



The Evolution of Genocide

PART 1

Believing abortion is a stand-alone issue is like believing egg yolks appear by themselves without egg whites, shells, and male and female chickens. My greatest mistake as a pro-life person was in thinking *Roe v. Wade* arrived by itself. I didn't want to link abortion to other controversial subjects, which scared or confused me, detracting from the obvious atrocity of butchering a living, unborn child. Because of my narrow focus, I ignored the horrific world-view and the socio-political-financial machinery fueling abortion.

While reading the newspaper in May 1999, I noticed a headline about an evolution controversy occupying the Kansas State Board of Education. I flipped the page without reading the story. Like many pro-life people, I felt that the origin of the species was a matter of God's choice of methods—but not a pro-life concern. Busy in local pro-life matters, I believed evolution was an "education dispute," a controversy I could, gratefully, sit out. When a metro-area newspaper reporter sought my opinion on the proposed science standards, my cautious response was, having not read them, to remind the reporter that evolution in the wrong hands had supported the bloodiest regimes in history. The reporter urged me to read the science standards, assuring me there was "nothing to offend."

I did read them, and went on to research the history and content of the "national science education standards," a national model on which the Kansas science standards are based. I realized that evolution by natural selection has been the fundamental pro-life issue since Darwin himself. His argument that biologically inferior people threaten to deprive intellectually superior people of food and resources established a scientific-sounding rationale for genocide, which is used today by the abortion-based population control and family planning establishments, as well as others bent to this day on improving the race by laboratory methods.

I contacted the reporter, and gave her some

disturbing preliminary research to pursue about the groups involved with the science standards, in the belief that she would do investigative research, whereas I would continue my humble attempt to prevent abortions through our agency's maternity home, and likewise help people recover from the anguish of abortion aftermath through our post-abortion counseling.

But the reporter rebuffed me. So, perceiving the newspaper's political commitments were set in concrete, I decided to document some basic information. The facts bear directly not only on my day-to-day efforts against the culture of death; they also concern public policy matters in science education, "family planning" and a host of issues about which the public has the right to know, and the duty to make right.

In 1871, Darwin argued that Thomas Robert Malthus' earlier theory of scarcity was the mechanism that drove human evolutionary "progress." In his book, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, Darwin wrote:¹

The early progenitors of man must also have tended, like all other animals, to have increased beyond their means of subsistence; they must, therefore, occasionally have been exposed to a struggle for existence, and consequently to the law of natural selection. Beneficial variations of all kinds will thus, either occasionally or habitually, have been preserved and injurious ones eliminated.²

Conversely, Darwin argued that charitable acts by civilized men lead to evolutionary degeneration:

With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws and our medical men exert

their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment... Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of a domestic race; but excepting in the case of man himself, hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed.³

On one hand, Darwin acknowledged, "Nor could we check our sympathy, even at the urging of hard reason, without deterioration in the noblest part of our nature."⁴ On the other hand, Darwin proceeded to classify people as "weak" and "inferior" versus "intellectually superior," in order to analyze why the "reckless, degraded, and often vicious members of society," tend to increase at a quicker rate than the "provident and generally virtuous members."⁵ Darwin himself evidenced how evolution made bigotry an academic exercise, when he quoted another writer on the Irish:

The careless, squalid, unambitious Irishman multiplies like rabbits: the frugal, foreseeing, self-respecting, ambitious Scot, stern in his morality, spiritual in his faith, sagacious and disciplined in his intelligence, passes his best years in struggle and in celibacy, marries late, and leaves few behind him.⁶

And when he applauded the extermination of "savage races" and "anthropomorphic apes:"

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphic apes... will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest

allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the Negro or Australian and the gorilla.⁷

Normal parents would be horrified to know the foregoing racist premise of a Darwin-based "science education" (surely now actionable against states under anti-discrimination and civil rights statutes).

Except for my curiosity about the science standards, I would never have known that a strong case can be made against Darwin's natural selection. I doubt that the origin of the species evolved from non-living matter into living organisms through Darwin's gradual means of natural selection in a struggle for survival. Darwinism has been carefully refuted by a soft-spoken biochemist, the author of *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*.⁸

Dr. Michael J. Behe's 1996 critique is so earth shattering that, rather than respond to the substance of his book, Darwinians pronounce that Behe's points are *ipso facto* "religion," the standard response to any evidence refuting evolution. In fact, however, Behe simply challenges evolutionary theory with the cold, unforgiving chemical facts, made visible using high-tech equipment.

In his book, Behe shows how, at the one-cell level, life is a self-contained system of indispensable moving, chemical parts, so mutually dependent on each other that absent even one part, the system would not exist. Behe named this observation "irreducible complexity." By physical necessity, all of the molecules of even a one-celled life must have burst forth together as an integrated operating system.

