

**Episode 2 of the Eugenics Mini-Series: Pre-Eugenics Eugenics**

Jim: Hey guys, guess what I'm thinking about?

Jo/Erik: What?

Jim: Whoopi Goldberg.

Jo: Well that's random. Why? Please tell me you were re-watching *Sister Act*, the greatest nun-themed film of all time....

Erik: Really Jo? C'mon, what about the *Sound of Music*?

Jim: Funny you should mention the *Sound of Music*, Erik, since it's set in Nazi Austria. The reason I'm thinking about Goldberg also has to do with Nazis.

Jo: Boy, that's a tenuous throughline. But now I know what you're referring to. You're talking about Whoopi's comment on the TV show "The View" earlier this year, aren't you?

Erik: Um.

Jo: What, do you not watch "the View"?

Erik: Not as such, no.

Jo: Okay so it's this talk show and Whoopi Goldberg is on it and there was this episode earlier this year where she insisted that the Holocaust was *not* about race? That pissed some people off.

Erik: Ooooooooooooh!

Jim: Exactly. Now, our enlightened listeners already know that the Holocaust was one terrible consequence of the Eugenics Movement because you all listened to [our first episode on eugenics](#) from way back in January this year, when we promised we'd do a whole series on the topic. Right?....

Erik: I can tell you're about to launch us into another episode in that series, Jim. But before you do, just to make sure the record is clear, the Holocaust was very much about race, right? Can we agree about that?

Jo: I mean, my understanding is that Jewish people were considered a separate and inferior race, and the Holocaust was about wiping them out so they wouldn't pollute the good genetic stock of Aryan peoples. And it's interesting that it comes up right now, this very year of our lord 2022, in the good old US of A with Whoopi's comment.

Erik: What is it she actually said?!?

Jo: We'll talk more about that. But I will say—listeners who have not heard that first episode in a while might want to go back and check it out before continuing on with this one. So are we doing this? Episode 2 of our series on eugenics and race?

Jim/Erik: LET'S GO!!!!

INTROS—I'm Jim, I'm Erik, etc.

Jo: Alright then, here we are in episode 2 of our long-awaited series on eugenics and race. Just to remind our listeners, do either of you want to take a stab at summarizing what we talked about in episode 1?

Jim: We told the sort of canonical story of eugenics that begins with Francis Galton, Charles Darwin's cousin who coined the term in an 1883 publication, and ends with the disaster of the Holocaust.

Erik:...which makes it sound like we've covered the whole thing already, right? And that is, in fact, the story that typically gets told or taught, if you happen to be in a classroom that teaches about eugenics

Jo: —which itself is pretty rare in the US—

Erik: But my recent research suggests there was a WHOLE LOT more going on with eugenics prior to Galton, especially in the US. So I think that's what we should talk about today.

Jo: OK, so the alternative history of eugenics. I like it. Let's start off with an explanation of what we mean when we say "eugenics."

Jim: Usually people just refer to eugenics as "the science and practice of promoting 'good breeding' among humans," which is how we also defined it in our first episode.

Jo: That's definitely how I teach about it.

Erik: To me, eugenics is about 3 key ingredients being present all at the same time—something we see in US history long before Francis Galton reared his mutton chops.

Jo: Shortbread is made from 3 ingredients. And, perhaps not coincidentally, it's white and flaky. Get it?! Kind of like many eugenicists. White and flaky! ....cause they love whiteness and purity...and, they're flaky?

Erik/Jim: groan.

Jo: Ok but why the three ingredients, Erik?

Erik: Well, number one, I saw them crop up again and again in this research I was doing. And number two, I'd argue—and maybe I'm giving away the punch line here— that these 3 ingredients are again present in the US right now. Which, y'know, doesn't bode well for racial equality.

Jo: Sinister! But I like this idea of an alternate framing that might help give us insight into what's going on today, cause I really think most people consider eugenics a strange relic of history, if they consider it at all. So what's the first ingredient?

Erik: The first is a widespread fear of degeneration, by which I mean a sort of population-level panic about what the “undesirables” will do to the quality of the population if they interbreed with everyone.

Jim: Crucially, I'll add, who counted as “undesirable” or “unfit” has shifted a lot over the history of eugenics. At some points it was people who were considered insane, diseased, or developmentally disabled. At other points it was ethnic or religious minorities—

Jo: Including Jewish people in Europe!

