## Eugenics: The Rearing of the Human Thoroughbred*

By H. E. JORDAN, M. A., Ph. D., Professor of Histology and Embryology, University of Virginia, University, Virginia.

Eugenics is defined by its founder, the late Sir Francis Galton, as "the study of the agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations, either physically or mentally." In his earlier lecture before the Sociological Society of London on May 16, 1904, Galton spoke of Eugenics as "the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race, also with those that develop these to the utmost advantage."

Sir Francis Galton a half first cousin of Charles Darwin, was born in Birmingham in 1822, the same year with Louis Pasteur and Gregor Mendel. The word "eugenics" was first used by Galton in his book "Inquiries into the Human Faculty," published in 1883. Eugenics, literally the science of being well-born, or racial hygiene, as it is called by Saleeby, is thus one of the very newest sciences.

The idea was of course not new to Galton. Just as the idea of evolution was not new to either of the contemporaries Spencer, Wallace, or Darwin, who almost at the same instant glimpsed the truth of an organic progress through struggle for existence and a survival of the fittest, or by natural selection; but had been suggested, at least to Darwin, by Malthus' book on Population, and can be traced in germ back through the writings of Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus Darwin, and his contemporaries, Treviranus and De Candelle, to whom it had probably been suggested in the works of the philosopher Buffon, back to Lucretius and Empedocles and finally to the early Greek philosopher Anaximander; so the idea of "good stock," "noble blood," and "fine breeding" may be discerned in more or less clear form in almost every age. The idea is clearly stated in Plato's Republic; and it is a historical fact that, whatever the state of biological science in the time of the Spartans, these noble people, in crude but effective form practiced the art of eugenics until the time when their best youth was too largely sacrificed to the God of War.

It was not, however, until Louis Pasteur had announced the results of his studies of microörganisms, and had made clear

---

*An address before the third annual meeting of the American Association for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality, held at Cleveland, October 2-5, 1912.

their relation to man as a part of his environment, working in some cases for good, in others for mortal ill, and emphasized their importance with respect to the welfare of man; nor until the unassuming Austrian monk of the cloister at Brünn had had rediscovered the results of his experiments in hybridizing peas, that any real and certain advance could be made in the science of eugenics. The sciences of bacteriology and genetics, or the physiology of heredity, had to be born before certain steps could be taken in the control of human evolution.

The science did not get the early start that it might have had. Mendel's paper, published in 1865 in The Transactions of the Natural History Society of Brünn, was neglected until the same results were simultaneously rediscovered in 1900 by Correns of Leipzig, Tschermack of Berlin and De Vries of Amsterdam. Search of the literature then revealed the fact that Mendel almost forty years before had reported the same facts. Of course ample recognition has since been taken of Mendel's work, and fitting respect has been paid to the man in essay and memorial and in the erection of a statue in his native town of Brünn, and in naming the particular type of heredity he discovered, alternate or Mendelian inheritance.

Galton was meanwhile laying the foundations of engenics in the preparation of his book on "Hereditary Genius," published in 1869. This work also was for many years neglected. Pasteur's work and the rebirth of Mendelian heredity gave renewed impetus to the biosocial study of men. With renewed zeal and interest Galton returned to the work in the interest of eugenics in 1901 when he delivered the Huxley lecture of that year before the Anthropological Institute of London on "The Possible Improvement of the Human Breed under the Existing Conditions of Law and Sentiment." Then the science of eugenics leaped into prominence. Pasteur, who laid stress on the importance of the factor of environment with respect to man's well-being; Galton, who emphasized the importance of the factor of heredity to this end; and Mendel, who stated the law of the inheritance of organic characters, thus lying a scientific foundation for the social direction of human evolution, had now received a universal hearing.

It is not too much to say, I believe, that the idea of eugenics, based upon the science of genetics, will work the greatest social revolution the world has yet known. Closely related to the con-

cept of evolution, which has left its impress on every department of human thought, the idea of engenics can hardly be compared with it in the pregnancy of its promise, the immensity of its scope and in the serious import of its reception or neglect for the future trend of nations. It aims at the production, and the exclusive prevalency, of the highest type of physical, intellectual and moral man, within the limits of human protoplasm.

Before discussing the foundations and data, and attempting an interpretation from several standpoints, notably social and economic, let me merely mention its organs for research and propaganda.

