

Kutztown University

Research Commons at Kutztown University

Honors Student Research

Honors Program Student Projects

Spring 5-3-2022

The Abuse of Darwinism (and Social Darwinism) for the Purposes of Discrimination

Jessica N. Kantrowitz

Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, jkant415@live.kutztown.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/honorspapers>



Part of the [Biological and Physical Anthropology Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), [Other Anthropology Commons](#), [Other Sociology Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kantrowitz, Jessica N., "The Abuse of Darwinism (and Social Darwinism) for the Purposes of Discrimination" (2022). *Honors Student Research*. 10.
<https://research.library.kutztown.edu/honorspapers/10>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors Program Student Projects at Research Commons at Kutztown University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Student Research by an authorized administrator of Research Commons at Kutztown University. For more information, please contact czerny@kutztown.edu.

**The Abuse of Darwinism (and Social Darwinism) for the Purposes of
Discrimination**

Jessica Kantrowitz

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Kutztown University

2021-2022

Abstract

Throughout most of history, people have tried to justify their discrimination against other groups of people in any way they can, especially using biology and evolutionary theories as reason. When Charles Darwin published his book “On the Origin of Species”, introducing his theory of evolution and the work and experiments he did to prove this theory, it caused many to question their previous bigoted beliefs. For some, however, Darwin’s theory of evolution, which would come to be referred to simply as Darwinism, only further proved their biases, or they could, at least, make it sound like they did. Later on, Herbert Spencer took the concept of Darwinism and applied it to society, thus creating the concept of Social Darwinism. Due to its nature of explaining why certain people “survive” and thrive better in society, Social Darwinism is entirely a justification of bigotry. In this paper, I will examine the many ways that Darwinism and Social Darwinism have been used to justify discrimination, especially as it pertains to the current state of American society.

The History of Evolutionary Thought

The study of evolution can be found as far back as the ancient Greek philosophers Empedocles and Anaximander (Kirk et. al. 1983). Empedocles’ theory of cosmogony simply dealt with the origin of humans, although it did not deal with the topic of evolution itself (Wallace 1911; Everson 2007). Anaximander, on the other hand, did explore thoughts on evolution, theorizing that animals came from the sea originally, trapped in bark, and when the bark dried up, the animals would be let free (Plutarch).

Overtime, several other theories began to pop up as to the origin of humankind and evolution. Overall, however, the majority thought it seemed to be that the world and all its creatures were created by God, in the state that they were in. That was until the 17th century, with the rise of naturalistic thought. Benoît de Maillet, for example, believed that the state of the world was not the product of divine intervention, but a mechanical process that happened over the course of 2.4 billion years (Bowler 2003; Dalrympe 2004).

Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, in 1809, published *Philosophie zoologique*, in which he proposed his theory of evolution. Lamarck theorized that species would adapt to their environment, but not overtime. Instead, they would adapt to their environment within a lifetime, and then pass these adaptations on to the next generation (Bowler 2003). For example, a giraffe whose neck was too short to reach the leaves on a tree stretched its neck out to reach them, and the giraffe's children have longer necks as a result.

There are several theorists who can be attributed to the beliefs on evolution prevalent today. None, however, can be credited as much as Charles Darwin.. Darwin's theories on evolution and natural selection changed the way most thought about evolution, even if it was not immediate. In his theory, Darwin proposed, like Lamarck, that creatures adapted based on their environment. However, unlike Lamarck, Darwin believed that this adaptation was not as straightforward and quick. He believed that creatures born with the best suited traits for survival in an environment are the most likely to survive long enough to have children. These children would carry over the same traits, and develop even better ones over time.

Darwinism

Introduction to Hatred Justified by Darwinism

Darwin's theory helped shift the world's view on how humans came to be. That came with unforeseen consequences, however. Using Darwinian theories of natural selection, a variety of people began to create their own theories of how certain groups of people were lesser than, or unnatural. Racists, sexists, homophobes, anti-semites, and many other forms of bigots began to come out of the woodwork to begin justifying their beliefs with Darwinism, natural selection, and other theories of Darwin's related to evolution.

These theorists used Darwinism as a mechanism in their hatred, using several of Darwin's methods of classification of species, as well as his beliefs on the process of natural selection and reproduction in their works. Throughout this first half of my capstone project, I will be examining the variety of tactics used by these bigots in order to use Darwinian evolution to justify their beliefs, including common tactics between different types of bigotry, and what this could possibly say about our current society.

Racism

Even before Darwin published his theories on evolution, there were those in the scientific community who used evolution and the classification of species as a way to justify racism. The pseudoscience of "scientific racism" was dedicated to the practice of finding ways to do this.