Many Darwinists are left sputtering to save their theory. If a single-cell could not have originated by the gradual assembly of chemical "parts" over time, then Darwinists are tongue-tied to prove the complex diversity of all life, cell by cell, over time. Behe quotes Darwin's own prediction that a discovery like irreducible complexity would cause the demise of his evolution theory: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down."⁹

Darwin's Black Box will, for many readers, categorically seal the intellectual death of evolutionary biology. But the reading together of two independent works of historiography adds moral condemnation.

The first work, by Katharine O'Keefe, is a brilliantly simple, but momentous, alphabetical compilation,¹⁰ with *curricula vitae*, of the members of the British and American eugenics societies, groups dedicated to genetic hygiene based on evolutionary biology. O'Keefe's work reveals that, throughout the twentieth century, eugenic philosophers held vast institutional influence over public policy, education, economics, science, medicine and law.¹¹ Significant too, she documents the groups' explicit strategy, after Nazism had exposed the deadly consequences of "applied biology," to conduct eugenic activities by using the names of other organizations.¹²

The second work, *Unifying Biology: Evolutionary Biology and the Evolutionary Synthesis*,¹³ by Vassiliki Betty Smocovitis, identifies Darwinians who worked feverishly in the 1940's, allegedly to prevent the theory of natural selection from being extinguished by the fast-developing hard sciences of physics and chemistry,¹⁴ but does not mention contemporaneous decisions to pursue eugenics under other names.

The leaders of the effort to "unify" biology and other sciences around natural selection were in fact, as revealed by O'Keefe's research, some of the century's leading eugenicists. According to Smocovitis, the key man who founded the unification, or "synthesis," effort was Sir Julian Huxley, whose life "was devoted to leading a crusade... to ground a humanistic philosophy in evolution."¹⁵ Julian Huxley was a central figure in the twentieth-century history of eugenics. He was a leader of the British Eugenics Society, the first president of UNESCO, a charter member of the Society for the Study of Evolution [SSE],¹⁶ discussed later, and the SSE's vice-president in 1948.¹⁷

Huxley wrote, "Evolution—or to spell it out, the idea of evolutionary process—is the most powerful and the most comprehensive idea that has ever arisen on earth. Above all, it unifies our knowledge and our thought... Thus the evolutionary idea must provide the main unifying approach for a humanist educational system, and evolutionary biology could and should become a central or key subject in its curriculum."¹⁸ Huxley had been alarmed about a decline in evolutionary studies, "in

part because it undermined his evolutionary humanism and his progressive worldview."¹⁹

To eugenicists, "progressive" means "evolutionary progress." Huxley's "unification" effort was "to help extend and legitimate both evolution and biology."²⁰ To Huxley, that meant even replacing religion:

I believe that an equally drastic reorganization of our pattern of religious thought is now becoming necessary—from a God-centered to an evolution-centered pattern.²¹

Today the God hypothesis has ceased to be scientifically tenable, has lost its explanatory value and is becoming an intellectual and moral burden on our thought. It no longer convinces or comforts, and its abandonment often brings a deep sense of relief... once our relief at jettisoning an outdated piece of ideological furniture is over, we must construct something to take its place.²²

Huxley's 1942 book, *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis*,²³ emphasizing evolutionary progress, "offered an inquiry... into an ethical system, an ethos, grounded in evolution... with its fundamental principle of natural selection."²⁴ Referring to evolutionary humanism, Smocovitis observed that it bore "special significance for religious systems of thought..." and "represented an end to conventional Judeo-Christian thought..."²⁵

Besides Charles Darwin, his cousin Sir Francis Galton, Darwin's son Major Leonard Darwin,²⁶ and grandson, Sir Charles Galton Darwin²⁷ all carried the family's dynastic ideology long into the twentieth century—the idea that Malthusian scarcity in nature randomly determines genetic supremacy. Darwin's followers continued the general argument that superior traits are naturally selected when another gene dies in a life and death competition over "inadequate resources."²⁸

On how natural selection applied to humans, evolutionists seemingly ignored evidence of man's survival as being due to his purposeful, intelligent efforts to design habitats and develop resources favorable to human survival. Instead, as in the *Descent of Man*, eminent Darwinians continued to insist that human intelligence interferes with man's evolutionary progress.²⁹ Some evolutionists like Margaret

NLA REVIEW

SPRING/SUMMER 2000

Sanger denounced religious tenets of equality, compassion and charity, contending they cause genetic deterioration in the human race,³⁰ leading eventually to man's extinction: i.e., people vaguely deemed "unfit" and "unwanted" should die off instead of being helped to survive and possibly reproduce their kind.

