In the first quarter of this century, the science of eugenics enjoyed a very considerable vogue in most Western countries. It was widely accepted among people of all political persuasions that the quality of a particular race or nation could be profoundly affected by government neglect or intervention. Most governments were seen to have neglected their duties in this area, with grave consequences in the form of a rapid increase of racial degeneracy. This was manifested in crime, alcoholism, mental deficiency, epilepsy and insanity, which were all believed to represent points at the low end of one continuous spectrum of human types. In reaction to fears of impending decline, eugenic reformers called for measures to prevent the reproduction of the unfit, while encouraging the increase of worthwhile and intelligent members of society.

With the collapse of Naziism, such ideas fell into deep disfavor. They also tended to be neglected by historians. In recent years however, scholars have begun to rediscover eugenics as an important science in itself, and also as a major factor in motivating other (seemingly unconnected) reforms—in health, welfare, housing, education, or penology. This eugenic context has been argued forcefully by Professors Haller, Gould and Pickens in the United States, by Professors Searle and MacKenzie in Britain. Many would argue that an understanding of the eugenic movement is essential to an appreciation of the real nature of reform in the Progressive Era.

In particular, there is considerable debate about the social roots of eugenics. Why should a relatively new scientific fad so rapidly gain enormous popularity—especially when it required extensive legislation, the building of institutions and the spending of a great deal of government money? MacKenzie has tried to explain this by citing the
appeal of the movement to newly prominent professional groups, the sort of intelligent and self-sufficient people who were the heroes of the eugenicists. Others stress the perceived need to produce an Anglo-Saxon race adequate for its new imperialist responsibilities.

This article attempts to explain the popularity of eugenics as an ideology, by means of a case-study of the movement in Pennsylvania. This state is especially appropriate for such a detailed examination as it produced some of the earliest eugenic theorists in America, and also possessed perhaps the broadest spectrum of eugenic thought—from moderates generally familiar with the new theories to extremist advocates of sterilisation and extermination. Furthermore, it will be shown that the state's political leaders were deeply influenced by eugenic thought at a much earlier stage than most Americans.

It will be suggested that Pennsylvania provides clear evidence to explain the sudden popularity of eugenics. Essentially, the new science gave conservatives a technocratic and modern-sounding guise in which to dress traditional prejudices going back at least sixty years. Through much of the nineteenth century, WASP elites had resented the growing power of immigrants. They had resisted the invaders by establishing prisons, refuges and other institutions to Americanise them; and they had attempted to impose their own cultural values on newcomers by the 'symbolic crusades' of temperance and evangelism.³ With the new political climate of the 1890s, such ideas seemed archaic and superstitious; and the weakness of old ideologies was especially dangerous in a time of unparalleled social conflict, marked by strikes and massacres.

It was exactly at this point of crisis that there emerged a new and powerful eugenic movement. This provided the ideological structure necessary to give scientific substance to traditional prejudices. In 1915 as in 1865, social and political elites were attempting to control lower-class newcomers through reforming and 'child-saving' institutions, and through moralistic campaigns. What had changed between the two dates was the ideological justification for such intervention. The change was from religion (temperance and evangelism) to science (eugenics). Finally, it will be shown that although the eugenic fervor was short-lived in Pennsylvania, the movement had enduring effects in shaping the treatment of crime and deviancy in the state through most of this century.

In its origins, eugenic science was closely linked to Victorian criminology.⁴ Between about 1830 and 1870, there emerged a number of theories about the connection between crime and defective mental states, and eugenics was essentially the synthesis of these well-established ideas. By
the 1830s, an extensive literature had developed on the existence of mental types such as the idiot, imbecile or psychopath—all of whom fell short of insanity, but all likely to be found overrepresented in the criminal population. At the same time, phrenologists were suggesting that crime and evil were physiological conditions resulting from the structure of the brain. Thirdly, studies of criminal subcultures seemed to show the existence of 'bad families' in which crime was almost hereditary. By the 1860s, Morel had synthesized these theories to explain crime as a component of his detailed classification of 'degenerate' types. Crime, idiocy, epilepsy, alcoholism, insanity, all were likely to be found in 'degenerate' families.