First in point of time, and I believe in point of value of its scientific output and service, is the Galton Eugenics Laboratory of the University of London, endowed in part by Galton himself, and under the directorship of Karl Pearson, Professor of Applied Mathematics, and the author of the well-known "Grammar of Science." The Eugenics Education Society of London, with offices in Adelphi, issues quarterly the *Eugenics Review,* a most valuable periodical. Under the influence of these two institutions Eugenics Societies have been formed in almost every large city of the British Isles. Numerous public lectures are also maintained, and pamphlets published. From the Galton Laboratory issues almost monthly some valuable memoir by one of its fellows or scholars, embodying the results of some practical eugenics investigation, e. g., effect of parental alcoholism on physique and intellect of the offspring; effect of women employment on infant mortality; the effect of factory legislation on birth rate; etc. The Drapers Company Research Memoirs must also be mentioned here as most valuable contributions, mostly by workers in the Galton Eugenics Laboratory. These several organizations and their organs and representatives have made numerous, thus far mostly unsuccessful, attempts to influence Parliament for the passage of legislation, e. g., legislation relating to Poor Laws, Child Labor, Factory Laws, Marriage Laws, etc., fully concordant with eugenic principles.

In America we have the Eugenics Committee of the American Breeders' Association, founded in 1903, with Doctor David Starr Jordan, President of Leland Stanford Junior University, as its chairman, and Professor C. B. Davenport, Director of the Carnegie Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, as Secretary. Its official organ is the

*American Breeders' Magazine*, a quarterly which publishes the results of scientific investigations largely in nontechnical form. The Committee hopes to come into possession of larger financial resources, and has already laid elaborate plans for the prosecution of a detailed scientific study of human characteristics and traits both normal and pathological. The Committee has cooperated in the establishment of the Eugenics Record Office, at Cold Spring Harbor, under the directorship of Mr. H. H. Laughlin. This office is collecting, filing and analyzing data from all over the country respecting the heritable family traits or capacities of various sorts. Already very valuable publications have issued from this office.

The American Association for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality has also organized a Eugenics Section and contemplates the collection of data regarding the hereditary transmission of pathological conditions with a view to lessening the infant mortality rate.

In Germany an International Society for Improving the Health of the Race (*Internationale Gesellschaft für Rassen-Hygiene*) has been formed with Doctor Alfred Ploetz, of Munich, as President. There is a similar society in Sweden. The German society aims to pursue its work in a spirit of chivalry, operating on higher levels, however, than the chivalry of the Middle Ages. This chivalrous spirit will, Doctor Ploetz believes, impart self-respect and dignity; and guard against the squandering of the chief national strength. The society seeks to promote the study of scientific biology—social and racial—and of social and racial hygiene (a), by collecting and recording such facts, pathological and normal, bodily and mental, as illustrate the working of the laws of heredity and variation in the case of man; (b), by spreading the knowledge of these facts, and of the lessons to be derived from them amongst its members and the population at large. It seeks to stimulate its members to carry out in practice the following principles, viz., (a), to improve their own spiritual, intellectual, and bodily efficiency; (b), to agree that before entering into marriage they will submit to a medical examination as to their fitness for the marriage state, and if pronounced unfit, will abstain from marriage, or, at all events, from parenthood; (c), to promote by every means in their power the individual and racial efficiency of their offspring.

In France also there is activity along these lines. Here, however, there is perhaps more of practical work and less of oratory and essay. The various agencies which seek to counteract present economic conditions, which tend to penalize motherhood and to handicap the man of family, are cast largely along eugenic lines. Numerous bonuses to large families and special concessions to the married here tend to preserve the middle class, the backbone of any nation, the source from which under present conditions, the men of ability and genius must be recruited. For example, in the city of Paris every workman receives at marriage a gift of 100 francs. Married workmen receive a gift of 100 francs each at the birth of a child. The mother, if she is in work or in service, has a right to six weeks' holiday on full pay. Every workman who has more than three children on his hands under the age of sixteen receives the sum of 100 francs per annum for each child after the third. In the colonies also of England, Germany, and France research, agitation and legislation along eugenic lines are advancing.

What does all this activity mean? Is the matter really serious? Are the English, German, French and American nations actually in peril? Are our prophets seeing aright when they point our attention to the fate of Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome? Are symptoms appearing among us similar to those which accompanied the demise of these great nations? Have our statesmen-scientists suddenly become hysterical, lost their power of clear vision and intelligent foresight? Are they tilting with wind-mills or are they actually fighting national dragons? What then seems to be the trouble? The trouble is implied in a statement of Whetham's "Although the suppression of the best blood of a country is a new disease in modern Europe, it is an old story in the history of nations and has been the prelude to the ruin of states and the decline and fall of empires."