It wasn't Darwin, but rather his cousin, Sir Francis Galton, who invented the name and the "science" of eugenics,³¹ eroding an academic chair for it in London in 1904.³² University recognition bestowed prestige upon eugenics, attracting the world's most highly educated and wealthiest bigots who were eager both to study eugenics and to support it financially. By 1922, scientists and blue-bloods had organized politely-named Eugenic Societies around the world. The global leadership was located in the United States, Germany and Great Britain.³³

The 1925 Scopes Trial in Tennessee supposedly commemorates the triumph of Darwin over religion. Perhaps it was chance that the case arose in the Deep South, where bigotry had been particularly institutional. In fact, the trial commemorated the legality of teaching the biological inferiority of certain races and classes of people.³⁴ The textbook on trial in that famous case, Hunter's *A Civic Biology*,³⁵ espoused white supremacy and the "science" of eugenics, thus bolstering through education the sterilization campaigns going on at that time by the "scientific" communities in the United States. The 1930's campaigns in Germany, fashioned after American laws, are credited as the psycho-social beginning of the Holocaust.³⁶

Historical scholars in the 1990's published the connections between the American Eugenics Society, current family planning and population control systems and—the Third Reich. Members of the American Eugenics Society received thankful correspondence from Adolf Hitler, accepted honors from Nazi universities, applauded the Nazi regime, served as legislative inspiration for sterilization and anti-immigration laws, and rehabilitated German scientist Dr. Otmar Von Verschuer, collaborator with Josef Mengele, the Terror of Auschwitz. Researchers meticulously documented how, after World War II, members of the eugenics societies reinvented themselves to the public, under disciplines like family planning, demog-

raphy, population studies, and others. Household names who advocated a government birth-control system, like Margaret Sanger, Alan Guttmacher, even two Rockefellers, were all members of the American Eugenics Society.³⁷

Not only does the toxic spill of eugenics poison federal family planning and population control systems, even federally funded genetic research, but now a Huxleyan eugenic vision forms the theoretical model of the *National Science Education Standards*.³⁸ Both the national and a modified Kansas version approach science as "unified concepts"—unified by natural selection, while emphasizing scarcity, heredity and population genetics.³⁹

The outline of the NSES' "unified concepts," teaches a point-of-view, a *philosophy* of science developed by groups, some of which have long histories of leadership by and affiliation with members of the American Eugenics Society. In fact, the standards expressly state that they de-emphasize facts, and instead stress abstract concepts.⁴⁰ The philosophy contained in the standards, even as modified by the state of Kansas, is incompatible with Christian beliefs—according to the admissions made, before there was a controversy, by the men who developed the standards.

Moreover, the science standards are corrupt *ab initio*; deleting a word or a phrase cannot salvage them. If the standards were likened to an unsafe building, then it would have to be completely rebuilt with a new foundation, stronger beams and new walls—not just more windows, ventilation and fire escapes. The boundary, the framework, the outline of the science standards which purports to define what constitutes scientific thought is fundamentally contemptible because it is

- constructed around eugenics, a world-view which is inherently racist, anti-religious and anti-democratic
- advocated by groups with long histories of leadership by and cooperation with eugenicists.

While the controversy in Kansas surrounded the book entitled *National Science Education Standards* (NSES), this book was actually compiled by the cooperation of two powerful, out-of-state private groups, aided by the federal government and wealthy, private foundations.

The key groups drafting the science standards include:⁴¹

The American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington, D.C. (AAAS), which operates with annual revenues of \$44 million. The AAAS initiative relating directly to the publication of the NSES book is known as *Project 2061: Science Literacy for a Changing Future*.⁴²

The National Research Council in Washington D.C. (NRC), which operates with annual revenue of \$180 million.⁴³ The NRC is a subsidiary of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), a private, non-profit organization chartered by Congress to advise the government on scientific matters.

Funding for the National Research Council's work on the NSES project was from private, non-profit foundations and public tax dollars from federal agencies including the National Science Foundation; the U.S. Department of Education; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the National Institutes of Health.⁴⁴

Funding for the AAAS' Project 2061 was by foundations including Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, The Pew Charitable Trusts, Hewlett-Packard Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the National Science Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York.⁴⁵

Clued by the phraseology of the science standards that they were attempting to define an "approved scientific thought," I investigated a curious catch-phrase peppering the content of the science standards, "science is a way of knowing." The phrase turned up in the "for further reading" section of the national standards as the title of a book by John A. Moore,

Moore is a California biologist who is officially acknowledged for his contributions to the NSES.⁴⁶ In his book, *Science as a Way of Knowing: the Foundations of Modern Biology*,⁴⁷ he expresses personal admiration for the work of German biologist, Ernst Haeckel, whose work he analyzes in some detail.⁴⁸

Moore fails to mention, however, a critical piece of information about Haeckel, who was "a towering figure in German biology and an early Darwinian."⁴⁹ Haeckel was also "a racist, a believer in a mystical Volk, and a strong advocate of eugenics"⁵⁰ who "can be claimed as a direct ancestor" of the Nazi "euthanasia" project." Haeckel believed "wooly-haired Negroes" were not only incapable of higher mental development, but that they

NLA REVIEW

SPRING/SUMMER 2000

were "psychologically nearer to the mammals (apes and dogs) than to civilized Europeans... [and therefore] we must... assign a totally different value to their lives."⁵³

Despite such a glaring historical lapse in a Harvard-published book purporting to be a history of biology, *Science as a Way of Knowing* is incorporated by reference into the NSES, at least twice for further reading, and the phrase is used and highlighted in the NSES text.⁵⁴

