

the HUMAN LIFE REVIEW



FALL 1998

Featured in this issue:

William Murchison on "The Bible Tells Us *No*"

Wesley J. Smith on . . . Dr. Death's Mouthpiece Mouths Off

John F. Matthews on When Charity Dries Up

Infanticide Chic II: Professor Singer Goes to Princeton

Maria McFadden • David S. Oderberg • George McKenna

Naomi Schaefer • Ellen Wilson Fielding • David van Gend

Read and Rachel Schuchardt on The Babycult

Mary Meehan on *The Road to Abortion (Part I):*

How Eugenics Birthed Population Control

Also in this issue:

Noemie Emery • The Hon. Henry J. Hyde • *The Weekly Standard*

Linda Chavez • Mona Charen • Kathryn Jean Lopez • Mary Kenny

Published by:

The Human Life Foundation, Inc.

New York, New York

Vol. XXIV, No. 4

\$5.00 a copy

How Eugenics Birthed Population Control

Mary Meehan

The typical account of the battle for legal abortion in the United States goes something like this: brave civil libertarians and women's rights advocates, encouraged by liberating currents of the 1960s, dared to raise the abortion issue in public and to prompt serious debate about it. Some of them started amending state anti-abortion laws to allow exceptions beyond life-of-the-mother cases, while others challenged abortion restrictions in the courts. The U.S. Supreme Court gave them a huge victory with its 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision. Yet that decision resulted in a backlash which has kept the issue in politics, and the country badly divided over it. So the brave civil libertarians and feminists soldier on in their lonely battle.

This version, while including a few truths, leaves out so many others that it is deeply misleading. A wealth of inside information, now available in private and government archives, suggests that the eugenics movement (devoted to breeding a "better" human race) led to population control, which in turn had enormous influence on the legalization of abortion. Civil libertarians and feminists were certainly in the picture, but in many cases they were handy instruments of the eugenicists and population controllers. Moreover, far from fighting a lonely battle, abortion supporters received enormous aid from the American establishment or "power elite."

It is important to note the difference between birth control and population control. Birth control, although often used as another label for "contraception," actually includes any method to limit births for any reason. It can be used by individuals or couples with no involvement by government or private agencies.

Population control, however, involves a public or private program to reduce births within a specific area or group (for example, within China or among African-Americans) and/or to increase births elsewhere (for example, within France or among the highly-educated). In other words, those running the program have a specific demographic outcome in mind. While equal-opportunity population programs are theoretically possible, in practice one race or nationality generally uses population control against another.

Population control may involve any or all of the following: propaganda in

Mary Meehan, a Maryland writer and veteran *Review* contributor, is writing a book about eugenics.

favor of smaller families; pressure for legal change such as raising the legal age for marriage or repealing restrictions on contraception and abortion; widespread availability (often including public subsidy) of contraception, sterilization and abortion; the use of specific target numbers for birth control "acceptors" and for reduction of birth rates; economic penalties for having more than one or two children; and physical coercion to use birth control.

Occasional internal disputes among U.S. population controllers have obscured broad areas of agreement. Key figures such as Garrett Hardin and Alan Guttmacher, for example, disagreed over whether it was best to use a radical or a gradualist approach to advance the cause of abortion.

In 1963 Prof. Hardin, an environmentalist who was also an ardent population controller and a member of the American Eugenics Society, made a radical argument for repealing anti-abortion laws. In an approach that would be copied by many others, he put his population and eugenics concerns in the background and based his argument mainly on the welfare and rights of women. To religious objections citing the commandment "Thou shalt not kill," Hardin responded that the Bible "does not forbid killing, only murder." And murder, he said, means "unlawful killing. . . . Murder is a matter of definition. We can define murder any way we want to." Later he said that "it would be unwise to define the fetus as human (hence tactically unwise to refer to the fetus as an 'unborn child')." ¹ Hardin had learned well the Humpty Dumpty technique:

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all."²

Dr. Alan Guttmacher, President of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, wrote Hardin that anti-abortion laws could be changed "inch by inch and foot by foot, but not a mile at a time." Later Guttmacher told another correspondent that "I am in favor of abortion on demand, but feel from the practical point of view that such a social revolution should evolve by stages." Publicly he, like Hardin, presented access to abortion as a benefit for women. Guttmacher undoubtedly believed that it helped women; in fact, he had referred patients to an illegal abortionist as early as 1941. Yet he also had other motives, ones indicated by his service as vice president and board member of the American Eugenics Society.³

He had a fair amount of medical prestige, which he used to advance the

abortion cause. But prestige alone was not enough. Substantial amounts of money were needed to promote the kind of change he wanted.