Jim: Exactly. And at other times it might've been black or brown people, or immigrants.

Jo: You make an important point here, Jim, because I think it's this moving target of eugenics that often confuses people. Maybe even people like Whoopi Goldberg. Like—eugenics is not always clearly about race in the way we think of race today, and sometimes my students struggle with that.

Erik: What do you mean?

Jo: Like, they'll say that it doesn't look like racism to them if it's not overt, bigoted, Black vs white stuff, like what they've learned about leading up to the Civil Rights Movement in the US. But what I try to emphasize to them is that eugenics is still about trying to make the “best” race more pure, and in most cases that “best” race is defined as white/Aryan.

Erik: Yes, good point. *Rassenhygiene* is what the Nazi's called it. And eugenics has always been about limiting people who aren't the right kind—maybe not the right kind of white, or not the right kind of religion, or whatever. GETTING BACK TO MY POINT, though, the first ingredient we need for eugenics is fear of degeneration.

Jo: OK. So worries about the dominant population being “diluted” by minorities or newcomers. What's the second?

Erik: The second is biological determinism.

Jim: Our listeners are familiar with that from our [top 5 scientific racisms episode](#) from earlier this year. To remind folks, that's a fancy way of saying the belief that your biology dictates your destiny, and that people's superiority or inferiority is biologically (now we'd say genetically) coded in such a way that it can't be changed. ...And it just so happens I'm cooking up an episode about the biological determinism of the 1960s for the future.

Jo: And since we're all doing a bunch of asides here, I'll point out that biological determinism is also the key substrate of scientific racism. So there's a really big ideological connection between eugenics and racism, in case we haven't convinced people yet that we should be talking about eugenics on a podcast about race.

Erik: Yeah, that's super important, and we'll definitely come back to it later. but in the meantime, the third and final eugenic ingredient is where the rubber hits the road: actual practices that change reproduction to make sure some people have more children and others less. Sterilization is the big one --

Jo: -- or arranged marriage --

Erik: Sure, I hadn't thought about that, but yes. Also, incarceration I think would count.

Jo: You mean like pulling a group out of the gene pool by sticking them in an asylum, yes?

Erik: Or, even just prison.

Jo: I can see that. So, you're saying the definition of "eugenics" is fears of degeneration plus biological determinism plus practices changing the ratio of reproduction across a society. Got it. And...remind me why this matters?

Erik: I mean, two reasons really. First, if you take those three things in combination, it allows us to see that "eugenics" was brewing long before it was called "eugenics" by the cousin of Charles Darwin, Sir Francis Galton. And second, it allows us to see how the current moment—which for many people might seem like light years away from a eugenic past—is actually much closer than we might think.

Jo: So you're saying that defining eugenics as just stuff that leads to the Holocaust causes us to miss a part of the story—and potentially a really important part if we're concerned about anything like, y'know, racial justice?

Erik: Precisely. I feel like we have already repeated that point a couple of times, but it's worth emphasizing. Though I will say, given the way this episode is going, I can tell we probably aren't going to get through the entire story this time. But we'll cover it all over the next few episodes.

Jim: Well we may as well jump in after all those preambles and definitions. We said earlier that these eugenic ingredients show up in history well before Francis Galton in the late 19th century. How early are we talking?

Erik: At least as far back as the ancient civilizations in the eastern Mediterranean, and likely much farther, since the Greeks didn't just spring out of nowhere. One good example comes from the writings of the poet Theognis, who was on the scene sometime in the 6th century BCE. Can someone else PLEASE read the quotes this time?

Jo: Fine. FINE. Here we go. From the poetry of Theognis: We seek out rams and asses and horses that are purebred [...] but a noble man does not mind marrying the base daughter of a base father if the latter gives him a lot of money, and a woman does not refuse to be the wife of a base man who is rich [...]. It is money people honour [...] Wealth has mixed up blood. And so, Polypaides, do not be surprised that the townsmen's stock is becoming enfeebled, since what is *noble* is mixing with what is *base*.<sup>1</sup>

Jim: Well poop! Would you look at that? We've got the fears of degeneration and the idea of biological determinism in there...all we're missing is the infamous ingredient #3, the actual practice of limiting reproduction.

Erik: It took about a century for that to work its way in.