By this time, the last necessary component of eugenics was found in Darwinism, which provided a mechanism for explaining the inheritance of traits. In 1869, Francis Galton published the foundation text of eugenics in Hereditary Genius; and in 1876, Lombroso's Criminal Man created the closely related science of 'criminal anthropology.' By the 1890s, these sciences had been widely popularised in the English-speaking world by works like Havelock Ellis's The Criminal (1889), and eugenic societies and journals began to campaign for legislative changes.

A major focus of the movement was to provide segregation and specialised treatment for mental defectives, who (it was believed) comprised a large and unmanageable proportion of the population of schools, prisons and workhouses. In England, for example, a number of acts were passed between 1900 and 1914 to remove mental defectives, vagrants, alcoholics and habitual petty criminals from the penal or welfare systems, and place them in specialised farm colonies or homes. At once, this would leave the prisons only with offenders for whom rehabilitation would be possible; and it would provide the segregation and control necessary to prevent the procreation of 'degenerate' racial types. The coming of effective methods of assessing intelligence—like the Binet test—would mean that the process of classification could in future be carried on scientifically and objectively.

The United States was equally familiar with eugenic ideas. As early as the 1830s, Isaac Ray had been aware of the link between criminality and 'defective' states. Dugdale's work on The Jukes (1877) was a classic eugenic case-study of how degenerate traits were passed on through the generations, at immense cost and inconvenience for respectable society. The appearance of an American edition of Havelock Ellis in 1892 was seminal, and the distinctively American Lombrosan tradition dates from Macdonald's Criminology in 1893. By 1902, there was a Congressional
attempt to establish a federal 'laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper and defective classes.'

The American eugenic movement reached its height between about 1906 and 1917, as has been well described by Professor Haller. Indiana passed the first Sterilisation Bill in 1907, and soon eugenic record offices and laboratories were established. Under the leadership of enthusiasts like Goddard, Davenport and Laughlin, the movement retained its power into the 1940s.

Pennsylvania was one of the first areas to be influenced by the identification of defective mental states, and the link proposed between such states and crime. As early as the 1840s, Dorothea Dix's campaign to remove insane convicts to a special asylum involved suggestions that all crime was in fact a symptom of a mental condition, of which insanity was but an extreme manifestation. In the same decade, there was an attempt to create a new type of institution for mentally deficient children, using the latest French educational scholarship to attempt to make them self-sufficient. This institution was eventually opened at Germantown in 1854, although it moved to Elwyn in 1857; and it was one of the first two such homes in the United States.

But it was in the last quarter of the nineteenth century that specifically eugenic theories began to make their impact in the state—and at an early stage of the movement's development. Such theories found a constituency among two main groups: among bureaucrats and administrators (especially in the areas of penology, charities and mental health); and among legislators. That is to say, the eugenic movement found early support among the state's political and administrative elite.

Certain institutions can be identified as eugenic centers from the earliest days. Elwyn, in particular, was important in the genesis of the national movement. From 1864 to 1893, its superintendent was Isaac N. Kerlin, who wrote as early as 1884, 'How many of your criminals and prostitutes are congenital imbeciles?' From the mid-1880s, he carried on a public campaign for strict eugenic segregation as a means of preventing crime and social decay. Under his regime, other early eugenicists found a haven at Elwyn. These included (from about 1884) his assistant superintendent A. W. Wilmarth and his chief physician Martin W. Barr. Wilmarth argued for Lombrosan views of crime, the hereditary nature of deficiency, and its cure by sterilisation—all in the 1880s and 1890s. (To appreciate how advanced these views were, we should recall that Professor Haller calls the years from 1890 to 1905 a mere 'Prelude to Eugenics'.) In 1904, Barr published one of the first comprehensive American textbooks on Mental Defectives. Sterilisation
as a eugenic solution found some of its earliest American advocates at Elwyn—with Kerlin, Wilmarth, Barr and especially with DeForrest Willard, one of the school's trustees.\(^4\)

In 1893—long before most jurisdictions in America or Europe—Pennsylvania's legislature approved an Institution for the (adult) Feeble-Minded, which was opened at Polk in 1897. And as at Elwyn, this institution became a center for eugenic sentiment. The superintendent, J. M. Murdoch, wrote in 1902 of the importance of segregating defectives, to prevent them becoming the 'irresponsible progenitors of a miserable posterity.'\(^5\) It also pioneered (before 1912) the use of the Binet test to classify inmates by intelligence.\(^6\)

At a very early stage, Pennsylvania's medical and charitable establishments were thus campaigning for eugenic reforms. Apart from Polk and Elwyn, the reformers were strongly based in the state's Board of Public Charities and especially its Committee on Lunacy. Indeed, the reports of the latter committee included notes from each institution on the cause of the insanity of their inmates; and the Board left no doubt that it expected eugenic answers.\(^7\) Managers were asked to comment whether the insanity or imbecility of their charges resulted from parental imbecility or inebriety, or merely the condition of only one parent. Non-hereditary explanations were permitted, but were only expected to account for a small proportion of inmates.