The fall of Rome is not now attributed to degeneracy following luxury and overculture spoken of by Gibbon, nor to the malarial parasite as urged by Doctor Ross, nor to a principle of natural racial senility spoken of by Professor Ray Lancaster; but most probably to the fact, as President David Starr Jordan points out, that the human harvest was bad, that Rome sacrificed its best manhood in war, and left the business of breeding new generations to weaklings, seniles, cowards, and scullions. The same sad lesson is just beginning to be read by England in the

Indian and African wars. The flower of her young manhood, scholars from Oxford and Cambridge, lie in the sands of India and South Africa, "replaced by marble tablets" throughout the counties of England.

A similar lesson we read in the Civil War. Five hundred thousand of our best young men, North and South, lost forever. The lost can never be replaced. America, perhaps, will never know what the war has cost in terms of its highest national asset—splendid young manhood.

In the Wiertz Gallery in Brussels is a picture of Napoleon in Hell. There stands Napoleon looking out into space. Here in the foreground are innumerable faces. Thousands upon thousands are simply hinted at. These are the faces of the young men and women and children who were killed in the wars of Napoleon. Surely this is a Hell; for Napoleon must have seen, clear-headed man that he was, that back of these were the potential millions of the best of Europe never now to be, because he had killed their potential ancestors.

The two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Frederick the Great was celebrated in Berlin by an exhibition of paintings at the Royal Academy of Arts. These showed the versatile monarch in the many phases of his remarkable career, and represented the work of his contemporaries as well as of later artists. A reproduction of one of the paintings, "Frederick the Great After the Seven Years' War." is published in the *International Studio* for May. I am sure it was one moved by eugenic ideals who interpreted the picture thus: "The pathetic, intellectual face and the bowed figure seem to suggest that the victor is asking himself the question, 'Was it worth while'?"

Do you realize that only about 12 per cent of the present generation (or about 25 per cent of the marriages) produce 50 per cent of the next. Who constitute this 12 per cent? Is it our racial best? If so, then all is well. If otherwise then we are in peril. And we are in peril because like produces like. As the parent so the children; because figs will not grow on thistles nor grapes on thorns; because out of an unclean thing no clean thing can come.

The real trouble is that the most prolific are on the whole the less fit for the sacred duties of rearing the next generation. Too much poor stock is being bred, there is too little restraint upon idiots, feeble-minded, epileptic, tuberculous, syphilitics, dis-

eased; and too meager productivity among the best stocks. This is not merely an academic question; it is practical and most vitally important. National salvation seems to lie along the path of rigidly applied negative and positive eugenics, i. e., prohibition of parenthood, either by public opinion, moral suasion, or legislation, to the unfit; and encouragement, again by either or all of these methods, for more abundant parenthood among the racially fit.

The scientific basis upon which this remedy for national death rests is our knowledge of heredity. I have not time here to discuss the importance of the factor of environment. Suffice it to say that this factor is essential. The environment must be made as nearly ideal as possible by the elimination of all noxious bacterial and other deleterious conditions for the proper development of the best that heredity can give. But heredity comes first; environment, however necessary, can only follow. As Barrington and Pearson put it "The first thing is good stock, and the second thing is good stock, and the third thing is good stock, and when you have paid attention to these three things, fit environment will keep your material in good condition. No environment or educational grindstone is of service unless the tool to be ground is of genuine steel—of tough race and tempered stock."

Darwin long ago wrote "Hardly anyone is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed." When the matter is one of breeding rare fowl or fine cows or good horses or dogs we breed only from the best. Why do we so persistently and cowardlywise shut our eyes to very obvious facts when they concern man? And today when we know so much—though we desire so much more, which will be ours in time—about the hereditary transmission of human characters, there is no excuse for inaction except selfish indifference or cowardice and the lack of patriotism.

There is an almost appalling array of scientific data regarding heredity in higher animals and man. I have time to speak of only a few investigations whose results seem to me most significant for our present purpose.