Jo: You mean until the 19th century....

Erik: No, I mean only 100 years later, in the 5th century BCE.

Jo: Oh, but probably no one really talked about it, then, cause I've never heard of it happening that early.

Erik: I mean, if by "no one" you mean the most widely cited ancient book, at least a book that isn't scripture.

Jo: Um.

Erik: Plato's *Republic* --

Jim: Yeah, even I have a copy of that on a bookshelf at home, and it's not even part of my Disney comics collection!

Jo: Wait, Plato? As in Socrates, Plato, Aristotle?

---

<sup>1</sup>Elegiac Poems, 183–192, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. DOI: 10.4159/DLCL.theognis-elegiac\_poems.1999

Erik: Right there in the *Republic*, Tom Jefferson's favorite book, one of the most read books of all time, Plato borrows from Theognis. And we're going to have to read this quote as a team because in true Platonic fashion it's written as a dialogue between individuals.

Jo: Ok, let me put on my Greek thespian costume.

Jim: Um, Jo. This is a podcast. No one needs costumes—I don't even have pants on!

Erik: Back to the point: "How can marriages be made most beneficial?" Plato starts, "that is a question which I put to you, because I see in your house dogs for hunting, and of the nobler sort of birds not a few. Now, I beseech you, do tell me, have you ever attended to their pairing and breeding? ...

And if care was not taken in the breeding, your dogs and birds would greatly deteriorate?

Jo: "Certainly."

Erik: "And the same of horses and animals in general?"

Jo: "Undoubtedly."

Erik: "Good heavens! my dear friend, I said, what consummate skill will our rulers need if the same principle holds of the human species!" ....ok, and then we skip ahead a little bit.

Jo: Ok I will read this last part, so I get to be the smart guy for a minute. "... the principle has been already laid down that the best of either sex should be united with the best as often, and the inferior with the inferior, as seldom as possible; and that they should rear the offspring of the one sort of union, but not of the other, if the flock is to be maintained in first-rate condition. Now these goings on must be a secret which the rulers only know, or there will be a further danger of our herd, as the guardians may be termed, breaking out into rebellion."

Erik: So he basically says that there should be marriage festivals both to keep city population stable and to make sure that only the best are breeding. But I'm even more interested in the fact that Plato thought there should be special nurses for the children of the best parents, but ...

"the offspring of the inferior, or of the better when they chance to be deformed, will be put away in some mysterious, unknown place, as they should be."

Jo: Jeez. Yeah, so he's suggesting we basically allow the less desirable to wither away, but in secret? Isn't he?

Jim: Sounds very "Republican."

Jo: Groan! Also what jumps out to me here is how Plato seems completely comfortable comparing human reproduction to animal husbandry. That seems like a common thread in the,

well, I guess *centuries* of eugenics -- including in 2020, right as COVID was closing in on the world, when assthat Richard Dawkins, British evolutionary biologist, wrote this tweet that ... well... This time you've got to read it, Jim.

Jim: Fine, but it's under protest! I've despised him since he piggy-backed his biological determinism on top of E.O. Wilson's Sociobiology back in the 70s! Anyway, here's his tweet: "It's one thing to deplore eugenics on ideological, political, moral grounds. It's quite another to conclude that it wouldn't work in practice. Of course it would. It works for cows, horses, pigs, dogs & roses. Why on earth wouldn't it work for humans?" (@RichardDawkins, 02/16/20)

Erik: That's crazy bad timing to write that right before the pandemic!

Jo: That's a Twitter hot-take on eugenics for the 21st century!

Erik: Do we think he's even right?

Jo: Well, we're not going to address that yet. We need to connect more historical dots first to the origins of modern eugenics. Back to the 19th century!

Erik: yay!

Jim: Remember that the 19th century is a key time in the history of race science, when folks we've talked about in the past--people like Arthur de Gobineau, who earned the title of "the father of racist ideology," were doing their thing.

Jo: Gobineau, dear listeners, was the French guy who came up with the idea of the Aryan master race and wrote his "Essay on the Inequality of Human Races," which later became a favorite among Nazis.

Jim: And he was talking about the destruction of humankind by inter-racial mating, very eugenicky.