I was alarmed that the NSES relied heavily on Moore's book as a reference and even incorporated its title throughout the text. But it concerned me more that, on its dust jacket, his 1993⁵⁵ book bears official endorsements by, among others, the highest-ranking men in the groups overseeing the national standards and two other men with decidedly bio-philosophical points of view:

- the President of the National Academy of Sciences, Bruce Alberts
- R. James Rutherford, head of the AAAS Project 2061 education initiative
- an elderly Harvard evolutionist, Ernst Mayr, who was a central figure in founding a post-war group to promote the idea of a "unity of the sciences," called the Society for the Study of Evolution (SSE) and its journal, *Evolution*
- Paul Ehrlich, original population control advocate/author

Out of seven endorsers listed on Moore's book cover, four are contributors to the NSES.⁵⁶ Moore and at least four endorsers appear to have been colleagues in Huxley and Mayr's Society for the Study of Evolution, a group for which Moore is himself a past-president.⁵⁷

According to documentation in Sonocovitts' *Unifying Biology*, it was Huxley and his contemporary, Ernst Mayr who formed the Society for the Study of Evolution as part of their move to "synthesize" or "unify" (some might say contaminate) all concepts of science with Darwin's doctrine of natural selection. Appearing to cap long-time career goals, Mayr is the lead endorser of Moore's book, while a Mayr essay appears in materials published by a textbook group, the Biological Science Curriculum Studies, whose president chaired the content committee of the national standards.

In fact, the NSES book and the Kansas Science Standards, as modified, do seem to promulgate the SSE's "unified concepts," as Mayr, Huxley and fellow SSE founders and members may have envisioned.

A quick review of three early members of the SSE reveals fatal flaws in placing reliance upon these men's vision of science. One charter member of the SSE was the infamous Alfred C. Kinsey,⁵⁸ "sex-researcher," now exposed for committing wholesale fraud in publishing his conclusions in 1948 and 1953, and for soliciting pedophiles to share with the Kinsey Institute their "research" on their child-victims.⁵⁹ Moreover, Kinsey was a self-avowed eugenicist.

Hermann J. Muller, a member of the American Eugenics Society, was a 1946 "Council Member" of the SSE, who became the SSE's vice-president in 1952 and president in 1957.⁶⁰ After Muller had worked in Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia on "genetics,"⁶¹ he was a Kinsey colleague at the Kinsey Institute.

For many people, simply knowing that the fathers of the theory of "unified concepts" are eugenicists is enough reason to reject the science standards. In 1931, Huxley put his eugenic vision this way:

Man has become what he is by a process of evolution which has taken perhaps a thousand million years; there is no reason why that evolution should not continue... If the past with its crude methods has taken life from single cell, or whatever simpler units it at first inhabited, to man, what may not man do in the future with the aid of conscious reason and deliberate planning. On its negative side it becomes racial preventative medicine; on its positive side, racial hope... And once this is so, the pressure of public opinion to get something done will become so great that something will be done... We cannot yet see what those discoveries will be, or envisage the organization of a eugenic society. But knowledge will slowly grow, and ways and means can surely be found. And so man may take up his birthright, which is to become the first organism exercising conscious control over its own evolutionary destiny⁶² [emphasis added].

Even though Hitler had been defeated, Huxley was more blunt in 1947 about the politics of his vision:

[E]ven though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable⁶³ [emphasis added].

Moore's failure to identify the relationship between the "foundations of modern biology" and the Holocaust is evidence of why education, when it is "standardized" or monopolized by any single publisher or government, can quickly be made a tool of despots. Historians' assessment of Ernst Haeckel is available in bookstores in a still-published book, *Nazi Doctors*, by Robert J. Lifton (Basic Books 1986). Moore, purporting to write *Science as a Way of Knowing* about the historical foundations of modern biology, could not have avoided seeing racism in Haeckel's *The History of Creation*. Moore's book actually duplicates an illustration from Haeckel's book,⁶⁴ a book in which Haeckel stated:

The Caucasian, or Mediterranean man ...has from time immemorial been placed at the head of all races of men, as the most highly developed and perfect... If we are to draw a sharp boundary between them, it must be drawn between the most highly developed and civilized man on the one hand, and the rudest savages on the other, and the latter have to be classed with the animals.⁶⁵

Science as a Way of Knowing not only fails to identify Haeckel's significance to the rise of Nazi eugenics, but Moore fails in the same way in writing about Sir Francis Galton. Moore does discuss Galton,⁶⁶ but fails to mention that Galton is the father of the eugenics movement. In England, as a matter of fact, the eugenics group is now called the Galton Institute.

It strains credulity to believe that Moore does not know Galton's and Haeckel's primary significance in the history of biology. Moore's omissions of material information should be viewed as fatal, whether it was done negligently, or intentionally. However, as will be explained, these are not the only "scientists" whom Moore references in his book, without disclosing their identities as eugenicists.

