenic Educational Society refused to fund such research as a result of Pearson and Galton's opinions on the primacy of nature and inherent biological flaws.

Drawing upon the exhibits from the Second International Eugenics Congress, Saleeby makes it clear that the future of the Eugenic Educational Society depended on the

[16] Darwin Correspondence regarding Second International Eugenic Congress, SA/EUG/G/21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[17] Caleb Saleeby, *The Eugenic Prospect National and Racial* (London: British Eugenic Educational Society, 1921)

integration of popular scientific ideas such as nature and nurture being contributing factors to 'degeneracy' in order to remain relevant.[18] Saleeby's argument was unpopular within the Eugenic Educational Society. H however, as a result of his friendship with Carr-Saunders, the editor of the *Eugenic Review*, small articles which included more recent eugenic ideas began to be integrated. This led to disputes over the publishing of refutations to these new ideas, and as a result, Carr-Saunders was forced to resign from his position as editor of the *Eugenics Review* in 1922.[19]

While revising the *Eugenics Review* to include more popular eugenic themes, the Eugenic Educational Society also began to reconsider their name. Arguing that the idea of eugenic education was inherent in their purpose and seeking non-profit status, the organization incorporated as the British Eugenics Society in 1924. To celebrate their new name and incorporation, the British Eugenics Society sponsored a series of scientific lectures by eugenicists, including Henry Laughlin of the American Eugenics Society, as well as internal collaborations with the Royal Anthropological Institute and the Psychological Society. The expansion of the Eugenic Library to over 1320 books and hundreds of pamphlets by the winter of 1924 is celebrated internally as proof of their research base and scientific standing.[20]

As an incorporated organization, the British Eugenics Society was able to transition from these spoken lectures to movie and radio eugenic propaganda. Beginning in 1925, the Eugenic Society began producing films to be shown at schools and exhibits

[18] Caleb Saleeby, *The Eugenic Prospect National and Racial,* 15.
[19] Fisher Correspondence to Blacker and Darwin, SA/EUG/C/108, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[20] Eugenic Library Catalouge and Reading Records SA/EUG/J/3, Box 71, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

and successfully promoted a series of radio talks by Julian Huxley. These talks then enabled Hodson, secretary of the society, to petition Birmingham University to have eugenic evaluation taught to social workers as an essential part of 'mental hygiene.' The University considered this course as it was based upon the "biological background of economics and social science" and therefore was not propaganda.[21] This trend of the Eugenic Society being permitted to advocate on campuses if they did not explicitly say their work was eugenic, but instead, a ' prevention of waste' or 'mental hygiene' becomes standard at this time. Insight on this decision may be seen from the religious clergy the Eugenic Society reached out to, including Reverend Hewlett Johnson of Manchester, who negotiated with the Society in 1927 to promote a series of covertly eugenic lectures. Arguing that open eugenic arguments offended the sensibilities of his flock, Johnson believed that lectures on proper marriage partners could do much more for public opinion as "until this is done the popular prejudice amongst serious people…will make an insuperable barrier to Eugenic advance."[22] Despite their renewed approaches to non-professional class individuals, it is noted throughout that 'drawing-room meetings' among the professional non-scientific upper class were still "the most profitable way of increasing membership."[23]

This question of increasing membership became increasingly important at the end of the 1920s as the British Eugenics Society faced a crisis of patronage and legitimacy. While professionalization of the science and medical fields had widely occurred prior to

[21] Letter from Tillyard to Darwin ,July 17th, 1926, SA/EUG/G. 21, Box 60 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[22] Letters between Johnson and Eugenic Society June 2nd, 1927, SA/EUG/G. 21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[23] Memoir written by Lady Chamberlin 'Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society' SA/EUG/B.11, Box 3, Folder 6/7, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain. Eugenic Memoir, 32.

the war, medical and scientific advances, as well as the continuance of modernity, firmly established hierarchies of medicine during the inter-war period. As a result, the inclusion of the British Eugenics Society of non-scientifically credentialed individuals was seen as increasingly suspect by established medical and scientific bodies, including the Royal Society of Medicine. Despite this difficulty, however, it was the exodus of scientifically credentialed and influential members from the British Eugenics Society in the 1920s as a result of internal disputes that shattered any remaining legitimacy the organization had maintained through association with the Darwin and Galton legacies.

Following the First World War, the organizational structure of the British Eugenics Society continued its trend of being dominated by upper-middle-class intellectuals, eugenic hobbyists, social hygiene activists, and a minority of scientific academics. While this combination of scientific 'professionals' and hobbyists had not been uncommon in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, scientific and medical professionals increasingly restricted their membership to credentialed members of their profession during the 1920s. While part of the more significant trend of professionalization, this restriction served two purposes, firstly it enabled organizational bodies to exercise quality control and standardize education, and secondly, it reduced the number of practitioners and competitors in the field.[24]

In contrast to the British Eugenic Society, other eugenic organizations, including the American Eugenics Society, maintained a majority membership of credentialed scientific and medical professionals considered luminaries in their field. Similarly, German and French Continental Eugenics were driven by scientists who had previously

[24] Ivan Waddington, "The Movement towards the Professionalization of Medicine," *British Medical Journal* 301, no. 6754 (1990): pp. 688-690.

worked with Galton or Pearson and who had maintained transnational scientific research pools. This enabled these bodies to be seen as 'credentialed' and given access to government legislative powers and funding. As a result of personal difficulties between Pearson and other 'legitimated' scientific bodies such as the Royal Society of Medicine, eugenics in England continued to be separate from mainstream scientific, educational establishments, and norms following Galton's death.