John D. Rockefeller 3rd, his family, and their foundations provided much of the money. JDR 3rd's grandfather and father (that is, oil baron John D. Rockefeller and his son, John D., Jr.) were members of the American Eugenics Society, and JDR 3rd helped keep the eugenics group afloat financially during the Depression.

While he focused especially on population growth overseas, JDR 3rd was happy to squelch it within the United States as well. In 1967 he told his sister that "the matter of abortion is the principal remaining area in the population field which has not been given the attention it should." He suggested that she join him in giving money to the Association for the Study of Abortion. This sophisticated propaganda group, which pressed for legalization, included major eugenicists such as Guttmacher, ethicist Joseph Fletcher, and statistician Christopher Tietze. JDR 3rd and other Rockefeller sources contributed substantial amounts to the Association. They also gave money to support the winning side in *Roe v. Wade*.⁴

Another key figure in the abortion wars was Frederick Osborn, an immensely talented establishment figure who at various times was a businessman, scholar, army general, diplomat, and foundation executive. Osborn was also the strategist of the American Eugenics Society and the first administrator of a Rockefeller enterprise called the Population Council. Well before surgical abortion became a major issue, Osborn promoted Council research on chemical abortion and Council distribution of abortifacient intrauterine devices (IUDs). In 1974 he suggested that birth control and abortion were a great step forward for eugenics, but added: "If they had been advanced for eugenic reasons it would have retarded or stopped their acceptance."⁵

Who are the eugenicists, and why are they so obsessively interested in other people's fertility? When and why did they become involved in abortion?

English scientist Francis Galton, a cousin of Charles Darwin, invented the term "eugenics" in 1883. Taken from the Greek words for "well born," the term is used to describe the movement to "improve" the human race by encouraging the healthy and well-off to have many children and persuading, pressuring or coercing others to have few or none at all. The eugenics movement took root in many Western nations and also in China and Japan, with results that are very much with us today.

Galton, writing in the heyday of the British Empire, shared the profound bias against non-whites typical of his country and time. In one book, for

example, he suggested that the "yellow races of China" might eventually push "the coarse and lazy Negro from at least the metaliferous regions of tropical Africa."⁶ Racial bias deeply infected Western eugenics from the start; and in the United States, it reinforced bad attitudes of the slavery and segregation eras. Eugenics encouraged superiority attitudes of the upper class and all too many members of the middle class. They flocked to an ideology that seemed to give a scientific seal of approval to bigotry against the poor, non-whites, the immigrants pouring through the Golden Door, and people with physical and mental disabilities.

Several upper-class people devoted portions of their huge fortunes to promote eugenics. Mary Harriman, widow of railroad baron E. H. Harriman, gave large sums to support the Eugenics Record Office. The Rockefellers and George Eastman (of Eastman Kodak) also backed the cause. They supported not only the efforts of academic eugenicists, but also practical efforts to limit births among the poor.

Some eugenics supporters, viewing their own heredity as splendid, had the large families that eugenics doctrine said they should have. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had six children, as did Frederick Osborn. Some later supporters of population control have continued the tradition: Former President George Bush, television entrepreneur Ted Turner, and financier George Soros each has five children.

U.S. eugenics in the 1920s and 1930s sometimes looked like a strange assortment of academics, socialites, crackpots and racists who were going off in all directions at once—a circus in need of a ringmaster. Harry Laughlin and Rep. Albert Johnson were fighting to reduce immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe. Margaret Sanger and Clarence Gamble were spreading contraception everywhere they could, but especially among the poor. Paul Popenoe, E. S. Gosney and Harry Laughlin were persuading states to pass laws for compulsory sterilization of "feeble-minded" Americans. Many eugenicists were churning out propaganda, and some were even running "Fitter Families" contests at state fairs.⁷

Late in life, Frederick Osborn would look back upon this era as one that was almost useless in advancing eugenics. Yet there is much to suggest that he was too harsh in his judgment. Eugenics groups recruited many people who remained interested and active in eugenics throughout their careers, often passing on the ideology to children who also became active. Eugenics was firmly established in many prestige institutions, especially Ivy League universities and elite women's colleges. Its influence on the American establishment, through the education of its professionals and politicians and foundation executives, was profound.