Professor Davenport has worked out the inheritance of blue and brown eyes in man. Brown eyes are due to the presence in the iris of a brown pigment; blue eyes to the absence of this pigment. Brown eyes may be either brown simplex or brown duplex, i. e., they may have resulted from a double brown-eyed parentage, or from one in which only one parent was brown-eyed. When brown-eyed duplex individuals mate only brown-eyed off-

spring result. When brown-eyed simplex mates with brown-eyed simplex one in every four will be blue-eyed. When brown-eyed simplex mates with blue-eyed, one-half of the offspring will be blue-eyed. Inheritance of eye color follows the Mendelian laws of dominance and segregation, by which one of a pair of alternative characters dominates in the first generation; and from crosses of such hybrids a generation will result in the proportion of three of the dominant to one of the recessive, one of which dominant and all recessives always breed true. The same law holds for many other physical characters. I believe that I have demonstrated this type of inheritance for crosses between whites and negroes as respects skin pigment; also for the character of left-handedness; likewise for pulmonary tuberculosis.

There prevails a justifiable presumption that the same principle governs also the transmission of psychical and pathological characters. The point is that what is in the germ cells will come out at some time and in a certain definite proportion according to the type of the mating. If we want sound men, strong men, intellectual men, honest men, temperate men, chaste men, wise men, they must be bred from their type.

That this is not all assumption is shown by the investigations of Galton himself in which he studied the parentage of 207 Fellows of the Royal Society. He assumed that 1 per cent of the individuals of the class represented might be expected to be "noteworthy." In the general population it is about 1 in 4000, or 1/40 per cent. Galton found that on this basis Fellows of the Royal Society had noteworthy fathers with twenty-four times the frequency to be expected in the absence of heredity; noteworthy brothers with thirty-one times the expected frequency; and noteworthy grandfathers with twelve times the expected frequency. Galton, moreover, showed statistically, by a study of the families of the Judges of England between 1660 and 1865, that the chance of the son of a judge showing eminent ability was about 500 times as great as that for a man taken at random from the population.

Schuster in a similar investigation examined the class lists of Oxford covering a period of ninety-two years. He found that the first honor men had 36 per cent first or second honor fathers; second honor men had 32 per cent first or second honor fathers; ordinary degree men had 14 per cent first or second

honor fathers. These percentages are far in excess of that to be expected—estimated at about 0.5 per cent—on the assumption that ability is not inherited.

Schuster also determined the coefficient of heredity between fathers and sons as regards intellectual ability, using class marks at Harrow and Oxford. The correlation coefficients as determined were 0.30 for the parental relation and 0.40 for the fraternal. In many forms of insanity the correlation coefficient has been found as high as 0.57 for the parental relation and 0.50 for the fraternal.

It seems clear that psychical traits are inherited in like manner and with the same intensity as physical traits. The history of the Edwards family as determined by Winship gives the very strongest evidence in favor of the heredity of mental ability. "Of the 1,900 descendants of Johnathan Edwards, of Connecticut, 1,394 have been identified; 295 were college graduates; 13 were college presidents; 65 were college professors; 60 were physicians; 100 were clergymen of renown; 75 were officers in army and navy; 60 were prominent authors; 100 were lawyers; 30 were judges; 80 held public offices; 3 were United States senators. Besides, fifteen railroads, many banks, insurance companies, and large industrial enterprises have been indebted to their management." In fact, as Judge Foster remarks, "almost every department of social progress and of public weal has felt the impulse of this healthy and long-lived family. It is not known that any one of them was ever convicted of crime." Think what it would mean for this country, if its individual citizens were preponderatingly of such superb stock.

On the other hand the Juke family illustrates most favorably the inheritance of various types of mental and moral delinquency. Dugdale has carefully traced the Juke family from the five daughters of a lazy and irresponsible fisherman born in 1720. In five generations the family increased to about 1200. The histories of about 1000 are known. 310 were professional paupers in almshouses a total of 2300 years—and at whose expense? 440 were syphilitics; more than half of the women were prostitutes; 130 were convicted criminals; 60 were habitual thieves; 7 were murderers. This family has cost the State of New York over a million and a quarter dollars—and the end is not yet.

A family recently described by Poellmann has a very similar history. This family was established by two daughters of a

woman drunkard who in six generations produced 834 descendants. The histories of 709 are known. 107 were of illegitimate birth; 64 inmates of almshouses; 162 professional beggars; 164 prostitutes and 17 procurers. 76 had several sentences in prison aggregating 116 years; 7 were murderers. This family has also cost more than a million dollars and is still very prolific.

Perhaps the most complete family history of this kind is that of the Swiss family "Zero" recently carefully worked out by Jörger. In 1905, 190 members of this family were known to be living, all characterized by vagabondage, thievery, drunkenness, mental and physical defect and immorality.