Moore's book, moreover, exudes anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant Fundamentalist bigotry. Moore, a biologist, spends nearly half of his book in poor explanation of different philosophies, with an entire chapter titled "The Judeo-Christian World-View." In contrast to his admiration for Haeckel, and his nonchalant reference to Galton, Moore expresses stereotypes and disdain for Christians and the history of the Catholic Church. Throughout *Science as a Way of Knowing*, Moore regards his scientific worldview as distinct from, and incompatible with, his distorted definition of a "Judeo-Christian worldview."

For example, he says: "The Judeo-Christian worldview had been accepted as adequate for centuries—and remains so for many individuals today—but it leads to a very different view of nature than the one provided by modern science."⁶⁵ Rather than reconciling science and religion, Moore repeatedly goes out of his way to polarize them, saying for example, the discovery of fossils was to "involve science and the Judeo-Christian worldview in yet another confrontation—one that lingers to this day."⁶⁶

In his book, Moore calls biology a "conceptual science."⁶⁷ He states, "True belief requires the acceptance of some things and not the other."⁶⁸ Moore claims "the statements of science are derived ultimately from the data of observation and experimentation."⁶⁹ In contrast, he claims religious dogma "is interpreted by a caste of priests and is accepted by the multitudes on faith or *under duress* [emphasis added]."⁷⁰

Moore misrepresents the foundations of Christianity by singling out St. Augustine, whom Moore ridicules in the course of five pages.⁷¹ He also ridicules scripture and reports of miracles.⁷²

He says, "One might seek to blame the Judeo-Christian dogma of special creation for inhibiting thought about descent with change, and to some extent this blame is valid."⁷³ Moore asserts: "It is true that the attitudes of the Church prevented the development of science for more than a thousand years and inhibited it for centuries... the Church never was a supporter of open minds."⁷⁴

What kind of men does Moore view as open-minded? "Open mindedness" has a different meaning to Moore than to most

people. Against his backdrop of religious bigotry, he elevates two men as being "eminent biologists," Hermann J. Muller and Theodosius Dobzhansky.⁷⁵ He does not disclose that both Muller and Dobzhansky were avid eugenicists.

Hermann J. Muller trained under Hitler's high-ranking Nazi scientist, Dr. Ernst Rudin, author of the 1933 Nazi sterilization laws. "...I acquainted myself with the genetic work of the Zoological Institute, and of the Institut fur Psychiatrie, under Dr. Rudin, whose very comprehensive material offers a nice field for the study of mutations in man, and of their inheritance."⁷⁶

Rudin was director of the Research Institute for Psychiatry of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society in Munich.⁷⁷ In 1939, Hitler honored Rudin with a medal and a written statement celebrating him as the "meritorious pioneer of the racial-hygiene measures of the Third Reich." Honored again in 1944, Rudin received a "bronze medal bearing the Nazi eagle from Adolph Hitler, who lauded him as the 'pathfinder in the field of hereditary hygiene.'"⁷⁸

Serving as an advisor to the American Eugenics Society at least as late as 1938, Dr. Ernst Rudin, a psychiatrist, was chief architect for the "Law for the Prevention of Hereditary Disease in Posterity," which had taken effect in 1934.⁷⁹ According to one historian, Rudin demonstrates "in an extreme form, the attraction of the Nazi biomedical vision for a certain kind of biologically and genetically oriented scientist."⁸⁰

The AAAS published an article by Muller in 1961, "Human Evolution by Voluntary Choice of Germ Plasm."⁸¹ Writing then as a zoology professor with the Kinsey Institute in Indiana, Muller criticized a few colleagues in the American Eugenics Society as well as Germany's Eugen Fischer, because they "brought such odium upon the whole concept of eugenics as to run it into the ground."⁸²

It is noticeable, however, that Muller's 1961 article does not renounce eugenics at all. Even though he criticized "racists and Hitlerites," he also criticized scientists who viewed all eugenics as dangerous and who "held that genetics in man could be left to care of itself"⁸³ [emphasis added].

Like Alfred Kinsey, Muller called for an end to sexual boundaries:

"...adequate implementation of eugenic policies also required a clearing away

of the ancient heritage of superstition and taboos that had so obstinately ensnared human usages and preconceptions in matters of sex and reproduction"⁸⁴ [emphasis added].

E.G. Conklin is another eugenicist esteemed in Moore's *Science as a Way of Knowing* for his "careful and capable" work.⁸⁵ Conklin was a pre-war Advisory Board member of the American Eugenics Society.⁸⁶ Recently the website for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, another group drafting the NSES, applauded Conklin who, as AAAS president in 1936, founded an international committee on "intellectual freedom."⁸⁷

Conklin's position on the advisory board of the American Eugenics Society is a point omitted by the AAAS website as well as by Moore's book. In a possible chilling irony, Conklin's "intellectual freedom" may have been intended for the "science" of eugenics. Listed in the eugenic society's March-April 1936 journal, alongside Conklin's name, are other Advisory Board members: rabid racists and anti-Semites, like Americans C. G. Campbell and Madison Grant, and three German advisors who were among the highest-ranking Nazi scientists in the Hitler regime: Eugen Fischer, Ernst Rudin, and Falk Ruttko.⁸⁸ *sa*