Erik: At the same time as Gobineau, in 1840s-50s--a good 20 or 30 years before Galton coined the term "eugenics"--two American phrenologists, Orson and Lorenzo Fowler, set up shop in New York City. These guys are central to the origins of eugenics we're trying to map out here.

Jim: In case you don't remember, we did [an episode on phrenology back at the end of 2019](#).

Jo: Thug heads!

Jim: That's the one. In that episode, we discussed the now-discredited science of looking at the lumps and bumps and shapes of people's heads in order to tell about their personality and potential!

Jo: And we covered it pretty well. But the interesting thing you're bringing up, Erik, is that this modern eugenics story starts in New York. We usually think of Eugenics as a British-origin thing. Our first episode credited Francis Galton, cousin of Darwin. So what'd the Fowlers have to do with eugenics—especially if they were focused on phrenology?

Erik: The Fowlers promoted biological determinism in the idea that their traits could be read by their physical signatures on the body.

Jim: Something I'd say some people are still in love with, like genetic ancestry story tellers or hereditarian psychologists!

Jo: Good point. So these Fowler dudes were...popular?

Erik: I'll say. They were public intellectuals so prominent that they were followed by the likes of Walt Whitman, Edgar Allen Poe, Ralph Waldo Emerson...

Jo: That's quite a following.

Erik: Yeah, so you can imagine when Lorenzo's *Principles of Phrenology and Physiology Applied to Man's Social Relations* (1842) came out, people listened.

Jim: You're gonna have to unpack that title for us, Erik. I've never even heard of it.

Erik: It was basically about how people should be matched for marriage based on their phrenological characteristics.

Jo: Wait, what?!

Erik: I know, right? But here's a quote: "Great pains are taken to improve our breeds of horses and sheep, and we hold in high esteem breeders of excellent hogs or obedient dogs. Why do we deny humans should reproduce along equally thoughtful lines?"<sup>2</sup>

Jo: I feel like we just heard Theognis again.

Erik: Good point. The other Fowler brother, Orson, wrote *Laws and Facts Applied to Human Improvement* just a few years later in 1848. And he sketched hundreds of anecdotes to make the argument that bad traits were passed down in families, readable in skulls.<sup>3</sup>

Jim: This sounds like standard phrenology stuff.

---

<sup>2</sup> Fowler, L. N. *The Principles of Phrenology and Physiology Applied to Man's Social Relations; Together with an Analysis of the Domestic Feelings*. New York: Fowler & Wells, 1842.

<sup>3</sup> Fowler, O. S. *Hereditary Descent: Its Laws and Facts Applied to Human Improvement*. New York: Fowlers & Wells, 1848.

Erik: BUT, they both advocated that medical authorities should use this phrenology to control marriage. The well-born should have more children; the defective should be prevented from having children.

Jo: And let me guess, without this kind of control, the corruption and eventual demise of humanity would be inevitable?

Erik: Yup.

Jo: But with it, we could get rid of all the traits that are supposedly “bad” and perfect humans?

Erik: Also yup.

Jim: Yeah, and that’s a familiar story—it sounds like Galton’s eugenics to me, even though it comes before Galton.

Jo: I’d say that in some ways it even goes FARTHER than Galton because Fowler proposes an actual mechanism for the diagnosis of negative characteristics that should be subject to this kind of control—that is, phrenology.

Erik: That’s right. The important point to underline here is that the Fowlers connected their science to a direct proposal for controlled reproduction.

Jo: So, if I pull it apart, what you’re saying is the Fowlers had all 3 ingredients on hand to bake the shortbread of eugenics—the fear of degeneration, the biological determinism—hell, even the animal breeding analogy—AND a proposed mechanism for controlled reproduction. And that was quite a while before Galton came on the scene!

Erik: You’re right, Jo, and those key eugenic ingredients were MUCH more widespread in the mid-19th century US than most people realize. They were so widespread, in fact, that many educated white men subscribed to them, perhaps especially physicians.

Jo: OK, I get that, but can I ask...like, when does this really become about race? We promised listeners at the start of this episode that we’d get there. But so far it sounds like pro-eugenic people like the Fowlers were interested mostly in controlling people they viewed as defective. We already said in our first eugenics episode that this will culminate in 1927 with Oliver Wendell Holmes’s *Buck v Bell* pronouncement. I mean, if it wasn’t about race in the antebellum USA, when would it be?!