Pearson's opposition to American and German Eugenic models was key to this separation as was his ongoing resistance to the inclusion of non-credentialed or academic eugenic advocacy.[25] As a result of this refusal to work with non-academic eugenicists and persistent public conflicts in newsprint regarding his work as compared to the Eugenic Society Pearson severed ties with the British Eugenic Society following the First World War. As such he also prevented researchers associated with the University College of London from participating in British Eugenics Society events. Pearson additionally engaged in increasingly separatist narratives regarding the founding of the Eugenic field of science and the future of the discipline.[26]

As Heron and Davenport noted in a published refutation after their work was criticized in newsprint and *Nature* by Pearson they were "told that the Galton laboratory people would attack anything that was not in exact accord with their method of doing things and that the spirit of the attack would be bitter and made for the purpose of tearing

[25] David Heron, "English Eugenics Expert Again Attacks Davenport; Dr. Heron Accuses Head of American Eugenics Record Office of Carelessness, Inconsistency, and Misinformation, and Says That the Following of His Advice Would Mean 'the Death of Eugenics as a Science,'" *The New York TImes*, January 4, 1914, p. 14, https://www.nytimes.com/1914/01/04/archives/english-eugenics-expert-again-attacks-davenport-dr-heron-accuses.html

[26] While Pearson had been given the copyright to Galton's autobiography within Galton's will he wrote his own three volume version of Galton's life and work and restricted access to Galton's research papers to prevent revisionist interpretations of his scientific work. Karl Pearson Correspondence, SA/EUG/C/268, Box 24, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

down."[27] Continued public disputes led to a disengagement from British experimental eugenics as dictated by Pearson following the First World War and minimal contact between foreign Eugenic Organizations and the British Eugenics Society.

Pearson's disengagement and discouragement of scientific association with the British Eugenic Society were compounded when other internal issues emerged. As with all organizations, differences of opinion are vital to continued change and knowledge as well as non-stagnation. Within the British Eugenic Society, however, these disagreements caused the eventual disintegration of the remainder of the scientific core of the organization, leading to a final overall loss of status for the British Eugenics Society in the 20th century.

During the inter-war period, the majority of eugenic organizations in continental Europe and America had codified their essential doctrines of what elements socially and physically were essential to eugenics, including nature and nurture the effect of the environment, genetic mutation, and heredity. The British Eugenics Society, however, with its many sub-organizations and fields, did not share this code and, as late as 1928, was still debating the importance of nurture for a 'genetically defective' individual.[28] As a result, internal disputes between scientific members who sought to align themselves with transnational eugenic trends and hobbyist eugenicists who had personal relationships with Galton and the Darwin family became more frequent. Hobbyist eugenicists were often older with money and social connections, which reinforced the importance of being

[27] Garland E. Allen, "Eugenics and Modern Biology: Critiques of Eugenics, 1910-1945," *Annals of Human Genetics* 75, no. 3 (2011): pp. 314-325, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1809.2011.00649.x
[28] General Correspondence and Meeting Notes by Cora Hodson, SA/EUG/G/21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

connected with individuals such as Leonard Darwin or Galton's nephew.[29] Scientific members were mostly middle-class individuals who had worked their way into the established English class hierarchy through the new avenue of becoming professional credentialed academics. As such, there was a difference in opinion of how change could be accomplished with the older members of the British Eugenics Society assuming that connections and class could drive the movement forward instead of the scientific rigor insisted upon by the younger component.

This divide became even more significant following the Second and Third Eugenic Congresses, which had minimal representation from the British Eugenics Society, and was dominated by German and American eugenic panels. Without international presentations of their research, there was an additional drop-in productive legislative attempts as well as effective results, a key factor mentioned in correspondence throughout the late 1920s and 1930s. One particular example of the external and internal frustration with the lack of eugenic results or improvement is seen in the communication between the High Commissioner for New Zealand MacGregor Walmsley and Julian Huxley secretary to the British Eugenics Society in 1930. Stating that the work done by Davenport, Pearson, and Saleeby has been 'useless' in identifying the 'critical underlying factors' of mental and physical illnesses and that their research has borne no results, Walmsley is unwilling to further participate in their work.[30] Instead, Walmsley indicates

[29] General Correspondence and Meeting Notes by Cora Hodson, SA/EUG/G/21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[30] MacGregor and Huxley correspondence SA/EUG/J/22 Box 73, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

that he is more inclined to work with visiting eugenic researchers from Germany and the Americas as they had proven track records and 'verified' ideas.

This allegation regarding their inability to effect change and integrate into the broader community of eugenic science was met with concern by the council of the British Eugenics Society and outrage by the more massive member body. As a result, an internal inquiry was conducted, and the British Eugenic Society sought to tally exactly how much they had accomplished following Galton's death and the First Eugenic Congress. While the British Eugenic Society was able to prove that its internal journal circulation had increased among non-members, it was unable to refute the argument that it had failed to create concrete change in the birth rate of the poor or any eugenically based legislation including bills for taxation shifts and the castration of criminals.

Believing this failure came from a lack of prestige, the British Eugenics Society attempted to attract more credible and known individuals from the scientific fields beginning with an overhaul of their journal to meet the peer-reviewed standards of external scientific journals and a revision of tone and verbiage throughout their published literature.[31] This revision of works written by long-time members of the British Eugenics Society led to the resignation of the editors who had replaced Carr-Saunders, including Moore and Fisher, who together were the primary founders of the field of population genetics. Unlike Carr-Saunders, however, Moore and Fisher resigned not only from their position as editors but entirely from the British Eugenics Society, a blow that Darwin described as 'painful.'[32]

---

[31] Propoganda Leaflets SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

[32]. Editorial Dispute Correspondence SA/EUG/I/5 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

In an attempt to modernize the *Eugenic Review*, Moore and Fisher had permitted editorial criticism of internally written articles as well as the denial of publishing of subpar eugenic papers within the journal. Decisions objected to by long-time members of the British Eugenics Society, including the vice president of the British Eugenics Society, Ernest McBride.[33] The resulting internal and external debate led to the resignation of Leonard Darwin from the Presidency of the British Eugenics Society and the election of Bernard Mallet to the position. Mallet was, however, immediately faced with the threatened resignation from the British Eugenic Society by McBride, who was a member of the Linnaean and Zoological societies, and his scientific Oxford associates as a result of Moore's editorial policies.[34] As a result, between 1930 and 1932, McBride, Moore, and four other members of the council resigned.