Continued Fall Review 2000

NOTES

1. Darwin, Charles, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. (NY: D. Appleton and Company 1896).
2. *Ibid.* at 47-48.
3. *Ibid.* at 136. Darwin credits his remarks about natural selection in civilized nations to three men, including Sir Francis Galton.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.* at 141.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.* at 160.
8. Beha, Michael, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*. (NY: Touchstone Simon & Schuster 1998).
9. *Ibid.* at 39, quoting Darwin, C. (1872) *Origin of the Species*, at 154 (New York University Press 1986, 6th ed.)
10. www.toolan.com/hitler/index.html
11. O'Keefe, Katharine, "Social History and the Eugenics Societies," *Social Justice Review*, 89A-7 (1998).
12. *Ibid.* at 6, citing a formal resolution adopted in 1960 at the annual meeting of the English eugenics society, and also citing the leading twentieth century American eugenicist, Frederick Osborn, speaking at the 1956 Galton Lecture in London.
See also Blacker, "Eugenics in Retrospect and Prospect," at 25, 26 and 27, Occasional

- Papers on Eugenics, No. 1, The Galton Lecture 1945 at Manson House, London (The Eugenic Society and Cassell and Company Ltd., London 1950) (Three months before the war in Europe ended in 1945, Blacker, secretary of the English eugenics society for fourteen years, described how eugenics, "through events over which the Society had little control...got into disrepute; how it came to be regarded as a field for cranks, misguided enthusiasts and irresponsible propagandists. The hostility to eugenics seems to have come and gone in waves." On the subject of propaganda, Blacker explained the de-emphasis of eugenic propaganda: "I should like to say a word about the Society's attitude to propaganda. To this, in its early days, it devoted much of its time and energy...Lately, however, we have done much less propaganda... The Council has taken the view that if we can put forward a reasonable and convincing case that considerations of quality should be taken into account in devising a population policy, and if we can formulate sensible suggestions as to how, in practice, this can be done, many of these cognate organizations will do our propaganda for us. This campaign need not be specially conducted in the name of eugenics or of the society. Our primary object is not the glorification of the Society, nor even the glorification of the word eugenics; it is to get sound eugenics principles recognized, accepted and acted upon.")
- See also, Osborn, "Implications of the New Studies in Population and Psychology for the Development of Eugenic Philosophy," *Eugenics News, Current Record of Race Hygiene*, 22:104-107 at 106, 107 (Nov-Dec. 1937) (Frederick Osborn, leader of the American Eugenics movement between 1937 and 1974, undoubtedly referring to German events, wrote against imputing "superiorities or inferiorities of a biological nature to social classes, to regional groups, or to races as a whole," stating that "scientists are not at all sure that any races or social classes in this country are above or below others in biological capacity for developing socially valuable qualities." However, Osborn, possibly alluding to the introduction of birth control and abortion, does not denounce eugenics; he merely urges a new public emphasis, "Eugenics should therefore operate on a basis of individual selection... The public emphasis of eugenics should be on a basis of individual selection... The public emphasis of eugenics should be on a better distribution of births throughout the population. Such an aim is sympathetic to existing social activities whose cooperation is essential to the wide-spread acceptance of eugenics [emphasis added].")
13. Smocovitis, Vassiliki Betty, *Unifying Biology: The Evolutionary Synthesis and Evolutionary Biology* (NJ: Princeton University Press 1996).
 14. *Ibid.* at 175 ("Warding off reduction to the physical sciences became a primary concern for Ernst Mayr, the architect most sensitive to philosophy at this time."); and see *ibid.* at 176 ("In 1963, Simpson picked up and extended Mayr's argument for two biologies, not only to argue against reduction to the physical sciences, but also to argue for the centrality of biology in the drive to unify the sciences.")
 15. *Ibid.* at 138.
 16. *Ibid.* at 126.
 17. *Evolution*, 24:43-44 (Society for the Study of Evolution, Lawrence, KS: Allan Press 1970).