Laughlin and his friends, moreover, had great influence on immigration and sterilization policies. Others turned the new birth-control movement in the direction of population control for eugenic purposes.

Margaret Sanger—the charming, articulate and ruthless champion of birth control—was a eugenicist through most of her long career. She was a member of the American Eugenics Society and also a fellow of England's eugenics group. Her marriage to the wealthy Noah Slee and her enjoyment of the upper-class lifestyle toned down the radicalism of her youth—so much so that she suggested birth control as a solution for unemployment and labor militance during the Depression. After a 1931 demonstration by unemployed marchers in Washington, D.C., she wrote to industrialist George Eastman: "The army of the unemployed—massed before the Capitol yesterday morning—reminded one very forcibly that birth control in practice is the only thing that is going to help solve this economic and current problem."

In one of her early books, Sanger said that eugenicists were showing "that the feeble-minded, the syphilitic, the irresponsible and the defective breed unhindered" and that "society at large is breeding an ever-increasing army of under-sized, stunted and dehumanized slaves." In 1932 she called for a Population Congress that would "give certain dysgenic groups in our population their choice of segregation or sterilization." She had in mind "morons, mental defectives, epileptics," suggesting that "five million mental and moral degenerates" would be segregated. She also estimated that a second group of "illiterates, paupers, unemployables, criminals, prostitutes, dope-fiends" could be segregated "on farms and open spaces as long as necessary for the strengthening and development of moral conduct." She mentioned numbers casually and in a confusing way, but apparently was speaking of between fifteen and twenty million Americans to be segregated or sterilized.⁹

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, writing for a 1927 Supreme Court majority that upheld a Virginia sterilization law, shared Sanger's cold view of the mentally-retarded when he said: "Three generations of imbeciles are enough." The compulsory sterilization laws, aimed at people in public institutions, victimized many poor whites in the South and elsewhere—and not just the retarded, either. A woman who was sterilized as a teenager in 1928, but told she was having her appendix removed, was shocked to learn about the sterilization fifty-one years later. "I wanted babies bad," she said. "Me and him [her husband] tried and tried to have 'em. I just don't know why they done it to me. I tried to live a good life." Her husband, a retired plumber, said that they were "always crazy about kids."

One writer suggests that black people were increasingly targeted for sterilization by the early 1940s, as state institutions in the South were opened to

black residents. Targeting poor women—black and white, Native American and Hispanic—continued long after that period. Sometimes it involved mainly the enticement of public subsidy (still offered today), and sometimes pressure or outright coercion.¹⁰

Abortion was not much discussed in the 1920s, even among eugenicists, for it was a criminal venture widely condemned in the medical profession and the major churches. But there were rumblings of interest in the next decade. In 1933, for example, the Eugenics Publishing Company published a book advocating substantial loosening of anti-abortion laws. At a 1935 high-level meeting of eugenicists and population controllers, Dr. Eric Matsner suggested making abortion law more permissive, but the meeting notes did not mention any discussion of his proposal. Other participants were primarily interested in encouraging births among “good stock” or in spreading contraception. Mrs. Robert Huse of the National Committee on Maternal Health “suggested getting rid of the undesirables before trying to stimulate the birth rates of the top strata of society.”¹¹

Her committee sponsored a conference on abortion problems in 1942, one that indicated ambivalence on the topic but included suggestions for fighting illegal abortion.¹² This was a serious problem in large cities at the time. Had there been more interest in positive solutions among the conference participants, they might have set up a network of crisis pregnancy centers to aid women in need. That, however, would have resulted in the births of many children eugenicists would have viewed as inferior.