Another center of eugenic thought was among the administrators of the Eastern Penitentiary in Philadelphia, and their associates in the state's Prison Discipline Society. This was rather curious, as both prison and prison society had throughout the nineteenth century been the strongest advocates of moral and evangelistic efforts to reform prisoners. But as early as 1886, the physician at the Penitentiary presented a paper to the Prison Discipline Society arguing for the new medical views on crime. He wrote that 'I find the influence of bad physical and mental condition a most potent factor in crime causation, the percentage of inherited consumption, syphilis and scrofula being many times as great as is found existing among the general public.' Criminals were likely to have physical diseases, as well as 'imbecility, idiocy, delusions, insanity.'\(^8\) The reports of this prison over the next two decades became steadily more eugenic in their orientation. For many years, the reports had published case-studies to show that criminals constituted a distinct class of society; but by 1900, they were perceived as a criminal race.\(^9\) In 1907, the Inspectors wrote of 'the desirability of restricting the liberty and power of degenerates to transmit their criminal propensities to unfortunate progeny.'\(^10\)
The strength of eugenic and 'criminal anthropological' views is suggested by the long survival of the Bertillon system of measuring convicts, years after it had been replaced by fingerprints as a means of identification. Presumably it was kept on because of the Lombrosan theory that criminals were somehow anatomically different. At the state reformatory in Huntingdon, Bertillon measurements were taken as late as 1937; and the institution's psychologist was the eugenicist Frank Woodbury. If their records were more complete, it may well be that other penal and medical establishments would emerge as being under equally strong eugenic influence.

In Pennsylvania, the 1890s were not merely a 'prelude' to eugenics. These years marked the beginning of a flourishing vogue; and the state produced in Henry M. Boies of Scranton one of the first Americans to produce a systematic eugenic study. Boies was a member of the Board of Public Charities, the Lunacy Committee and the Prison Discipline Society—all groups influenced by the new ideas—and his book *Prisoners and Paupers* (1893) is a comprehensive eugenic and Lombrosan view of conditions in Pennsylvania. His main argument (perhaps derived from Kerlin) was that crime, pauperism and mental deficiency were all increasing at a terrifying rate. Between 1880 and 1890, Pennsylvania's population had risen by 22.5%; but the number of 'defectives' had risen by 60%; of prisoners by 35%; and the cost of institutional care had risen by more than 35%. In his home area, of Lackawanna county, the number of prisoners had risen by 86% over the decade, and the poorhouse population by 94%.

Boies found a wide range of social explanations for this crisis, which I will examine in more detail later in the paper. He mentioned immigration, alcohol, and the devastating effects of modern urban life on the family and on morality. But his conclusions were thoroughly eugenic. Crime, pauperism and deficiency were the result of heredity, as had been shown in studies of defective families like the Jukes. True 'born criminals' like those described by Ellis or Lombroso should be confined for life; but the real solutions were preventive. Boies attacked the 'incomprehensible neglect of rational measures to restrict degeneration', by which he meant sterilisation, for this book is one of the first overt calls for such a policy. In summary, 'The marriage of the criminal and defective must be prevented; and indeed, marriage of all those afflicted with constitutional defects should be prohibited.'

By 1901, Boies was still an extreme eugenicist, but his interests had turned more specifically to criminal anthropology. In his *Science of Penology*, he used an extreme Lombrosan and Positivist approach to
crime, with a definite emphasis on the hereditary element in causing drunkenness, pauperism, disease, syphilis, murder, theft and prostitution.26 Again, his answer was 'a wise legislative regulation of the marriage relation' combined with sterilisation for defectives.