Continued conflict over the *Eugenic Review* soon led to the exit of Fisher, who had coedited the *Review* with Moor. Fisher, in addition to his external work for the British Eugenics Society, had internally composed the drafts for legislation including the statement of purpose for the 'Committee for Legalizing Eugenic Sterilization.' As a result of his external work in population genetics and statistics, Fisher was both oriented toward Pearson's work and positive eugenics, which placed him increasingly at odds with other committee members of the British Eugenics Society.[35] Following his refusal to publish what he deemed subpar eugenic statistical work, he left the British Eugenics Society in 1934 to tangentially work with Pearson's laboratory while maintaining his academic

[33] MacBride Correspondence with Cora Hodson and Eugenic Society SA/EUG/C/214, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[34] MacBride Correspondence with Cora Hodson and Eugenic Society SA/EUG/C/214, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[35] Fisher Correspondence, letter from the 9th of March, 1934 SA/EUG/C.108, Box 12, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

chair. While a lifelong friend and correspondent with Darwin and Blacker, Fisher's final interaction with the British Eugenics Society in 1941 asked for his works to be removed from their library and his name and research not to be used in their works.[36]
While non-confrontational Fisher's preference for non-association was driven by his concerns regarding the association with his current research and international prestige with the British Eugenic Society's increasingly marginal scientific reputation. Fisher's concern is mirrored in letters from other external scientists who had been previously affiliated with the British Eugenic Society.

Without the backing of science and significant progress, there was a significant drop in both membership and patronage of the Eugenic Society in the late 1930s and early 1940s. While the leadership of the British Eugenics Society was conscious of this drop, they had few ideas to counter it and were also presented with ongoing internal and committee disputes. As a result, suggestions for reconsideration of the numerous committees were by Blacker and Mallet in order to commit more fully to their personal goals. These personal goals included eugenic legislation oriented towards sterilization legislation and euthanasia as a means to establish some form of change and achieve recognition nationally and internationally. These goals, however, solidified their fringe position and led to their associations with radicalism and authoritarian eugenic legislation.

[36] Fisher Correspondence, letter from August 21st 1941, SA/EUG/C.108, Box 12, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Chapter 5: **Eugenic Failure**

The society's inability during the inter-war years to maintain and achieve further scientific legitimacy is seen in the lack of any other eugenic legislation in the British Isles in the period. This failure to enact legislative and social change disintegrated the British Eugenics Society and led to its social irrelevance following the Second World War. While activists such as Hodson and Saleeby fought for social reform and the educational spread of eugenic thought during the inter-war years, others, including Mallet, Darwin, and Blacker, continued in their organizational attempts to advocate for legislation. Ideas to achieve such legislation in the British Isles were, however, limited by 'popular sentiment' and the continued problems with the legality of birth control. Despite this, the British Eugenics Society's made a final series of attempts to pass some additional form of eugenic legislation centered on sterilization and euthanasia during the 1930s.[1]

The shift from legislation such as sterilization which was seen as a continuation of their previous efforts to segregate the 'unfit' to radical authoritarian eugenics in line with Germany characterizes the increasing distance between the British Eugenic Society and british social culture. This shift to radical eugenics was the result of continued exposure to outside organizations, including the German and American eugenics societies, the British Eugenics Society began to consider advocating for legislation previously regarded as unpassable. Of particular interest to the British Eugenic Society following the Second International Eugenics Congress of 1921 was American legislation surrounding compulsory sterilization.

[1] See: Positive Eugenics Committee SA/EUG/C/268, Box 24, Euthanasia Legislation Committee SA/EUG/D/201, International Federation of Eugenic Organizations SA/EUG/J/18, Later Propoganda Leaflets 1930s SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72. Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

American eugenic legislation limiting immigration requiring the sterilization of the 'unfit' was initially driven by advocacy from Charles Davenport and Henry Laughlin, who had personally sought advice from Galton on ways to minimize the reproductive capabilities of the 'unfit.'[2] While the American Eugenic movement was focused in Cold Harbor, New York, it rapidly spread throughout the United States. Despite being centered on the eastern seaboard Indiana was the first state to pass eugenic legislation for sterilization, and an additional twenty-nine states would pass similar bills by 1929.[3] Sterilization legislation in the United States primarily targeted immigrants, poor Caucasians, indigenous, or mentally ill individuals, and while the legislation was contested in a variety of states, the Supreme Court ruled in many cases that sterilization legislation was constitutional. The most famous case was that of *Buck Vs. Bell* in 1927, where it was determined that the State of Virginia did not violate the personal rights of the plaintiff as medical 'medical evaluations and the patients' preexisting care through state institutions were considered due process.'[4]

Key aspects, therefore, of American eugenic legislation included assessments on an individual's reproductive potential and their potential burden to society through the use of public funds and institutions. These evaluations were generally required to be based upon documentation from social workers, public institutions, and boards of health and education. If deemed 'unfit,' an individual had the right to appeal the designation in court. In many cases, legislation became a means to deinstitutionalize individuals

[2] Davenport Correspondence with Galton Oct. 26, 1910, Francis Galton Collection, File 235, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.
[3] While 29 states passed legislation some states such as the State of New York repealed their sterilization laws within a year of their passing due to legal cases. Others continued to sterilize individuals through the 1970s. While it is currently extrajudicial eugenic sterilization has occurred in California in the 21st century and in Puerto Rico.
[4] *Buck v. Bell,* 274 U.S. 200 (1927) Page 274 U. S. 207

considered to be only 'slightly feebleminded.' The State of California's approach to deinstitutionalization through sterilization was noted as popular by Cora Hodson upon her visit in 1934 as it enabled individuals to leave the institution upon agreement to sterilization.[5]

Inspired by the American successes in passing eugenic legislation, the British Eugenics Society formed an additional committee in 1923 to jointly work with the National Society for Lunacy Law Reform. Modeling their proposed legislation on work done by Saleeby, the British Eugenics Society believed that the guarantee of impartial evaluation of individuals as well as an avenue for appeal would assuage public concerns with such legislation. As a result of additional concerns regarding public opinion and the 'readiness' of the public to accept eugenics, the committee would attempt to pass no new legislation but instead sought to amend the preexisting Mental Deficiency Act allowing for the detention of the unfit outside of institutions and their sterilization. Central to their justification for modifying the Mental Deficiency Act was census, and institutional data that they argued showed that the mentally unfit had seemingly flourished during the inter[war period. While the British Eugenics Society primarily blamed the institutions themselves for a failure to segregate the 'unfit' by gender, they also argued that promiscuity among the population had led to an increase of the 'unfit' and a decrease of the 'fit.' Additional public outreach emphasized that "the pick of England died fighting in the War" and that without such legislation, the British Empire would be unable to continue to flourish.[6]