German eugenicists, including Adolf Hitler, were interested in the American experience with immigration and sterilization. In *Mein Kampf*, published soon after Harry Laughlin and others had persuaded the U.S. Congress to pass immigration restrictions, Hitler suggested that American immigration policy was superior to German policy, although he called American restrictions “weak beginnings” and “slow beginnings.” According to Leon Whitney, who had served as executive secretary of the American Eugenics Society and had become a sterilization enthusiast, a Hitler aide “wrote me for a copy of my book, *The Case for Sterilization*, which I sent and which Hitler personally acknowledged.” Whitney showed Hitler’s letter to Madison Grant, who chaired the eugenics group’s immigration committee. Grant’s response? “He smiled, reached to a folder on his desk and gave me a letter from Hitler to read. It was in German. It thanked our chairman for writing *The Passing of the Great Race* and said that the book was his Bible.” Clarence Campbell, president of another American group called the Eugenics Research Association, attended a 1935 population congress in Berlin, where he offered a banquet toast to “that great leader, Adolf Hitler!”¹³

Frederick Osborn, who was in the process of taking over the American Eugenics Society, realized that hobnobbing with the Nazis had a down side in public relations. In 1938 he remarked that American public opinion was "opposed to the apparently excellent sterilization program in Germany because of its Nazi origin" and warned fellow eugenicists: "We must keep ourselves as Caesar's wife, beyond reproach. And that means the things we do, the people we keep company with, the things we say, and the things other people say about us."¹⁴

Osborn certainly changed eugenics rhetoric for the better, but he did not really reject class and racial bias. He probably contributed some thoughts to a remarkable chapter on population in Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*, the classic 1944 study of race relations in the United States. Osborn was a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which funded the massive Myrdal study. Myrdal included Osborn in his acknowledgments and cited Osborn and many other American eugenicists in his footnotes to the population chapter. Myrdal and his wife Alva, although mainly known in the U.S. as Swedish socialists, were also eugenics sympathizers.

As a whole, the Myrdal study was a strong indictment of white cruelties against the black community in America. But his population chapter might be described as intellectually chaotic, deeply cynical, or both. Perhaps his comment about the confusion, ambiguity and inconsistency that lurk "in the basement of man's soul" should be applied first to himself.

Myrdal wrote that "*the overwhelming majority of white Americans desire that there be as few Negroes as possible in America.*" He claimed, though, that the desire for "a decrease of the Negro population is not necessarily hostile to the Negro people." He said that it "is shared even by enlightened white Americans who do not hold the common belief that Negroes are inferior as a race. Usually it is pointed out that Negroes fare better and meet less prejudice when they are few in number."

Myrdal remarked that "all white Americans agree that, if the Negro is to be eliminated, he must be eliminated slowly so as not to hurt any living individual Negroes. Therefore, the dominant American valuation is that the Negro should be eliminated from the American scene, but *slowly.*"

Myrdal genuinely wanted to improve the living standards of the black community, but believed that until reforms could be made, "and as long as the burden of caste is laid upon American Negroes, even an extreme birth control program is warranted by reasons of individual and social welfare." He said that many Negroes "are so destitute that from a general social point of view it would be highly desirable that they did not procreate." Many, he

said "are so ignorant and so poor that they are not desirable parents and cannot offer their children a reasonably good home." He suggested that expanding birth control and lowering the black birth rate could relieve "the poverty of the Negro masses" and improve black women's health.¹⁵

This mishmash of eugenic and humanitarian motivations became standard fare among population controllers in the decades after Myrdal wrote. By no means were all population controllers liberals. But some who were apparently made a bargain with their own consciences: they supported civil-rights laws and programs to fight poverty in the black community, while also supporting birth-control programs to contain or reduce the black population. Many of them probably believed the humanitarian rationale yet also had, deep down, a fear of growing numbers among non-whites.¹⁶

Myrdal also stressed the problem of sexually-transmitted disease in the black community, suggesting contraception to prevent its transmission to children and adding: "A case could also be made for extending the scope of the circumstances under which physicians may legally perform therapeutic abortions." His native Sweden had already done this.¹⁷

Myrdal was familiar with Margaret Sanger's "Negro Project," although he did not use that term in describing it. Sanger was trying to spread birth control to Southern Negroes in pilot projects that featured black doctors and nurses as well as endorsements by black ministers and other leaders. According to her defenders, Sanger was genuinely concerned about the health and welfare of black women and felt that too-frequent childbearing harmed them. Dorothy Roberts, a black law professor who has studied the Negro Project, says that black women wanted birth control and that many were already using it at the time. Black leaders, she notes, thought it was needed for the advancement of their community. Yet Roberts also remarks that W. E. B. Du Bois "and other prominent Blacks were not immune from the elitist thinking of their time" and "sometimes advocated birth control for poorer segments of their own race in terms painfully similar to eugenic rhetoric."¹⁸

Possibly some black leaders had a bias against poor members of their own community that started in the house servant/field servant division of the slavery era. But Sanger, who was white, had both class bias and racial prejudice of the paternalistic variety. By dealing with doctors of their own race, she suggested, Negroes could more easily "lay their cards on the table, which means their ignorance, superstitions and doubts." She told another white eugenicist, Dr. Clarence Gamble: "We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population," adding that "the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members."