Where rests the blame for such atrocities as the Poellmann, Juke and Zero families? No one will blame it upon the persons themselves. Kellicott is right when he says that "it must be placed squarely upon the shoulders and consciences of the intelligent members of society who have permitted these predetermined degenerates to be brought into the world, and who are today taking no broadly sympathetic view of their treatment by exercising preventive measures."

Some years ago England became alarmed at its decreasing wheat supply and the prospect of consequent starvation. At the meeting of the National Association of British and Irish Millers in 1900 this matter was discussed with the result that Professor R. H. Biffen, a biologist, was employed to make a scientific study of the causes underlying the poor wheat crop, and determine means for improving the same. The specific problem was to produce from a loose-eared, well-bearded native wheat, with low gluten content and susceptibility to rust, one suited to British climate but with full beardless ear, strong straw, high gluten content, high yield per acre, and rust-resistant. We are interested here only in the attainment of that last requirement, though it ought to be stated that Biffen succeeded in producing the wheat according to specifications in 1905.

Biffen crossed the native rust-susceptible wheat with a foreign rust-resistant wheat. All of the first generation were rust-susceptible. But when seed of this generation was sown there resulted rust-susceptibles and rust-resistants approximately in the Mendelian proportion of three to one. The rust-resistant recessives thereafter bred true to type. This experiment, and others that might be mentioned, demonstrate that susceptibility and resistance (or immunity) to disease are of the nature of "unit

character" or "allelomorphs" and may be fixed or eliminated at will in plants and animals by appropriate breeding experiments.

Suppose we substitute here for rust-susceptibility and rust-immunity, predisposition and resistance to the tubercle bacillus in man. Tuberculous stock crossed with tuberculous stock can only yield like stock; similarly for many other pathological conditions, such as syphilis, cancer, heart disease, nephritis, arteriosclerosis, rheumatism, idiocy, epilepsy, etc. And a number of studies already show that this is not pure assumption nor surmise.

To cite only the investigation of Karl Pearson with respect to tuberculosis: This work yields most cogent proof that a large quota of tuberculosis is due to a hereditary diathesis or predisposition thereto. The salient facts in the proof are that tubercle germs are fairly ubiquitous, and that about 85 per cent of all individuals have tuberculous lesions before the age of eighteen, consequently if it were simply a matter of infection most of us would be tuberculous; furthermore, while the degree of resemblance (the correlation coefficient) between husband and wife, where there is much opportunity for possible direct infection, is only somewhere between 0.17 and 0.25 (and this Pearson regards as due largely to assortive mating), that between parents and children is between 0.40 and 0.50, and between brother and brother, who at the time of the usual onset of the disease have generally already left the home, is as high as from 0.40 to 0.60. A large amount of tuberculosis is thus undoubtedly due to a hereditary lack of resisting power or immunity, and might be more largely eliminated from future generations by wise matings and proper marriage restrictions.

The solution of our great social problems from this standpoint is primarily in the hands of the scientist, notably the physician and trained biologist. But unless they have the hearty cooperation of the publicist, the statesman, the economist, the social worker, and such institutions as the church and eleemosynary institutions and charity organizations they can do very little. First the general public must be educated. Here every one can help. Then there must be further investigations. This demands the best scientific talent available in the country. It demands also a complete and centralized system of collecting, recording and preserving statistics. This means government endowment, which in turn waits upon the intelligent and sympathetic appreciation of the importance of such work on the part of the legislator and

statesman. Then there is demanded legislative action with respect to restrictive marriage laws forbidding marriage to physically or mentally tainted stock. There is demanded also legislation providing for the sterilization of the criminal and the very defective types, upon whom no appeal on any usual moral or civic plane has effect. Then there ought to be a federal law similar to the several state laws, under which sterilization may now be practiced in the states of Indiana since 1907, Washington, California and Connecticut since 1909, and recently also in Nevada (1911), New Jersey (1911), Iowa (1911) and New York (1912). There ought to be legislation which could counteract the present conditions which tend to penalize parentage and family life, the admitted vital unit of modern society. Such legislation awaits the thought and guidance of American young manhood.

Less than a century ago England administered capital punishment for 223 offenses. This was drastic but effective in keeping the supply of criminals at a minimum. A more humane civilization has universally reduced the list of capital crimes to one or several, but has still largely failed to meet the problems of feeble-mindedness and criminality in a manner adequate to hold these maladjustments at a minimum.