---

[5] Bradely Hart, "'Watching the 'Eugenic Experiment' Unfold: The Mixed Views of British Eugenicists Toward Nazi Germany in the Early 1930s," *Journal of the History of Biology* 45, no. 1 (2012) 33-36.
[6] Letter from Darwin to Blacker 1927 on council notes, SA/EUG/J.22, Box 73, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

As part of this argument, the British Eugenics Society also began to associate the 'unfit' with their supposed cost to society. While discussions regarding the financial burden of disabled, poor, or mentally ill individuals had been a mainstay of external eugenic organizations, the correlation between poverty and 'unfitness' and the non-necessity of aid was a new approach for the British Eugenics Society. This argument against charity aid for the poor in 1923 ended the British Eugenics Society's association with positive eugenics and nurture for the poor. Beginning with propaganda regarding the annual Christmas charity drives, the British Eugenics Society argued that charity drives were futile and that the recipients were also the recipients had been on charity for generations without improvement.[7] Instead, the Society argued that generational recipients of charity should be evaluated and sterilized to end the cycle of poverty, a change that could be accomplished through public advocacy for the revised Mental Deficiency Act. [8]

Additional attempts at public support for this new legislation were made through a series of public lecture tours by Cora Hodson and Hilda Pocock secretaries for the British Eugenics Society as well as social workers. While their lectures on eugenics and the importance of physical and eugenic hygiene were well attended, the membership drives held following the events yielded low results.[9] As a result, in 1927, Blacker began sending letters through the contacts formed through the previous International Eugenics Congresses and the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations to discover how

[7] Christmas Appeal Pamphlet SA/EUG/J/17 Box 72. Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[8] Eugenic Sterilization pamphlets SA/EUG/J/17 Box 72. Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[9] Counsel meetings 1928-38 SA/EUG/L.2, Box 80 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

the German eugenicists had succeeded in passing legislation and achieving public popularities. Difficulties in communication quickly emerged as McBride, who was currently threatening to leave the British Eugenic Society, was a contributing and well-respected member of the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations. As a result of this personal difficulty, Blacker and Mallet were forced to go through third-party individuals following McBride's departure from the British Eugenics Society. Eventually, personal friendships with George Pitt-Rivers, anthropologist, and one of the wealthiest men in England during the period were used to contact the German eugenic scientists. Through the intercession of Pitt-Rivers, who invited Hodson to attend meetings with him, the British Eugenics Society was able to obtain advice and communicate with Alfred Ploetz and Eugen Fischer, who had innovated Germany's unique and authoritarian eugenic practices.

Through her experiences with Pitt-Rivers and ongoing communication with German and American eugenic organizations, Hodson and other British Eugenics Society members, including Huxley and Blacker, began to conclude that without an authoritarian political shift, eugenics in Britain would be unlikely to succeed. Despite this, Hodson's other observation on the causes of German success was that all scientific and medical schools had collaborated to make eugenics research and medical imperative in Germany. Without the medical establishment and legitimated sources making eugenics imperative in the British Empire, Hodson was pessimistic of the potential eugenic success.

While Hodson's approval of the authoritarian sterilization programs met opposition from the majority of the Eugenic Society, there is proof that this opposition was rooted less in personal ethics and more in concerns of practicality and publicity.

Darwin notes this in his communication with Blacker that voluntary eugenic measures " are the only ones now acceptable in this country. But I hold that it would be wise, whilst adhering to democracy, to own that autocracy has considerable advantages…we cannot imitate Germany, but we may agree that German methods have merits."[10]

This was a sentiment shared by Pitt-Rivers who noted that the lack of concrete eugenic results in the British Isles aside from the Mental Deficiency Act was such that without united and authoritarian advocacy of eugenics little would change. As a result, he insisted:

"It is not a quarter of a century since Francis Galton declared that the fit moment to declare a "Jehad" or holy war against customs and prejudices that impair the physical and moral qualities of our race will be when the desired fullness of information shall have been acquired. I should be glad to move that this Council be asked to determine whether we are, after this long interval, any nearer that moment."[11]

While Pitt-River eventually left the British Eugenic Society due to a lack of faith in their work, he would continue to independently advocate for radical forms of eugenics and authoritarian government structures similar to that in Germany and Italy and was interned for two years during the Second World War as a result.[12]

Despite the unanimous rejection of completely authoritarian means to achieve eugenics by the British Eugenics Society, there was a tonal shift between 1929 and 1930 in their advocacy that alarmed outsiders, including Josiah Wedgewood. Wedgewood, who had opposed the passing of the Mental Deficiency Act in 1913, was concerned with at the revisions the British Eugenic Society sought to make to the Act. As a result, in

---

[10] Blacker letters Darwin to Blacker January 24th 1938, SA/EUG/C/20, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[11] Bradely Hart, "'Watching the 'Eugenic Experiment' Unfold: The Mixed Views of British Eugenicists Toward Nazi Germany in the Early 1930s," *Journal of the History of Biology* 45, no. 1 (2012) 33-36.
[12] Bradely Hart, "'Watching the 'Eugenic Experiment' Unfold: The Mixed Views of British Eugenicists Toward Nazi Germany in the Early 1930s," *Journal of the History of Biology* 45, no. 1 (2012) 33-36.

1930, Wedgwood published: “New Lunacy Terror” to aid his advocacy against the proposed revisions. Arguing that the revisions to the Mental Deficiency Act would deprive the British people of their rights and liberties, Wedgewood was particularly concerned about the new clause, which enabled institutionalization for ‘temporary’ madness. Stating this would unfairly detain many individuals, including war veterans who were suffering from what is now defined as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Wedgwood argued that both the courts and institutions would soon be overwhelmed. As a result, sterilization and release into the community would become the norm.[13] While not explicitly part of the Mental Deficiency Act’s revision, it is unlikely that the British Eugenic Society would not have intended this normalization to occur as part of their larger goals.