Earlier, Dr. Gamble had suggested *buying* black support for the project. He told a Sanger colleague that "relatively minor contributions to local churches might be made which would result in continuous backing of the project by the local ministers." He added: "If colored newspapers are found to be influential it might be found effective to exchange cash for editorial and news support."¹⁹

Sanger's friend and birth-control colleague, Mary Lasker, won large contributions from her wealthy husband for the Negro Project and other Sanger ventures. Lasker was a talented strategist in her own right. She and Sanger lobbied relentlessly to get federal and state governments involved in birth control. With help from their mutual friend in the White House, Eleanor Roosevelt, they had some success. The initial federal efforts were relatively small, and quietly arranged, but they provided a precedent when Presidents Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon decided to expand federal involvement in a dramatic way.²⁰

In the early 1940s, while Sanger worked on her many projects, U.S. troops were fighting in World War II and U.S. policymakers were making careful plans for the postwar era. Much of the planning was done through a secret project called "Studies of American Interests in the War and the Peace," which was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and conducted by the private Council on Foreign Relations for the U.S. State Department. Major concerns included postwar access to the rich natural resources of colonial areas and the possibility of finding markets everywhere for American products.

Frank Notestein—a eugenicist, an economist/demographer, and a friend and colleague of Frederick Osborn—wrote a paper on population for the project. Rapid population growth in colonial areas, he suggested, would result in great hardships for some of them, including hunger, disease and war. Such areas, he said, "will be increasingly expensive and troublesome to administer, and unsatisfactory to do business with." He proposed a program of modernization for the colonies, including the development of industries that would "draw a surplus and ineffective agricultural population into effective production," the use of popular education "to create new wants for physical and material well-being" and "propaganda in favor of controlled fertility as an integral part of a public health program."²¹ Notestein's proposals for manipulating entire societies had profound effects on other population experts and eventually on government policy.

Jacob Viner, a noted economist, also wrote a paper for the war/peace studies in which he remarked that "higher-standard-of-living populations" made better trading partners for the West than did "low-standard populations even

if greater in size." Lower birth rates in the "backward areas," Viner suggested, were "very much to the interest of the United States."²² This point was extremely important to the businessmen who participated in the Council on Foreign Relations and had great influence on U.S. foreign policy.

As American private and public agencies developed programs of population control over the next several decades, they stressed humanitarian objectives such as fighting poverty and famine and improving the status of women. Some of the population controllers, such as Notestein, actually believed the humanitarian rationale, at least in an abstract or paternalistic way. They did not, however, sit down with poor people as equals to discuss the matter; instead, *they* decided what poor people should have and then manipulated the poor to accept it.

For many population controllers, the humanitarian rationale was a cover for other motivations: (1) the eugenicists' desire to breed a "better" human race by suppressing the birth rate of poor people and non-whites; (2) the goal of retaining access to the natural resources of the old colonial areas and of developing markets there; and (3) as the Cold War intensified, a decision by U.S. leaders to use population control as a way of keeping the lid on poor nations so they would not fall victim to Communist take-overs. These three motivations reinforced one another; all of them were oriented toward keeping the industrialized West, and especially the U.S., dominant in the world.

After World War II, eugenicists started two organizations to promote population control in ex-colonial nations. (Populations there were increasing even more rapidly than predicted because of improved disease control.) Margaret Sanger, C. P. Blacker of England's Eugenics Society, and others formed the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), which now has worldwide national affiliates. John D. Rockefeller 3rd and Frederick Osborn launched the Population Council, a private foundation that first convinced government leaders in poor nations that they had a serious population problem and then showed them how to solve it through population control.