They often separated the races into different groups, and even often believed them to be of a different species than one another. One pioneer of the theory was Arthur de Gobineau.

De Gobineau was a staunch believer in the superiority of the Aryan race, white, Germanic people of pure ancestry (Biddiss 1970). Those who fell outside this were considered lesser by de Gobineau. In his most famous work, *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines (An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races)*, he laid out his beliefs about the classification and “ranking” of the races.

The lowest of these races, according to de Gobineau, were the “blacks”. De Gobineau did not believe these people were capable of intelligence, but were the strongest race in terms of physical strength. “Yellows”, de Gobineau thought, were not capable of intellectual thought and acts of physical strength, but had strong senses of materialism. In de Gobineau’s view, it was only the “whites” that were capable of intelligence and beauty. It was only when the “yellows” and “blacks” had children with white ancestors that they were capable of intelligent thought (Blue 1999).

This is the sort of thought that many were already harboring when Darwin published his theories. Ernst Haeckel, a staunch Darwinist (and Social Darwinist, although I won’t be touching on that until the next part), was also a scientific racist. While both Haeckel and Darwin believed in the theory that there was a common ancestor of humanity, Haeckel believed that the last common ancestor was much earlier than Darwin. Haeckel believed that humanity was made up of multiple different species of humans, and that multiple species still were around today. He proposed a phylogenetic tree of these human species, of which he believed there were 12 still alive: Papuans, Hottentots, Kaures, Negroes, Australians, Malays, Mongols, Arctic Men, Americans, Dravidas, Nubians, and Mediterranean. These 12 species were then divided into a

total of 36 races, such as Mediterraneans being divided into Caucasians, Indo-Germans, Semites, and Basques (Levit & Hossfield 2020).

He then ranked these species based on where he thought they were in development. Those lowest on the development scale were considered to be more apelike, while those highest were considered to be of the most intelligence capability. The lowest ranked “species” for Haeckel were Hottentots, Papuans, and Aboriginal Australians, and the highest, Indo-Germans. The Papuans were considered to be the very lowest, and were considered to be a dead end evolutionarily.

Haeckel believed that one of the defining features that determined the classification of humans was hair. Papuans, the lowest level human species according to Haeckel, were labeled “bushy-haired” humans. This is despite his clear lack of knowledge about what the Papuans were actually like; when Nikolai Miklucho-Maclay went to study the validity of Haeckel’s theory, he found that their hair was not bushy at all.

He also used the skull shape of certain races as evidence of their being different species. He compared the skull shape of apes in the area of those races to the skull shape of the races in those areas themselves. Of Asians and Africans, he had this to say: “For it is a very remarkable fact, that the African man-like apes (gorilla and chimpanzee) are characterized by a distinctly long-headed, or dolichocephalous, form of skull, like the human species peculiar to Africa (Hottentots, Caffres, Negroes, Nubians). On the other hand, the Asiatic man-like apes (especially the small and large orang), by their distinct, short-headed, or brachycephalous, a form of skull agree -with human species especially characteristic of Asia (Mongols and Malays). Hence, one might be tempted to derive the latter (the Asiatic man-like and primeval men) from a common

form of brachycephalous ape and the former (the African man-like apes and primeval men) from a common dolichocephalous form of ape” (Haeckel 1887).

Similar views were held by American anthropologist Carlton S. Coon. Coon theorized that the species of *Homo sapien* developed a total of five times, and these five times were performed by the five different geographic races, or subspecies. He believed that each of the races evolved into *Homo sapiens* at a different rate than one another. Caucasoids and Mongoloids developed much earlier than Africans. Because of this, Coon concluded, they developed more complex and higher level societies (Coon 1939, 1962).

He believed that the earliest *Homo sapien* was a long-headed white man with a larger brain size who was of a shorter stature, and because of their long history of racial progression, the primarily white Europe is the most refined civilization in the modern world. Asia, he thought, was also a highly refined civilization. In his book, *The Origin of Races*, Coon said, “If Africa was the cradle of mankind, it was only an indifferent kindergarten. Europe and Asia were our principal schools” (Coon 1962).

Sexism

The use of craniology and intelligence as a factor in the justification of discrimination is one that carries over into the sexist world of Darwinists. Several Darwinists have used craniology and intelligence as arguments in the question of why females are lesser than males. In particular, the examination of the brain size of females versus males has been examined on multiple occasions to make this particular argument; women are, evolutionarily, simply less intelligent than men.