Wedgewood’s work influenced Cavendish Bentinck of the Foreign Office to write numerous articles for the *Times* against the amendments. Bentinck’s most popular article, “Appeals for Justice for the Helpless,” cited the same concerns as Wedgewood while also arguing for the fate of the vulnerable people who would be deinstitutionalized as a result of the amendments. Noting that the individuals currently detained by the 1913 act received necessary care while working in institutional industries or farms, Bentinck questioned the British Eugenic Society’s argument that releasing these individuals once they had been sterilized would create an economic benefit. Drawing from victorian ideas of charity and the need of Christians to care for the poor, Bentinck additionally argued that releasing these individuals into the community to die homeless or to be taken

[13] David Barker, "How to Curb the Fertility of the Unfit: The Feeble-Minded in Edwardian Britain." *Oxford Review of Education* 9, no. 3 (1983): 197-211.

advantage of due to their mental disabilities was unbecoming of the nation as a whole.[14] While a minor part of their works, both Bentinck and Wedgewood were concerned with the precedent that detention and sterilization of the mentally ill set within Britain and argued that the rights of man which had derailed the initial Mental Deficiency Act were still applicable.

Hoping to temper the ongoing advocacy in the newspapers against their work, the British Eugenics Society began appealing heavily to Anglican and Methodist clergy in 1931. While the subsequent lectures held at religious venues were well attended by the middle and upper classes of society, there was still a disconnect between the British Eugenic Society's outreach and the enfranchised working class. Despite this, the British Eugenics Society pressed forward with their plan to have the House of Commons vote upon their revised draft of the sterilization amendments, which made sterilization consensual instead mandatory that fall.[15] As part of this final legislative push, the British Eugenics Society reached out to Pearson in 1931, sending their proposed bill and asking for his insight on the eugenic outcomes of the legislation. Pearson, however, virulently opposed their work, noting that as the individuals involved had been legally deemed mentally unsound, they could not, by definition, consent to consensual sterilization.[16]As a result, Pearson argued that this legal issue would be an insurmountable barrier to the amendments, an argument that proved correct when the legislation failed 167 votes to 89 that fall.[17]

---

[14] David Barker, "How to Curb the Fertility of the Unfit: The Feeble-Minded in Edwardian Britain." *Oxford Review of Education* 9, no. 3 (1983): 197-211.
[15] Bernard Mallet correspondence January 1931, SA/EUG/C.224, Box 22, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[16] Professor Karl Pearson correspondence Shelfmark: SA/EUG/C.268, Box 24, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[17] Donald Mackenzie. "Eugenics in Britain." *Social Studies of Science* 6, no. 3-4 (1976): 499–532.

Following this setback, the British Eugenics Society reorganized and reevaluated their approach. Deciding that the crucial issue was the British public's hesitation to embrace a term adopted and promoted by Americans and Germans, the British Eugenics Society committed itself to 'crypto-eugenics' or eugenic advocacy without the word eugenics. As the British Eugenic Society worked to revise their public outreach to redact the word 'eugenics,' they also began polling their external friends and the public about why they considered the movement a fringe or negative ideology.[18] As a result of these surveys, the British Eugenics Society created a series of handouts that framed genetic purity as a public and social health priority instead of a eugenic one. With titles such as 'Those Who Come After,' and 'What is Heredity?,' the pamphlets sought to break down eugenic ideas into easily understood non-eugenic sounding policies and life advice. With advice such as "We have forgotten Heredity, but Nature never forgets," these colorful pamphlets sought to non-threateningly discuss the principles of genetics-based upon work by Mendel and other popularly known and non-controversial scientists.[19]

The shift to crypto-eugenics created an additional fracturing of the British Eugenics Society as individuals, including Cora Hodson and Charles Davenport, objected to the shift. While Davenport's objections were rooted in the belief that eugenics was nothing to hide or be ashamed of, Hodson's objections to the covert tone lay in the implied renunciation of the authoritarian eugenic policies she had come to believe.[20] Despite her departure from the British Eugenics Society in 1932 and their non-

[18] Informal correspondence regarding society, SA/EUG/J/15, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[19] "The Aim of Eugenics" /EUG/J/17 Box 72. Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[20] General Correspondence, SA/EUG/G. 21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

endorsement of her more radical work, Hodson remained a part of the International Federation and regularly communicated to Blacker and Mallet on the progress of her work with the organization.

Hodson's *Human Sterilization To-day* published in 1934 following her departure from the Eugenic Society reviewed the eugenic policies regarding sterilization in the United States and Germany arguing for similar policies not only in Britain but throughout the world. Arguing that these policies had led to a new era of improved populations in California and Germany, Hodson drew not only on German experimental eugenics with the disabled but also the practice of eugenics on Canadian and American indigenous individuals. [21] Hodson's primary argument was her allegation that the 'unfit' who were sterilized were "without exception, very proud from their operation."[22]

Hoping that the continued American and German eugenic success had shifted public opinion, the British Eugenics Society again advocated for the passing of sterilization legislation in 1935. This final attempt to legislate sterilization led to the resignation of Treadgold, Saleeby, and Davenport, three of the few remaining medical professionals within the society. Tredgold, who had previously written against the Eugenic Society's work in 1930 on legal and practical grounds while remaining associated with the organization, became increasingly alienated from the organization over the following years. Central to Tredgold's concerns with the British Eugenic Society was their tendency in lectures to portray sterilization as a " privilege and a right of the

[21] Cora Hodson, *Human Sterilization Today; a Survey of the Present Position* (London: Watts & Co., 1934)
[22] Cora Hodson, *Human Sterilization Today; a Survey of the Present Position* (London: Watts & Co., 1934) 23.

individual and not as a punishment," a position Tredgold objected to both ethically and factually.[23]

As a result, Tredgold increasingly aligned himself with Davenport and Saleeby in the 1930s, even republishing his "The Sterilization of Mental Defectives" with additional concerns he had with the British Eugenic Society's agenda. Noting that there was no physical benefit to be had from sterilization, Tredgold states that in 1922, the Standing Medical Committee had determined it was unjust to inflict unnecessary operations on patients of state homes. Meant initially to prevent medical experimentation and unethical treatments, this medical board decision created an imperative legally and ethically against sterilizing individuals solely on their mental health/intelligence.[24]

The final legislation put forth by the British Eugenics Society before the Second World War was centered on 'voluntary' euthanasia. Begun in 1936, as a subcommittee of the Britsh Eugenics Society, the Voluntary Euthanasia Legislation Society's supporters included Blacker, Huxley, and George Bernard Shaw. While derived from the German practices being communicated by Cora Hodson, the British Eugenics Society's suggested legislation was not concerned with institutionalized or socially 'unfit' individuals. Instead, their work was focused on the decriminalization of euthanasia for the terminally ill in order to shift it from its current designation as murder or suicide.