Osborn, who was the key administrator of the Population Council in its early years, wanted it to keep a low profile in order to avoid charges of U.S. imperialism. At the Council's 1952 founding conference, he had asked, "Supposing a perfect contraceptive should be developed. Should it be announced by the University of Chicago, or Bellevue Hospital . . . or should it get its final development in Japan or India, so it would appear to spring from there?" Using grants and fellowships, he started building in the poor nations a network of population experts with career interests in population control. "We were trying to help foreign countries with large grants," he said years later, "and it was far better to do it quietly, without the public in the foreign countries

knowing that this was an American effort."²³

Osborn, Rockefeller and their colleagues were eager to develop birth-control drugs and devices that could be distributed on a massive basis both at home and abroad. They were interested in chemical abortifacients; for example, they funded research by Dr. J. B. Thiersch on "anti-metabolites" to induce early abortion. Documents on this project show a remarkable lack of concern about its ethical problems—not only abortion, but also the occasional disguise of the project as one involving only "the rat litter and fetus *in utero*" and the use of "institutionalized patients" for toxicity studies. Osborn was concerned about *legal* problems, though, at a time when abortion was illegal in all states with limited exceptions. Noting that an early Thiersch grant application did not "say explicitly that the people he is going to experiment on will be exclusively women certified for therapeutic abortion," Osborn asked, "Shouldn't we be so protected in making the grant?"²⁴

The Population Council also put great effort into developing and distributing intrauterine devices, or IUDs. (An IUD can either prevent conception—that is, fertilization—or prevent implantation of the embryo in the womb, thus causing an early abortion.) In 1966 Osborn told a correspondent that the Council was spending major sums on IUDs, adding: "We have felt this could be done far more effectively in the name of the Population Council than in the name of eugenics . . . Personally, I think it the most important practical eugenic measure ever taken."²⁵

Possible medical complications of IUDs include cramps, heavy bleeding, anemia, uterine perforation, pelvic infection, infertility, ectopic pregnancy, and even septic abortion and death. Feminist Betsy Hartmann says that the "mortality rate from IUDs in the Third World is roughly *double* that in the West" and the infertility sometimes caused by IUDs can lead to "social ostracism, abandonment, and ultimately destitution" for women.²⁶

Long ago, population controllers worked out a way to deflect criticism of abortifacient drugs and devices. At a 1959 conference, one expert suggested "a prudent habit of speech," hinting that it would be wise to consider implantation—rather than fertilization—the beginning of pregnancy. In 1962, in its "model penal code" project, the American Law Institute recommended legalizing the use of "drugs or other substances for avoiding pregnancy, whether by preventing implantation of a fertilized ovum or by any other method that operates before, at or immediately after fertilization."

In a 1964 Population Council conference, eugenicist Dr. Christopher Tietze pointedly reminded his colleagues that theologians and jurists do listen to doctors and biologists. "If a medical consensus develops and is maintained

that pregnancy, and therefore life, begins at implantation, eventually our brethren from the other faculties will listen," he said. A committee of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists soon obliged Tietze by defining conception as "the implantation of a fertilized ovum."²⁷ With that kind of support, the population controllers were off to the races, developing more and more abortifacients, which they usually referred to as "contraceptives" or simply "birth control." The IUDs and the later Norplant devices have proved useful in coercive population control, such as that in China, since it can be difficult and dangerous for non-physicians to remove them.²⁸

The second and final part of this series will show the growth of population control with strong government support, using President Richard Nixon's administration as an example. It will also explain how eugenicists and population controllers played a key role in the legalization of abortion in the United States and the promotion of abortion overseas.

Notes

Here are the locations of manuscript collections cited in the notes below:

- American Eugenics Society Archives, American Philosophical Society Library, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Carnegie Institution of Washington Archive, Washington, D.C.
- Clarence J. Gamble Archive, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, Boston, Mass.
- Alan F. Guttmacher Papers, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, Boston, Mass.
- Norman E. Himes Archive, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, Boston, Mass.
- Ellsworth Huntington Papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn.
- National Committee on Maternal Health Archive, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, Boston, Mass.
- Frederick Henry Osborn Papers, American Philosophical Society Library, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Population Council Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Sleepy Hollow, N.Y.
- Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Sleepy Hollow, N.Y.
- Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Sleepy Hollow, N.Y.
- Margaret Sanger Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

The writer is most grateful to archives staff for their assistance and, where needed, for permission to quote from their documents.

Statements about membership in the American Eugenics Society (later called the Society for the Study of Social Biology), unless otherwise indicated, are based on the 1930 membership list in the Margaret Sanger Papers, microfilm reel 41; the Eugenics Quarterly (especially the membership list in the Dec., 1956 issue); or issues of Social Biology.