Pennsylvania was thus producing advanced eugenic theorists over a decade before most American states or European countries. The state was equally forward in attempting to translate these theories into action. Far from being regarded as cranks, the theorists rapidly won the support and sympathy of legislators and the political elite. For example, Barr regarded the opening of the expensively equipped institution at Polk in 1897 as a direct response to Kerlin's campaigns. In 1903, another institution for the weak-minded opened at Pennhurst.27

Moreover, the eugenic reformers were soon in a position to press for a law to permit the sterilisation of mental defectives. The Elwyn group had campaigned for this from 1897, and by 1901 the state legislature actually passed such a bill. It passed both houses with ease, although was lost on what Barr calls 'some trifling technicality'.28 A second bill had to be vetoed by the governor in 1905, so clearly the state's elected representatives had accepted eugenic arguments years before most jurisdictions. In fact, Pennsylvania reversed the usual situation where penal and humanitarian reformers pressed for eugenic measures, while conservative politicians resisted them. In this state, it was the legislators who were avid supporters of sterilisation measures, while such extremism was attacked by sections of the Prison Discipline Society.29

The popularity of eugenics among the political elite can also be seen from the report of a legislative commission appointed in 1901 to examine the condition of the insane in the hospitals of Pennsylvania. Although ostensibly concerned with the insane, the commission remarked extensively on the rapid increase of the feeble minded in recent years. Their questions to managers of institutions also show close resemblances to Boies' theories on the reasons for this increase,30 and while visiting Polk, the commissioners emerged as far more sympathetic to eugenics than even the superintendent, Murdoch. At Polk, the questioning turned from the usual matters of administration and management to concentrate instead on the minutiae of sterilisation—particularly vasectomy. And both Murdoch and the commissioners were able to recount examples of 'bad families', local parallels to the Jukes.31 Clearly, eugenic concepts and commonplaces were very familiar to the rulers of Pennsylvania at this early stage.

Eugenics had some impact on legislative behavior, even if the state failed to acquire a sterilisation measure. Between 1903 and 1907, for
example, the state's lunacy legislation was broadened to include first those addicted to drink and drugs, and then the feeble-minded.\textsuperscript{32} The mere fact of legislation was not as important as the decision to include addicts and defectives alongside lunatics: after all, all these groups were 'degenerates' in eugenic terms.

By 1911, there was also enough pressure to establish a special commission 'to devise a plan for the segregation, care and treatment of the feeble-minded and epileptic persons in Pennsylvania.' The membership of this group was unashamedly eugenic, including as it did three members (out of five) drawn from the Board of Charities and the Lunacy Committee.\textsuperscript{33} Its secretary, Dr. Frank Woodbury, was an especially strong eugenicist. It was Woodbury who was largely responsible for the inclusion in the annual lunacy reports of the lengthy notes on the hereditary causes of insanity and imbecility. Not surprisingly, the commissioners were extremely sympathetic to the eugenic cause. They corresponded with eugenicists in other states, like Walter Fernald in Massachusetts (one of America's first Lombrosans), and even with Harry Laughlin, of the 'Eugenics Record Office.'\textsuperscript{34} Within the state, the investigation served as a focus for eugenic campaigns. When they were sent a pamphlet on \textit{The Problem of Race Betterment}, Woodbury remarked sympathetically that 'the subject is one that will legitimately come within the consideration of this commission.'\textsuperscript{35}

Between 1911 and 1918, the reformers were able to achieve the extension of institutional facilities they had long desired to provide adequate specialised care for 'degenerates'. The feeble-minded were to be cared for at Laurelton, Spring City, and the Lewisburg farm colony. There was a new home for the criminally insane at Fairview, and an inebriate reformatory was proposed. By 1921, the proliferation of institutions necessitated administrative reform. The health 'empire' was transferred from the Board of Charities and the Lunacy Committee, and absorbed into a new Department of Public Welfare.

These institutional reforms were also of great importance for the work of the criminal justice system. In 1909, Pennsylvania pioneered a highly discretionary penal system, which won praise among Progressive students of crime and punishment.\textsuperscript{36} Fixed sentences gave way to flexible indeterminate sentences, the length of which would be decided by administrators and medical experts; and new systems of parole and adult probation were created. These reforms have been described before, but not in the eugenic context in which they occurred.