While it may be argued that their push for the relaxing of such laws and the application of euthanasia to those so terminally ill would have eventually been shifted to apply to the disabled, there is no current evidence for this. Despite this, it is essential to

[23]General Correspondence SA/EUG/G. 21:Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[24] Alfred Tredgold, *The Sterilization of Mental Defectives* (London: Wm. H. Taylor and Sons, printers, 1929)

recognize that Pearson had advocated for medically performed euthanasia of infants over a decade earlier, as in 'most cases, it would be better for them not to have been born.'[25] While organizational letterheads and a list of supporters for the legislation were created before the war, concerns regarding public opinion of such radical legislation cause the British Eugenic Society to minimize the legislation as they formulated a way to engage the public. Test pamphlets drawing upon moral and religious philosophers, including Thomas Moore, were created in the fall of 1937 to gage further public interest in the matter.[26]

With the Second World War, the British Eugenics Society lost what little scientific and social legitimacy it had maintained throughout the early part of the 20th century. Beyond this crisis, however, the British Eugenics Society also faced alaring allegations of Nazi collaboration and German sympathy. While Pitt-River's and other members of the International Eugenics Federation in England were detained as potential sympathizers, the British Eugenics Society members were socially and politically ostracized. As a result, the British Eugenics Society voted to suspend operations and placed ads stating their separation from the German and International eugenic organizations, stating that "British Eugenics and German Eugenics are opposed doctrines and we need a *Review* in which to say it. Our eugenics is based upon and implies freedom and respect for the individual. Theirs is based upon compulsion and puts the political needs of the Militarist State before the biological needs of the people".[27]

---

[25] What is voluntary euthanasia ? Euthanasia Legislation Committee SA/EUG/D/201, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[26] Euthanasia Legislation Committee, SA/EUG/D/201, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.
[27] Eugenic Society World War Two files, SA/EUG/D.248, Box 54, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

While these advertisements attempted to clear the British Eugenic Society's name and reputation, the public and the medical establishment did not accept their shift. Noting that they had been advocating similar eugenic methods for several decades in the post-war period , Julian Huxley, one of the few remaining original members of the British Eugenics Society, was confronted with documentation from the Holocaust by medical and social connections when he attempted to engage them in eugenic discourse. While Huxley noted that the scientific research conducted by Nazi researchers was useless as a result of their non-standard victims and protocols, the harm was already done. Survivors of the Holocaust and the British public were no longer willing to entertain theories on eugenics.

Conclusion

With the public, medical, and scientific opposition following the Second World War, the British Eugenics Society curtailed its outside activities and ceased external lectures. Membership decreases led to the reorganization and a sell-off of property owned by the British Eugenics Society as well as the reordering of the organization's council. As a result, the British Eugenics Society became more of a social club of aging Victorian-era eugenic advocates facin the new realities of the 1950s. Julian Huxley's presidency would attempt to change this through a recategorizing of eugenics to genetics and a tactical public renunciation of past eugenic activities, a strategy that failed and resulted in the British Eugenic Society ending its printing of the *Eugenics Review* in 1968. Not until the British Eugenic Society's renaming in 1989 to the Galton Institute did external scientific organizations tangentially become reintegrated with the society. It was advertising itself as a "learned society concerned with the scientific study of all aspects of human heredity. These include molecular genetics, genetic medicine, genetic epidemiology, population genetics, and population dynamics, demographics, human evolution, elements of psychology, and the statistical analysis of inherited traits" the Galton Institute holds public lectures and conferences to this day.

The shift from the Galton Institutes' original scientific and social legitimacy to scientific and social repudiation is a result of both internal and external factors. While the Galton Institute's evaluation of the importance of social and religious opposition to their work is valid, objectively recognizing the internal loss of scientific legitimacy and external perceptions of that loss has not occurred. When Galton founded the organization in 1907 with Darwin and Crackenthrope, learned societies with gentleman scholars and

wealthy patrons were already a relic of the Victorian period. Early Edwardian and modern scientific professionalization, therefore, made the Eugenic Educational Society out of date before it was even fully established.

Despite this, connections with Karl Pearson's laboratory at the University College London, as well as the significant amount of allied medical professionals within the Eugenic Educational Society, enabled the organization to survive before the First World War. External connections with the American and German eugenic movements provided additional support for the Eugenic Educational Society in this period despite the fundamental differences between these international eugenic organizations. While the Eugenic Educational Society acknowledged the differences between the organizations, they believed that public presentations and normalizing eugenics would be sufficient to minimize them. This miscalculation became problematic following the First World War as genetics began to surpass eugenics as a field.

Additional issues that created a gap of legitimacy in the Eugenic Educational Society included the mass resignation of the scientists and medical professionals associated with the organization in the 1920s and 1930s. While some scientists such as MacBride and Saleeby left due to personality issues, others left as a result of fundamentally different understandings of how science, medicine, and eugenics should be intertwined. The final blow to the society was their continued association with fringe aspects of eugenics and those promoted by enemy nations in the Second World War.

While it is easy to dismiss the Eugenic Educational/Eugenic Society/ Galton Insitute as an archaic organization destined to fail as a result of current shifts in medical and social ethics, it is vital to recognize how new those ethics are. Additionally, the

Eugenic Educational Society's survival as the Galton Insitute despite its social and scientific failures creates a unique narrative of how eugenics as crypto-eugenics may survive until today. The Galton Institute's work in family planning and human genetics while seemingly distant from it's orgins in the Eugenic Educational Society shows the continuum not only in learned societies which transformed from legitimate to illegitimate but also an example of how restructuring and renaming can relegitimize an organizaiton.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acts

"Mental Deficiency Bill." Mental Deficiency Bill. (Hansard, 28 May 1913). Accessed April 2, 2020.