Statements about membership or fellowship in England's Eugenics Society are based on 1928 and 1944 lists in the Norman E. Himes Archive, box 7, folder 78; an Aug., 1957, list bound with 1957 issues of Eugenics Review, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md.; and Eugenics Watch, "The British Eugenics Society, 1907 to 1994," posted on the Internet (www.africa2000.com).

1. Garrett Hardin, *Stalking the Wild Taboo* (Los Altos, Calif., 1973), pp. 24-25 & 66. Hardin was a member of the American Eugenics Society as early as 1956. He served on its board in 1972 and remained on it in 1973-74 after the group changed its name to Society for the Study of Social Biology.
2. Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There* (New York, 1993), p. 124.
3. Alan F. Guttmacher to Garrett Hardin, Dec. 30, 1963, Guttmacher Papers, box 1; Guttmacher to Emily C. Moore, Dec. 20, 1968, *ibid.*, box 2; and Dr. Regine K. Stix to Dr. Boudreau, Feb. 11, 1941, National Committee on Maternal Health Archive, box 9. Guttmacher was vice president of the American Eugenics Society in 1956-1963 and was on its board in 1955 and 1964-1966.
4. Typed copy of John D. Rockefeller 3rd [hereafter JDR 3rd] to Frederick Osborn, June 30, 1936, Huntington Papers, Group 1, Series III, box 77; Rudolph Bertheau to Robert C. Cook, March 12, 1942, *ibid.*, box 88; JDR 3rd to Mrs. Jean Mauze, Jan. 12, 1967, Record Group 3 (JDR 3rd, unprocessed), box 388, Rockefeller Archive Center [hereafter RAC]; folder on "Association for the Study of Abortion," *ibid.*; "John D. Rockefeller 3rd Contributions in the Area of Abortion, 1966-1978," April 24, 1978, Record Group 5 (JDR 3rd, General, unprocessed), box 3, RAC; Record Group (A 79) (Rockefeller Foundation), Series 200A, folders on "Madison Const. Law Institute," RAC. (Note: All JDR 3rd materials recently have been processed and reorganized as Record Group 5.)
5. Frederick Osborn, "Notes on Markle and Fox . . .," Jan. 25, 1974, Osborn Papers, folder on "Osborn—Paper—Notes on 'Paradigms or Public Relations . . .'"
6. Francis Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development* (London, 1883), pp. 24-25 & 316-317.
7. Daniel J. Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics* (New York, 1985), pp. 54-56 & 60; Rockefeller Foundation, 1913-14 annual report; folder on "Genetics-Eugenics Record Office/Finance 1918-1940," Carnegie Institution of Washington Archive; Ellen Chesler, *Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America* (New York, 1992), *passim*; and Elizabeth Brayer, George Eastman (Baltimore, 1996), pp. 474-476. See *Who's Who in America* and *Who Was Who in America* for information on family size of noted population controllers.
8. Frederick Osborn, "Notes on Markle and Fox . . .," *op. cit.* (n.5).
9. Margaret Sanger to George Eastman, Dec. 8, 1931, Sanger Papers, microfilm reel 51; Margaret Sanger, *The Pivot of Civilization* (New York, 1922), p. 175; and Margaret Sanger in *Birth Control Review*, vol. 16, no. 4 (April, 1932), pp. 107-108. Sanger appeared on the 1930 and 1956 membership lists of the American Eugenics Society. She was listed as a fellow of England's Eugenics Society in 1928, 1944 and 1957.
10. *Buck v. Bell*, 274 U.S. 200, 207 (1927); *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, Feb. 23, 1980; and Dorothy Roberts, *Killing the Black Body* (New York, 1997), pp. 89-98.