As we have seen, in the late nineteenth century it became increasingly common to stress the role of 'born criminals,' a 'criminal race,' in
swelling the crime statistics. Indeterminacy and discretionary sentencing would permit the isolation and long-term confinement of such biological criminals. In any case, most such cases would presumably end up in one of the specialised institutions, such as Pennhurst or Fairview. With the removal of the unreformable cases, the prisons would be left only with unfortunates who had drifted into crime. These could easily be cured or rehabilitated, and released at the discretion of the penal authorities. At best, they could be 'out-patients' in the probation system. As Boies wrote in 1901, the eugenic model required such discretion: 37 'If criminality is a defect of character, or a disease to be remedied or cured, common sense rejects the fixing of a positive time in which the cure shall be effected for every individual who commits a certain crime alike, whatever may be his actual condition or variation from the normal, as absurd.'

So the medical or rehabilitative model established in 1909 was closely tied to the eugenic movement. It was the eugenicists who stressed that crime was inborn, so that sentences had to be flexible to allow for the condition of the individual; and it was the eugenicists who attempted to relieve the prisons of the hopeless cases to permit the triumph of rehabilitation for the rest.

How can we account for the popularity of eugenics among the elite of Pennsylvania? In particular, why did such radical ideas win support so very early? I suggest that although eugenics was a new science, it fitted in extremely well with traditional social and political analysis. It was a continuation of various powerful currents in the thought of the traditional elites, except that it was dressed in the most modern and scientific sounding language. It can be argued that eugenics produced few new solutions to society’s problems: it simply gave a more modern form to old ideas and institutions.

This transition can be observed if we examine the political divisions within Northern states like Pennsylvania in the mid-nineteenth century. Traditional elites wished to reassert their power in the face of immigration, which was dislike on ethnic and religious grounds, no less than on fears of radical challenges. 38 The responses of the elites, their reassertion of status and power, came in several forms. Institutions such as prisons and houses of refuge were intended to terrify the lower classes, while temperance and morality legislation showed the power of the old ruling class and its values. Xenophobia, temperance, nativism, the rise of the 'asylum,' all formed part of the ideology of dominant groups within the ante-bellum North; and these movements found a focus in evangelical campaigns and rhetoric. 39

At this time, the interpretation of crime was essentially moralistic and
non-specific, in keeping with the prevailing ideology. For instance, in 1870, the Pennsylvania clergyman J. B. Bittinger addressed the International Penitentiary Congress on the 'Causes of Crime.' He concentrated on gambling, drunkenness, ignorance and idleness, and his cures for crime were equally inspired by morality and religion: the government should uplift mortality and fight alcohol. His views were very representative. Some also believed that prisons should be remodelled on evangelical lines to 'regenerate' the prisoner during an indeterminate sentence. Early 'reformatories' like Elmira (1877) or Huntingdon (1889) were developed on this essentially religious pattern.

But by the 1880s, the old religious ideology of 'political puritanism' was entering a fundamental crisis. It was simply losing its power to convince inferior groups that social justice could be attained within this 'evangelical' context. In 1865, the triumph of the northern industrial and financial elite had marked the beginning of thorough social changes, manifested in urbanisation, immigration and industrialisation. By about 1886, a new wave of labor organization and radical unrest began; and as Reppetto has written, 'Pennsylvania was the state in which the conflicts of industrial America were fought out.' It was especially in Pennsylvania that the threat of class conflict seemed to show the exhaustion of the old moral consensus. Eugenics therefore arose against a background of social and political crisis, in which the ruling orders were seeking new and more modern-sounding justifications for their power.

I have argued that eugenic thought was well advanced in the state by the 1890s—which years were also a time of savage industrial battles in Pennsylvania. The Homestead strike of 1892 was followed by financial panic and depression. In 1897, strikers were massacred at Lattimer, and the anthracite strike of 1902 marked a dangerous new alliance of immigrant miners with the traditional skilled labor force. The heyday of eugenics (c. 1893–1914) was also a time of unparalleled fear of revolution, and of xenophobic attempts to blame chaos on aliens and immigrants.

How could catastrophe be averted? Various solutions suggested themselves, and in each case the eugenicists had much to offer the ruling class. As the ideological front, they justified the rule of the traditional elite; and they advocated racist views with which to divide immigrants from natives. They also justified the extension of institutional solutions to curb deviancy, and Americanise alien city-dwellers. When Boies, Barr or Murdoch examined the growth of the institutional classes, they saw only racial decay. There was no suggestion here of the social pressures and injustices driving people to crime, insanity or pauperism.
Eugenics was a perfect consensus theory, based on the view that the unfortunate were simply pathological cases. They had failed to succeed in the overwhelmingly fair social arrangements of the USA, which so well suited 'normal' people.