Jim: Slow your roll, Jo! Before we go too far down this rabbit hole, I just want to remind folks that Galton used race in his original definition of eugenics, just like his cousin Charles Darwin had used race in the full title of his *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. I also want to collect my quote

reading bonus, so let me say that years later in 1883 when Galton coined the term “eugenics,” he said: “We greatly want a brief word to express the science of improving stock, which is by no means confined to questions of judicious mating, but which, especially in the case of man, takes cognisance of all influences that tend in however remote a degree to give to the more suitable aces or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had. The word eugenics would sufficiently express the idea; it is at least a neater word and a more generalised one than viriculture, which I once ventured to use.” (Galton 1883, 25, footnote 1)--from his footnote 1, always check the footnotes!<sup>4</sup>

Erik: Absolutely! And I want to add a point to our timeline that even predates that. Human race became important in pre-eugenics America almost 30 years before Galton offered that definition. Enter one of those educated white men I was just talking about who were bitten by the eugenic bug: Dr. Gideon Lincecum, a Texas physician.

Jim: OK, as old as I am, I’ve never heard of him.

Erik: I know -- he wouldn’t have made it onto your radar screens. Lincecum corresponded with Darwin about ants.

Jo: Ants?!

Erik: Yep, Texas ants. And ant slavery -- which Darwin used as an example in the *Origin*.

Jo: I’m scratching my head here because I fail to see how this has anything to do with eugenics, Erik. Is this a historian’s rabbit trail?

Erik: I promise it’s relevant. Lincecum proposed a eugenics bill to the Texas House of Representatives) in 1855. And guess how he proposed to do it?

Jo: Ummmm, controlled marriage?

Jim: PHRENOLOGY!

Erik: NOPE. Castration.

Jim/Jo: Ow, eww.

Jo: Wait, what did he actually say? Are you sure it’s eugenics?

---

<sup>4</sup> Galton, F. *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1883, p. 25, footnote 1.

Erik: Let me take the text of his proposed law. “We all know that if one-half of the pains were taken to improve the human race that there is to improve a breed of sheep, the blood of horses, a stock of cattle --”

Jo: --holy crap, it’s the ancient Greek line all over again!

Jim: and like Richard Dawkins....

Erik: -- “So long as physical and moral deformity and disease are licensed to perpetuate themselves, the breed of ill-shaped will continue to multiply so rapidly as to postpone ... intellectual progress ....”

Jo: And he thought castration would improve this?!

Erik: Not just stopping deformities and hereditary diseases, but all sorts of social problems. For instance, he was incensed about dishonest politicians and physicians, “Don’t you think,” he asked, “that society could greatly benefit itself in diminishing the possibility [of] these fellows, to reproduce their kind, by a free use of the knife on their genital apparatus?”

Jo: Well well well ... I guess that indeed qualifies as eugenics. But where does the race stuff come in?

Erik: Lincecum thought his emasculation procedure should be applied first to African Americans because castration would both affect future heredity and change behavior through greater social control in the present. So it was perfect for the Texas frontier with its social divisions between whites, Mexicans, natives, and African Americans, whether enslaved or free. He even thought it was a charitable humanitarian intervention. For instance, according to Lincecum’s reporting a friend of his used that “convenient little instrument, the knife” to save the life of a Black field hand accused of raping a white girl. Because a physician “went into the field where he was at work and castrated him” the town didn’t lynch the accused man. Afterwards, supposedly the man’s behavior changed to make him caring and honest, blah blah blah.

Jo/Jim: How thoughtful, in a white supremacist sort of way.

Erik: But wait, there’s more: Lincecum proposed castration as a cure for compulsive masturbation!

Jim: Ohhhh, so THIS is where the masturbation comes in. We foreshadowed that in our first episode of this mini-series last January, and you’ve just left us all on the hook since then, Erik.

Erik: And I’m going to leave you on the hook a little longer! Let’s pause our history of pre-eugenics eugenics here and save that for next time. Jo, wanna wrap us up?

Jim: But wait! We've still left hanging the question "what about race", so maybe we can actually get back to the example we opened with—you know, Whoopi Goldberg on The View?

Jo: Ok, yes. So you asked earlier about what she actually said. Just a bit of context first: this whole discussion came about because they were talking on The View about how a Tennessee public school board had banned the graphic novel *Maus* by Jewish-American author Art Spiegelman. Have either of you read it?