Let me call your attention to another investigation of Professor Pearson's. Stated in greatest brevity, Pearson has disclosed a decided lowering of the English birth rate at a number of definite periods corresponding closely to certain factory acts reducing the economic value of children and applying to bleaching and dyeing works, to copper, steel, and iron industries; namely the Workshop Regulation Act of 1867; the Education Act of 1876; the Factories and Workshops Act of 1878; the Mines Act of 1887; and the 1891 act as to labor by women and children.

Pearson believes that the present precarious condition of England with respect to the birth rate is "a direct effect of the destruction by legislation of the economic value of the child." He advocates "reversal of all legislation which penalizes the parentage of the fit, and the restriction of all charity which favors the parentage of the unfit." "We must directly or indirectly," says he, "produce differential wages for the fit parent; in other words there must be endowment of fit parentage at the expense of the unfit parent and of childless men and women."

To quote further, "When we regard the present six or seven million pounds a year—soon to be ten or more millions—given to a mere environmental reform, which is applied long after the reproductive age and cannot possibly produce any permanent racial change, how deeply one must regret the want of knowledge and of statesmanship, which overlooked the naturally disastrous policy of the factory acts, and did not seek its opportunity to endow parentage rather than senility with those annual millions! Even as a party cry I believe the endowment of parentage would have been effective; as a step to meet grave racial dangers it would have possessed real insight." Here is occasion for serious thought and noble action on the part of the young men and women whose lives will be cast more especially in spheres of legislative influence.

The question is largely economic and it has its various social, political and religious phases which I cannot even touch upon. Charity organizations must take more intelligent note of the teachings of heredity. Just to cite one instance. There was formed four years ago a national Association for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality. The ideal of the society is to minimize the infant mortality rate. But very naturally infant mortality is a process of natural selection. Unless the conditions are very adverse so as to kill all the babies, only the weakest will die. But the weaker physically may have splendid endowment mentally and morally which cannot well be spared in this commercial day. But aside from this point, no method of discriminate infant conservation can be thought of. Anything less than an effort at universal salvage would be a disgrace to our civilization. But we must recognize the antieugenic effect of this attitude. Consequently we must compensate for this unfit material. Compensation lies along the line of prohibition of parenthood to the racially unfit (civically unworthy), and encouragement to greater productivity among the most fit (worthy).

I hope the main issue is clear. Or at any rate, I hope I have aroused your interest sufficiently to move you to seek and think for yourselves. Upon your thinking and action depend much of the future. And it concerns you whether you be man, or woman, or farmer, or mechanic, or teacher, or investigator, or lawyer, or what-not. You carry a sacred personal responsibility and a still more sacred national responsibility. Above all give your kindly sympathy and encouragement to the patient investi-

gator who gives his life to the study, of necessity often in the fashion of a recluse, to these questions of serious national import. Do not join that too large body who scoffs at or at best only tolerates the man who "plays" with peas and grains of wheat, or bugs or mice or guinea pigs. Upon the result of investigations into these homely, almost undignified things may depend the fate of nations.

When this nation shall have established its life upon a eugenic basis, as I believe it must if it shall survive, then of the national heroes that it stops in its toil to honor, will be the names of such men as Galton and Pasteur and Mendel. With honor still, for they did their duty as they saw it, but with pangs of pity and regret for irreparable loss, will be regarded the leader of war and of a too-short-sighted charity; but the real sons of Hercules will be those who tenderly yet sternly rid our national life of the sources of its corruption and destruction.

The remarks of Professor Schiller, of Oxford, respecting England's present attitude toward its racial unfitness seem pertinent universally: "There can be little doubt that this policy alone holds out a prospect of ultimate success; but when one reckons up the enormous weight of prejudices challenged by eugenics, the force of habit in all, the timidity and sterility of our spiritual, and the blind opportunism of our political leaders, the antiquated and unscientific education of the bulk of our cultivated classes, and the ignorance and disregard of real knowledge in which it naturally issues, it is impossible to repress a dread that any considerable measure of success is so remote that political contingencies may easily put an end to the British Empire long before the British people as a whole awakens to the fact that the national degeneration which it is at present complacently fostering is neither a process that can safely be indulged in nor yet a fatality no human foresight can avert. True, the outlook is almost as gloomy throughout the Europeon world, but no man of science can hesitate to predict that, if so, the whole of that world must pay the penalty and that the nation which first subjects itself to a rational eugenical discipline is bound to inherit the earth."