11. David Garrow, *Liberty & Sexuality: the Right to Privacy and the Making of Roe v. Wade* (New York, 1994), p. 273; and "Notes on Meeting of Council on Population Policy," Nov. 7, 1935, pp. II & I, Osborn Papers, folder on "Council on Population Policy."
12. National Committee on Maternal Health, *The Abortion Problem* (Baltimore, 1944).
13. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. by Ralph Manheim (Boston, 1971, original German version published in 1925-1926), pp. 439-440; Leon Fradley Whitney, (unpublished) autobiography manuscript, pp. 204-205, American Philosophical Society Library, Philadelphia; *Time* magazine, Sept. 9, 1935, pp. 20-21; *New York Times*, Aug. 29-31, 1935; and Stefan Kühl, *The Nazi Connection* (New York, 1994), pp. 26, 27, 32-35 & 85.
14. "American Eugenics Society, Annual Meeting—May 5, 1938," pp. 2 & 1, American Eugenics Society Archives, "Osborn, Frederick Papers I," folder 9. At various times, Osborn served as president, secretary, treasurer and/or board member of the Society; he was its key strategist for about 40 years.
15. Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York, 1962, anniv. ed.), pp. lxix & 167-178, emphasis in original. See Nils Roll-Hansen in *British Journal for the History of Science*, vol. 22, part 3, no. 74 (Sept., 1989), p. 342 on Gunnar Myrdal's role in proposing sterilization for handicapped people in Sweden. Alva Myrdal, Gunnar's wife, apparently was a member of the American Eugenics Society; see Norman E. Himes Archive, box 5, folder 56.
16. Myrdal, *op. cit.* (n. 15), pp. 1017-1018; and Hodding Carter III, *The South Strikes Back* (Garden City, N.Y., 1959), pp. 209-210.
17. Myrdal, *op. cit.* (n. 15), p. 177; and Alva Myrdal, *Nation and Family* (London, 1945), pp. 205-212.
18. Roberts, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 82-85.
19. Margaret Sanger to C.J. Gamble, Dec. 10, 1939, Clarence J. Gamble Archive, box 195; and "CJG" to Miss Rose, Nov. 26, 1939, *ibid.*, box 136.
20. David M. Kennedy, *Birth Control in America: The Career of Margaret Sanger* (New Haven, Conn., 1970), pp. 259-267; and Chesler, *op. cit.* (n. 7), pp. 387-391.
21. Frank W. Notestein, "Problems of Policy Toward Areas of Heavy Population Pressure," No. T-B 72, April 21, 1944, pp. 6 & 11, in Council on Foreign Relations, *Studies of American Interests in the War and the Peace* (New York, 1944).
22. Jacob Viner, "The United States and the 'Colonial Problem,'" No. E-B 71, June 24, 1944, pp. 10-11, in *ibid.*
23. Beryl Suitters, *Be Brave and Angry: Chronicles of the International Planned Parenthood Federation* (London, 1973); National Academy of Sciences, transcript of "Conference on Population Problems," Williamsburg, Va., June 21, 1952, afternoon session, p. 16, Record Group 2 (JDR 3rd, unprocessed), box 44 (but recently reorganized under Record Group 5), RAC; and Frederick Osborn, *Voyage to a New World, 1889-1979* (Garrison, N.Y., 1979), p. 133.
24. Population Council, 1956, 1957 & 1958 annual reports; Frederick Osborn to Laurance S. Rockefeller, March 31, 1955, Record Group IV3B4.2 (Population Council), box 16, RAC; Frederick Osborn to Warren Nelson, Dec. 6, 1954, *ibid.*
25. Frederick Osborn to P.R.U. Stratton, Jan. 12, 1966, American Eugenics Society Archives, folder on "Osborn, Frederick, Letters on Eugenics."
26. "Patient Package Insert" for ParaGuard T 380A, n.d. (received from Food and Drug Administration in May, 1998); Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs* (Boston, 1995, rev. ed.), p. 218.
27. Carl G. Hartman, ed., *Mechanisms Concerned with Conception* (Oxford, 1963), p. 386; American Law Institute, *Model Penal Code: Official Draft and Explanatory Notes* (Philadelphia, 1985), pp. 165-166; S.J. Segal et al., ed., *Intra-Uterine Contraception* (Amsterdam, 1965), p. 213; ACOG Terminology Bulletin, no. 1 (Sept., 1965); and Germain Grisez, *Abortion: the Myths, the Realities, and the Arguments* (New York, 1970), pp. 111-116. Dr. Tietze was listed as a member of England's Eugenics Society in 1948, 1957 & 1977.
28. Hartmann, *op. cit.* (n. 26), pp. 77, 164, 180, 211 & 218; and British Broadcasting Corporation, transcript of "The Human Laboratory," Nov. 6, 1995. See, also, Barbara Mintzes et al., ed., *Norplant: Under Her Skin* (Delft, The Netherlands, 1993).