 18. Huxley, Sir Julian, *Essays of a Humanist* at 125-126 (NY: Harper & Row 1964).
 19. Smocovitis at 138.
 20. *Ibid.* at 146.
 21. Huxley, *Essays of a Humanist* at 220.
 22. *Ibid.* at 222.
 23. Huxley, Julian, *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis*, (George Allen & Unwin Ltd.: London 1942).
 24. Smocovitis at 146.
 25. *Ibid.* at 151.
 26. Darwin, "The Aims and Methods of Eugenic Societies," *Science*, 54:313-323 at 323 (1921). (From an address given by Major Leonard Darwin, as president of the British eugenics society for the prior ten years: "But science, whilst giving us good ground for hope, also issues grave warning concerning the danger of national deterioration resulting from the unchecked multiplication of inferior types... A determination that such a downfall shall not be the fate of this nation is a sentiment felt by every man who is animated by the eugenic ideal, an ideal to be followed like a flag in battle without thought of personal gain.")
 27. "Improving the Breed," *Time*, Jan. 17, 1955 ("Figuring out which families to encourage, confessed Physicist [Sir Charles Galton] Darwin, is a discouraging problem [quoting Darwin]: 'The breed of race horses has been improved indeed to a remarkable degree... We would like to do the same for humanity, but it is a very difficult business what human beings have won the race of life, whereas it is fairly easy to see which people can be classified in ending last.'")
 28. Huxley, "Hereditry and Humanity," *Woman's Home Companion*, 59:20-21 at 21 (1932) ("And it seems it is these mutations which provide the raw material for real large-scale evolutionary change. In the pressure of the struggle for existence, the harmful changes are gradually weeded out, the favorable ones survive in large numbers and are incorporated into the race. The struggle has a sifting action on the mutations. This is what Darwin, seventy years ago, called 'natural selection,' and it is this sifting selection which, picking out the 'good mutations,' gradually pushes the race along its evolutionary path.")
 29. Blacker, "Birth Control and Eugenics," *The Nineteenth Century*, 111: 464-777 at 466 (1932) ("The effect of the advances in medicine and the improvement in our system of public health which have taken place in the period specified has been to lower the hurdles and to increase the individual's chances for survival. In consequence, many more persons than formerly of inferior resistance and physique now reach maturity and reproduce their kind.")
 30. Sanger, *Birth Control Review*, Vol. I, no. 12, at 7 (Dec. 1917) ("[C]ivilization has brought sympathy, pity, tenderness and other lofty and worthy sentiments, which interfere with the law of natural selection. We are now in a state where our charities, our compensation acts, our pensions, hospitals, and even our drainage and sanitary equipment all tend to keep alive the sickly and the weak, who are allowed to propagate and in turn produce a race of degenerates.") quoted by Human Life International, "Quotable Quotes from the Birth Control Review, Version 1.0, February 1997, www.HILL.org.
 31. Blacker, "Eugenics in Retrospect and Prospect," *Occasional Papers on Eugenics*, No. 1, The Galton Lecture 1945 at Manson House, London (The Eugenic Society and Cassell and Company Ltd., London 1950).
 32. O'Keefe, John Cavanaugh, "Introduction to Eugenics," (VA: American Life League 1995).
 33. *Ibid.*
 34. The author acknowledges, with high esteem and great appreciation, Kathy O'Keefe and her brother, John Cavanaugh O'Keefe, for leading the scholarship in post-war eugenics, and in particular for pointing out this information.
 35. Hunter, George William, *A Civic Biology Presented in Problems*, at 196 (NY: American Book Company 1914), claiming there are five races of man, "the highest type of all, the Caucasians, represented by the civilized white inhabitants of Europe and America." Foreshadowing the language and the concentration camps applied to the Jews and others in Germany, Hunter's textbook, at 263, taught school children that, like the unborn are called today, some people are "parasites" who need to be separated from society: "They not only do harm to others by corrupting, stealing, or spreading disease, but they are actually protected and cared for by the state out of public money. Largely for them the poor-house and the asylum exist. They take from society, but they give nothing in return. They are true parasites...If such people were lower animals, we would probably kill them off to prevent them