Erik: Yeah—it's really great. If I remember correctly, it's set up like a series of discussions Art had with his father, a Polish-born Jew who survived the Holocaust. It's this heartbreaking story of what the Holocaust did to their family—just horrible stuff, like his aunt's suicide and murder of his brother to avoid being captured by the Gestapo, his father's working as a POW in Auschwitz, his mom's eventual suicide...and the next-generation trauma all of this imposes on the author himself and his relationship with his dad. It's won a Pulitzer prize and everything!

Jo: Yes, and race enters the story in a couple of ways. One is that it shows up pretty directly through Art's account of his own father's racist treatment of African-Americans after they emigrate to the US. He depicts his father as being...kind of hypocritical, or short-sighted, for not seeing the parallels between his own treatment as a Jew and the treatment of African-Americans in the US.

Erik: The less obvious way racism shows up is through anti-Semitism which obviously is a key theme of Poland and Germany during WWII.

Jo: Yes, and that's where Whoopi Goldberg made her misstep. [On the show on Jan 31st of last year](#), she said "This is white people doing it to white people, so this is—y'know—y'all go and fight amongst yourselves," and then later, "...let's be truthful about it. Because the Holocaust is not about race. It's not about race. It's not about race! It's about man's inhumanity to man. That's what it's about." Then Ana Navarro, one of the other hosts and a Latina activist, says but wait, it's about white supremacy, Goldberg argues the point: "But these are two white groups of people!..You're missing the point. The minute you turn it into race, it goes down this alley. Let's talk about it for what it is. It's how people treat each other. It's a problem! It doesn't matter if you're Black or white. Because Black, white, Jews, Ital—everybody eats each other!"

Jim: So it sort of sounds like Goldberg is missing the crucial knowledge here that Jewish people were racialized—they might be accepted as white in many cases now, but they've been treated as a different race for hundreds of years, and they often still are.

Erik: Ya, and I'm sure it didn't help her case that this discussion happened right as we've been seeing a major uptick in anti-Semitism in the US, too. I remember that social media responses to Goldberg's comments really came down hard on her for this in particular because she herself is Black—like, she should have been more sensitive to what discrimination looks and feels like.

Jo: Yes, it was kind of a strange mirror image moment of Art's criticism of his own father in the book. Like: how does one NOT see the parallels between anti-Black racism and anti-Semitism, especially when one has direct experience of one of those forms of discrimination?

Erik: And I just want to go back to your point Jim about Goldberg missing that Jews were racialized. Let's not forget that the Nazis' aim was to exterminate Jews—to literally kill them all off so they could no longer reproduce and supposedly “sully” Aryan Germans' superior genetic stock. So although from Goldberg's perspective this intra-European racial cleansing looks like white people going after one another, Nazis would never have claimed racial commonality with their Jewish victims.

Jo: You might draw similar inferences about the terrible Hutu-Tutsi conflicts that have raged in Rwanda and Burundi for decades. Both groups are generally darker skinned and would be assumed to be African or African-American if you saw them walking down a street in the US. But they view themselves as categorically different and there have been millions of lives lost over that difference.

Jim: And let's not forget that Rwanda and Burundi were former Belgian and German colonies! So it's the same kind of “enlightened” European racial logic at work, with the same genocidal and tragic consequences.

Jo: And that, dear listeners, is how eugenics is about race even in cases where two groups might have similar skin colors.

Erik: Ok, NOW do you wanna wrap it up, Jo?

Jo: Oh sure. So: let's review, class! We started off with the notion that eugenics begins in the late 19th century with Francis Galton, who coined the term. But really, it turns out, as we've been tracing throughout this episode, the ingredients of eugenics were already in place long before Galton called it “eugenics”. People have blind spots when it comes to understanding how eugenics ties to race, even people like Whoopi Goldberg. But hopefully we also demonstrated the connections there today, and that's something we'll continue to look at in future episodes.

Jim/Erik: Yep um hmhhh etc

Jo: One more thing! Don't forget—this whole conversation matters both for a more accurate understanding of how eugenics (and its horrible consequences like the Holocaust) came to be. And also for predicting how it might again come to be even today.

Jim: And on THAT uplifting note, stay tuned for masturbation and castration! I'm Jim, the non-eugenicist physical anthropologist.....