As an ideology, eugenics was closely related to the evangelical theories of the mid-nineteenth century. The language had changed, but the essential conservative intent had not; nor had the details of the policies suggested. This can be illustrated with reference to two examples of continuity: in xenophobia, and in temperance.

In the mid-nineteenth century, mass immigration and alien influence had been blamed for many of America's problems. One of the most influential analyses of crime was that of Charles Loring Brace (1872) whose study of the 'dangerous classes' was explicitly anti-immigrant. Drink and 'the city' were often code-words for such xenophobic sentiments. By the 1890s, very similar views were being expressed; but now veiled in the pseudo-scientific jargon of eugenics. For instance, the commissioners examining the condition of the insane in 1902 frequently asked superintendents about the role played by foreigners and immigrants in engendering deficiency, insanity and epilepsy. Boies was a thoroughgoing racist, contrasting the 'Teutonic' foundations of the USA with the evil influences of the 'effete races.' Immigrants were causing the decline of the Anglo-Saxon race. Quite literally, Americans were becoming fat rather than muscular, and each new ethnic element brought its own particular curse—Jewish corruption, black criminality, 'Romish' superstition. Clearly, Boies' analysis of the role of urbanization in causing racial deterioration was chiefly an instance of traditional extreme nativism dressed as modern biology.

This continuity is equally apparent from the issue of temperance, long a shibboleth of protestants and nativists. Throughout the mid-nineteenth century, drink had been regarded as a major cause of crime and social decay by moral or evangelical theorists like Bittinger. By the 1890s, the eugenacists took over the concern with temperance, although now masked in scientific language. Boies 'attributed the abnormal increase of criminality and pauperism in the US largely to an increase of intemperance.' Drink accounted for perhaps 75 percent of crimes, and '50 percent of all the sufferings endured on account of poverty' (Again, how convenient such writers were in shifting the blame for injustice from the structure of society itself). Traditional nativist analyses were maintained—but now using the terms of 'degeneracy.' Despite the scientific changes in the interim, Boies would have found much in common with a nativist or moral reformer of the 1840s.

Eugenics was a valuable ideology for conservatives in the face of the
new social crisis. Eugenic theorists could also contribute to the immediate problem of repressing unrest and radicalism. In 1905, Pennsylvania acquired in the State Police a paramilitary nativist force of considerable efficiency, whose chief functions were the suppression of radicalism and organized labor. And precisely such an institution had been advocated in the eugenic works of Henry Boies at least since 1893. In that year, he had called for a 'carefully selected, wisely organized and firmly disciplined State police force.' In 1901, he had made much more explicit the need for state centralization and military organization, so that the police could fight the main changes of the day—radicalism, aliens, immorality and racial decay. He stressed that 'A State police force is the first general preventive prescription of scientific penology.' Boies also outlined his ideal constabulary force, in a scheme so close to the model adopted in 1905 that we must assume direct influence. The 'defense of the race' seemed to call for an extension of government and the justice system—which was also a vital weapon in defense of the social status quo.

Despite its pioneering role, the state soon lost its primacy in eugenics. By about 1914, the social crisis which had made the ideology necessary had subsided. In the 1920s and 1930s, Pennsylvania produced few eugenic theorists, although the University of Pittsburgh continued as a minor center.

However, the eugenic movement did have important after-effects, not least in the changes made in institutions for the criminal and defective. Long after prisons had given up hope of detecting 'born criminals,' they still operated on the medical and discretionary model which had arisen out of those theories. Until as late as 1966, the state was still attempting to isolate the 'defective delinquents' who had so terrified the eugenicists—and attempting to do so by laws of terrifyingly broad scope and bad definition. More generally, the rehabilitative model in the prisons preserved the practice of indeterminate sentencing for most offenders until the 1970s.

The eugenic fad represented a fairly brief phase in the history of penal and medical institutions. However, eugenic ideas were responsible for shaping many of the ideas and assumptions on which those institutions operated. If only because of this 'afterlife,' the eugenic movement deserves re-examination and re-evaluation.
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