The Medical Act (21 & 22 Vict c 90), *An Act to Regulate the Qualifications of Practitioners in Medicine and Surgery* accessible at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/21-22/90/introduction/enacted

Galton Papers UCL

Endowment draft written by Galton 1904, 2/4/19/9/1, Box 72, Folder 1, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Correspondence between Francis Galton and Charles Darwin 1875-1879, 3/3/7/16-20, Box 162, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Correspondence between Francis Galton and Charles Darwin 1875-1879, Galton 3/3/7/16-20, Box 163, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Galton memo on research progress 1884, 3/3/6-3/3/7-1-5, Box 161, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Correspondence and memos regarding Congress of Hygiene and Demography, 2/4/19/7/1, Box 73, Folder 2, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Opening speech of Congress given by Galton 2/4/19/7/1, Box 73, Folder 2, File 3, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Internal paper on the founding of the Galton Laboratory 'Annals of the Annals', Folder 1, File 3, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Endowment draft written by Galton 1904, 2/4/12/9/1, Box 72, Folder 1, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Francis Galton "Eugenics It's Scope and Aims" May 16th, Galton 2/4/19/9/1, Box 72, Folder 8, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Pearson 's reflection on " Eugenics It's Scope and Aims" May 16th , Galton 2/4/19/9/1, Box 72, Folder 4, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Empherma from the Sociological talk containing reviews of Galton's speech 2/4/19/9/1, Box 72, Galton Laboratory Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Private Correspondence Galton October 1905 regarding Advisory Meeting, 2/4/12/1/3, Galton Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Memo to UCL from Galton 2/3/12, Box 92, Folder 3r, Galton Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Galton Lab Internal Memos 2/3/12, Box 92, Folder 3f, Galton Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Davenport Correspondence with Galton Oct. 26, 1910, Francis Galton Collection, File 235, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Galton's Will and Endowment Memos, 2/4/12/1/1, Box 8, Folder 10r, Galton Collection, University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Letter from Galton to Society discussing money, 3/3/7/20-22, Box 163, Galton Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Series of letters between Galton and Pearson regarding Saleeby and the article, 3/3/7/2, Folder 718r, Galton Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Irish Archive

Letter from Dublin Minister of Public Heath March 16th 1932 DFA/2/3/35, File 3, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin , Ireland.

Letter from External Affairs Commissioner, DFA/2/3/35, File 4, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin , Ireland.

Letter from Dublin Public Health Office declining participation and acknowledging letters received, DFA/2/3/35, File 11, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin , Ireland.

Eugenic Fabians pamphlet on Eugenic Educational Society's goals and aims, DFA/2/3/35, File 9, Folder 2, Irish National Archives, Dublin , Ireland.

Pearson Collection

Memo on Eugenics Records Office Advisory Meeting, October 30th 1905, KP/234: Pearson Collection University College of London Special Collections, London, Great Britain.

Wellcome Library

Approaches to Religious Bodies, "Salvation Army", Box 60, Folder 1, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London England.

Christmas Appeal Pamphlet, SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72. Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Council meeting December of 1912, SA/EUG/L.2, Box 80, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Counsel meetings 1928-38, SA/EUG/L.2, Box 80, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Editorial Dispute Correspondence, SA/EUG/I/5, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Eugenic Congress Invitation Circular, SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72, File 1, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Eugenic Congress Invitation Circular, SA/EUG/J/17, File 7, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Eugenic Library Catalogue and Reading Records, SA/EUG/J/3, Box 71, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Euthanasia Legislation Committee, SA/EUG/D/201, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Eugenic Sterilization pamphlets, SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Fisher Correspondence, letter from the 9th of March, 1934, SA/EUG/C.108, Box 12 Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Fisher Correspondence, letter from August 21st 1941, SA/EUG/C.108, Box 12, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

General Correspondence and Meeting Notes by Cora Hodson, SA/EUG/G/21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

International Federation of Eugenic Organizations SA/EUG/J/18, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Karl Pearson Correspondence, SA/EUG/C/268, Box 24, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Later Propaganda Leaflets, 1930s SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Leonard. Darwin, 'Presidential Address', SA/EUG/A/82, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Letters between Johnson and Eugenic Society June 2nd, 1927, SA/EUG/G. 21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain

Letter from Tillyard to Darwin, July 17th, 1926, SA/EUG/G. 21, Box 60, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

MacBride Correspondence with Cora Hodson and Eugenic Society SA/EUG/C/214, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

MacGregor and Huxley correspondence, SA/EUG/J/22, Box 73, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Mallet Correspondence regarding internal disputes, SA/EUG/I/5, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Membership roll from 1913, SA/EUG/L/18, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Memo titled "Eugenic Aims and Means", SA/EUG/D/5, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Memoir written by Lady Chamberlin 'Notes on the early days of the Eugenics Education Society', SA/EUG/B.11, Box 3, Folder 6/7, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Propaganda Leaflets, SA/EUG/J/17, Box 72, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Positive Eugenics Committee, SA/EUG/C/268, Box 24, Eugenics Society Collection, Wellcome Library, London, Great Britain.

Articles

Carr-Saunders, A. M. "A criticism of eugenics" *Eugenics Review*, 5 no. 3, (1913). 214–233.

Committee Appointed to Consider the Eugenic Aspect of Poor Law Reform "The eugenic principle and the treatment of the feeble-minded" *Eugenic Review 2*, no. 3 (1910)178–185.

Darwin, Leonard. "The need for widespread eugenic reform during reconstruction," *Eugenic Review* 10(3) (1918),145–162.gsway House, 1913.

Eugenic Council “Legislation for the Feeble-Minded.” *Eugenic Review* 2, no. 2 (1910) pp 2-4.

Galton, Francis. "Forward." *The Eugenics Review* 1, no. 1 (1909).

Goddard, Henry. “Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness.” *Eugenic Review* 3, no. 1 (1911): 40–46.

Hodson, Cora, "International Federation of Eugenic Organizations: Report of the 1936 conference". *Eugenics Review*. 28 (3): 217–219.

Crackenthrope, Montague. “ 'Eugenics as a Social Force'.” *The Nineteenth Century* 63 (1910): 962–65.