NLA REVIEW

SPRING/SUMMER 2000

- from spreading. Humanity will not allow this, but we do have the remedy of separating the sexes in asylums or other places and in various ways preventing intermarriage and the possibilities of perpetuating such a low and degenerate race. Remedies of this sort have been tried successfully in Europe and are now meeting with success in this country."
36. Lifton, Robert J., *Nazi Doctors* (Harper Basic Books 1986).
 37. Kuhl, Stefan, *Nazi Connections* (Oxford University Press 1994); Meehan "The Road to Abortion (Part II): How Government Got Hooked," *Human Life Review*, 25:68-82 (1999); Meehan, "The Road to Abortion (Part I): How Eugenics Birthed Population Control," *Human Life Review*, 24:76-89 (1998); O'Keefe, "Social History and the Eugenics Societies," *Social Justice Review*, 89:4-7 (1998); Meehan, "Eugenics and the Power Elite," *Social Justice Review*, 88:167-170 (1997); Liagin, "Population Control in American Foreign Policy," *Social Justice Review*, 88:170-173 (1997); Waters, "The Ethics of Eugenics," *Social Justice Review*, 88:174-177 (1997); O'Keefe, "Introduction to Eugenics" (VA: American Life League 1995).
 38. *National Science Education Standards*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press 1996).
 39. *Ibid.*, Chapter 6 (content standards for levels K-12 include evolution as a "unifying concept" in all levels, taught under categories entitled "Life Science" and "Earth and Space Science." Population studies are taught in all grade levels under categories entitled "Science in Personal and Social Perspectives." Heredity is taught in grades 5 through 12 under the category "Life Sciences.")
 40. *Ibid.* at 113 ("Changing Emphasis—Less on...Knowing scientific facts and information/More on...understanding scientific concepts and developing abilities of inquiry.") For students, less factual information operates to decrease individual ability to question the basis of official government-required "concepts."
 41. Not within the scope of this report, regrettably, but nevertheless a vastly important topic of investigation, is the prominence of the Carnegie Corporation of Washington and many other foundations, in using their capital pools (trusts) to dominate the actions of public agencies. Public policy monopolies, dominated by a handful of private individuals with no public accountability, can be fashioned from "partnering" the vast resources of the private trusts with those allocated to public agencies.
With regard to the subject matter of this article, the professional biographies of more than a coincidental number of men related to the NSES involve their prior or current positions with the Carnegie Corporation of Washington, or funding from it. Needed reforms in laws relating to these trusts have been known for fifty years, but perhaps the NSES initiative illustrates the severity of need for tax and trust law reform.
 42. NSES at 15 ("The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences gratefully acknowledges its indebtedness to the seminal work by the American Association for the Advancement of Science's Project 2061 and believes that use of *Benchmarks for Science Literacy* by state framework committees, school and school-district curriculum committees, and developers of instructional and assessment materials complies fully with the spirit of the content standards.")
 43. Under the auspices of the NAS, therefore, the NRC performs contract work for other government operations. NRC revenue is primarily appropriated tax dollars, redirected to NRC from the budgets of its referring agencies. In addition to funds from federal agencies, development of the NSES book was funded by private foundations, including Volvo North American Corporation, The Ettinger Foundation, Inc. and the Eugene McDermott Foundation.
 44. NSES, Acknowledgments at iii.
 45. AAAS.org
 46. NSES, Appendix at 252.
 47. Moore, John A., *Science as a Way of Knowing: The Foundations of Modern Biology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1993).
 48. *Ibid.* at 416.
 49. Lifton, Robert J., *Nazi Doctors*, at 125 (Basic Books 1986).
 50. *Ibid.*
 51. *Ibid.* at 441-442.
 52. NSES at 201, 206, 207.
 53. This refers to the loose, outside jacket covering a library copy of Moore's 1993 printing. However, a different text for the hardcover/no jacket version of Moore's 1993 printing has been discovered, in addition to yet a third text for the book's 1999 soft-bound outside cover.
 54. Bruce Alberts, Francisco Ayala, Peter H. Raven, F. James Rutherford.
 55. Ehrlich, Ayala, Raven and Mayr.
 56. Smocovitis at 156.
 57. Reisman, Judith A. Ph.D, *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences* (Arlington, VA: The Institute for Media Education, Inc. 1998).
 58. *Evolution*, 24:43-44 (Lawrence, KS: Allan Press 1970).
 59. Reisman, at 291 *et seq.*
 60. Huxley, "The Vital Importance of Eugenics," *Harper*, 163: 324-331 at 331 (1931)
 61. UNESCO: *Its Purpose and its Philosophy* (Washington D.C. 1947), cited in Liagin, *Excessive Force: Power Politics and Population Control*, at 85 (Washington, D.C.: Information Project for Africa 1996)
 62. Haeckel, Ernst, Vol. I & II *The History of Creation, or The Development of the Earth and its Inhabitants by the Action of Natural Causes: A Popular Exposition of the Doctrine of Evolution in General, and of that of Darwin, Goethe, and Lamarck in Particular*, (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1914, 5th ed.); Illustration in Haeckel's book is Plate I, Vol. I. Moore duplicates the Haeckel illustration on his p. 417.
 63. *Ibid.* at 429.
 64. Moore at 250-251.
 65. Moore at 88.
 66. *Ibid.* at 102.
 67. *Ibid.* at 4.
 68. *Ibid.* at 59.
 69. *Ibid.* at 60.
 70. *Ibid.* at 59.
 71. *Ibid.* at 61-66.
 72. *Ibid.* at 64.
 73. *Ibid.* at 132.
 74. *Ibid.* at 66, 78.
 75. *Ibid.* at 133-134.
 76. Reisman at 297.
 77. Lifton, Robert J., *Nazi Doctors*, at 28 (Harper/Basic Books 1986).
 78. Wistrich, Robert S., *Who's Who in Nazi Germany*, at 213 (London: Routledge 1982).
 79. *Ibid.* at 213.
 80. Lifton at 29.
 81. *Science*, 134:643-649, (AAAS 1961).
 82. *Ibid.* at 643.
 83. *Ibid.*
 84. *Ibid.* at 644.
 85. Moore at 462.
 86. See e.g., *Eugenical News*, Vol. 21 (Mar-Apr. 1936) (Conklin is listed inside the front cover; on the page across from Conklin's name is an article by Dr. C.G. Campbell entitled, "The German Racial Policy.")
 87. <http://www.aaas.org/Exhibits/indivto/mtings.htm> (downloaded 5/5/99)
 88. See Wistrich.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Rebecca Messall, an attorney and mother of three, is also the Respect Life Director and Program Developer at Catholic Charities for the Archdiocese of Kansas City, Kansas.