N.A.“Idiots Act, 1886.” 1887. *Journal of Mental Science* 33 (141). Cambridge University Press: 103–8. doi:10.1192/bjp.33.141.103.

Pinsent, 'Social responsibility and heredity', National Review, (1910), 56, pp. 508-11

Misc

Charles Darwin, The Correspondence of Charles Darwin, vol. 23. 1875 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) letter of December 18th, 1875.

Buck v. Bell, 274 U.S. 200 (1927)

Heron, David. “English Eugenics Expert Again Attacks Davenport; Dr. Heron Accuses Head of American Eugenics Record Office of Carelessness, Inconsistency, and Misinformation, and Says That the Following of His Advice Would Mean ‘the Death of Eugenics as a Science.’*” The New York TImes*, January 4, 1914. https://www.nytimes.com/1914/01/04/archives/english-eugenics-expert-again-attacks-davenport-dr-heron-accuses.html.

Marie Stopes letter to Cora Hodson, 24 March 1934 (British Library, London, Marie C. Stopes' Papers').

"Obituary of Montegue Crackentrhrope," n.d., https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2987002/pdf/eugenrev00372-0060.pdf

Books

Fitzroy, William, ed. *Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*. London: Darling and Son, 1905.

Galton, Francis. *Inquiries into the Human Faculty & Its Development*. London: Macmillan and Co, 1883.

Galton, Francis. *Natural Inheritance* London: Macmillan and Co, 1884 .

Galton, Francis. *On the Inheritance of the Mental and Moral Characters in Man, and Its Comparison with the Inheritance of the Physical Characters: the Huxley Lecture for 1903.* London: Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 1903.

Galton, Francis. *Essays in Eugenics*. London: Eugenics Education Society, 1908.

Hodson, Cora. *Human Sterilization Today; a Survey of the Present Position*. London: Watts & Co., 1934.

Laughlin, Harry Hamilton. *The Second International Exhibition of Eugenics: Held September 22 to October 22, 1921, in Connection with the Second International Congress of Eugenics in the American Museum of Natural History, New York*. Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins, 1923.

Leach, Robert. *The Mental Deficiency Act, 1913* . London: Macmillan and Co, 1914.

Pearson, Egon. *Karl Pearson: an Appreciation of Some Aspects of His Life and Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.

Pearson, Karl. *Darwinism, Medical Progress and Eugenics: The Cavendish Lecture, 1912, an Address to the Medical Profession.* London: British Eugenic Educational Society, 1912.

Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-Minded, Minutes of Evidence. London: Darling and Son, 1908.

Saleeby, Caleb. *The Eugenic Prospect National and Racial*. London: British Eugenic Educational Society, 1921.

Smith, Henry. *A Plea for the Unborn: An Argument That Children Could, and Therefore Should, Be Born with a Sound Mind in a Sound Body, and That Man May Become Perfect by Means of Selection and Stirpiculture*. London: Watts & Sons, 1897.

Tredgold, Alfred. *The Sterilization of Mental Defectives*. London: Wm. H. Taylor and Sons, printers, 1929.

Secondary Sources

Articles

Allen, Garland E. "Eugenics and Modern Biology: Critiques of Eugenics, 1910-1945." *Annals of Human Genetics* 75, no. 3 (2011): 314–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1809.2011.00649.x.

Barker, David. "How to Curb the Fertility of the Unfit: The Feeble-Minded in Edwardian Britain." *Oxford Review of Education* 9, no. 3 (1983): 197-211. Accessed April 4, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/1050281.

Hart, Bradely. "'Watching the 'Eugenic Experiment' Unfold: The Mixed Views of British Eugenicists Toward Nazi Germany in the Early 1930s." *Journal of the History of Biology* 45, no. 1 (2012). https://doi.org/www.jstor.org/stable/41488441.

Jones, Greta. "Eugenics in Ireland: The Belfast Eugenics Society, 1911–15." *Irish Historical Studies* 28, no. 109 (1992): 81-95. doi:10.1017/s0021121400018599.

Larson, Edward J. "The Rhetoric of Eugenics: Expert Authority and the Mental Deficiency Bill." *The British Journal for the History of Science* 24, no. 1 (1991): 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007087400028442.

Mackenzie, Donald. "Eugenics in Britain." *Social Studies of Science* 6, no. 3-4 (1976): 499–532. https://doi.org/10.1177/030631277600600310.

Sturge, Mary, and Victor Horsley. "On Some of the Biological and Statistical Errors in the Work on Parental Alcoholism by Miss Elderton and Professor Karl Pearson, F.R.S." *British Medical Journal* 1, no. 2611 (1911): 72–82. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.1.2611.72.

Waddington, Ivan. "The Movement towards the Professionalization of Medicine." *British Medical Journal* 301, no. 6754 (March 1990): 688–90. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.301.6754.688.

Woodhouse, Jayne. "Eugenics and the Feeble-minded: The Parliamentary Debates of 1912-14," *History of Education* 11, no. 2 (1982): 133.

Books

Carlson, Elof Axel. *The Unfit: a History of a Bad Idea*. Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, 2001.

Chesterton, Gilbert Keith. *Eugenics and Other Evils, by G.K. Chesterton*. London: Cassell, 1922.

Elderton, Ethel M., and Karl Pearson. *A First Study of the Influence of Parental Alcoholism on the Physique and Ability of the Offspring.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1910.

Farrall, Lyndsay Andrew. *The Origins and Growth of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865-1925*. London: Ucl Department of Science and Technology Studies, 2019.

Kühl Stefan. *For the Betterment of the Race: the Rise and Fall of the International Movement for Eugenics and Racial Hygiene*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Levine, Philippa. *Eugenics: a Very Short Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Peel, John, John Timson, Robert A. Peel, and Milo Keynes. *Essays in the History of Eugenics: Proceedings of Conference Organised by the Galton Institute, London, 1997*, n.d.

Soloway, Richard A. *Demography and Degeneration: Eugenics and the Declining Birthrate in Twentieth-Century Britain*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Stone, Dan. *Breeding Superman: Nietzsche, Race and Eugenics in Edwardian and Interwar Britain*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002.

Talbot, Eugene. *Degeneracy, Its Causes, Signs, and Results*. London: W. Scott, 1898.