One such figure in anthropology who used this explanation was Pierre Paul Broca. Broca was a physician, anatomist, and anthropologist who specialized in the study of brains, and especially the area of the frontal lobe most associated with speech production, an area that is now known as Broca's area, named after him. Broca theorized that there was a significant disparity between the brain sizes of men and women, which would indicate a clear difference between the intellectual capabilities of males and females. He performed an extensive study in a series of four hospitals in Paris in which he weighed the brains of a group of 292 males and a group of 140 females (Gould 1996).

Broca found that the average weight of the male brains was 1,325 grams, and the average weight of the female brains was 1,144 grams. This is a difference of 181 grams, meaning that, based on Broca's finding, female brains are only 86% the size of male brains. Part of this difference in size, Broca acknowledged, was caused by the overall difference in the size of men vs. the size of women, with men being overall larger. Despite this, Broca did not try to expand on how that physical difference in size could have affected the size of the brain, as we are meant to assume that while it does affect the size, intellectual inferiority is also a major cause of this difference (Gould 1996).

Broca also wanted to prove that there was a widening gap between male and female brain size. In order to prove this, he visited L'Homme Mort cave, and measured a series of prehistoric male and female skulls located there. Here, he found only a difference of 99.5 cc between the size of male and female skulls, compared to the modern difference of 129.5 to 220.7 cc.

One of Broca's most dedicated students, Paul Topinard, explained that the reason for this difference is evolutionary demands for both men and women. He explained that men need more brain capacity because they are constantly defending themselves and their females. They are the

ones gathering food in order to be able to nourish themselves and their families. Men are the ones who, according to him, hold all of the responsibility in the world. In contrast, women are sedentary, and are “lacking any interior occupations, [and their] role is to raise children, love, and be passive” (Gould 1996, pp. 136).

Another proponent of the belief in the mental differences between men and women was Gustave Le Bon, another of Broca’s disciples. Le Bon wrote several scathing, blatantly misogynistic works about the mental differences between males and females. In arguing for these differences, he claimed that human female brains were supposedly more alike to gorilla brains in size than they were to male brains. He stated that most females were incapable of thought and logic, bankrupt of reason, fickle, and inconstant.

While he acknowledged that females capable of higher thought than the average man do exist, he wrote this off as being only as exceptional as the birth of any mutant, and simply could be written off. Le Bon even claimed that females “represent the most inferior forms of human evolution” and are “closer to children and savages than to an adult, civilized man” (Gould 1996, pp. 136).

Le Bon was also outspoken against the idea of women being allowed to have higher education similar to men. He declared this to be a dangerous idea. He stated, in his work *Recherches anatomiques et mathématiques sur les variations de volume du cerveau et sur leurs relations avec l'intelligence* (“Anatomical and mathematical research on the changes in brain volume and its relationships with intelligence”), “The day when, misunderstanding the inferior occupations which nature has given her, women leave the home and take part in our battles; on this a day a social revolution will begin, and everything that maintains the sacred ties of the family will disappear” (Le Bon 1879, pp. 62).

Another theorist by the name of M.S. Pembrey also spoke out against the concept of women's access to higher education. In his work, "Woman's Place in Nature", Pembrey declared that this would not be a good idea for men, women, or the state. He reasoned that the resources, mental, financial, and bodily, required for women to expend. He argued that these resources would be better used for marriage situations, and that there is little evidence to suggest that the learned woman would make a better mother or wife. This suggests that Pembrey believed that the only functions a woman can possibly hope to ultimately serve are that of a mother and/or a wife, so only domestic roles. He also claimed that this level of education makes these women more self-centered, distracted, and sensitive (Pembrey 1913).

He claimed that the traditional view of women and their rightful placement in society is supported by pre-existing knowledge about the biology of the sexes. Women, according to Pembrey, have "special gifts of patience, kindness, and love of offspring" (Pembrey 1913, pp. 134). The ideal woman, to Pembrey, was a woman who valued her role as a mother and wife, did not view herself to be a victim or slave of the social system that demanded that they belong in these roles and these roles alone, viewed married as the ideal goal of her life, and who does not speak out against this system, only trying to influence the world through her role as a mother and/or wife.

Pembrey also claimed that there is an evolutionary basis to this subjugation. He said that it has its origins in the instincts of animals, but he does not elaborate on this much further. He did state that maternal instincts are well developed even in some of the lowest developed species of animals. This is implying that women who do not want to be mothers, or who do not take to motherhood especially well (of which there are several), or even women that cannot become

mothers, are all lesser evolved creatures than some of the lowest developed lifeforms in the natural world (Pembrey 1913).

Pembrey even went as far as to claim that women's efforts to obtain similar rights to men within their society has directly led to the existence of certain evils within their society. Apparently, women who took up occupations in the commercial world are responsible for the increased spread of disease. Prostitution, contraception, and abortion (all considered to be evil to Pembrey) are the direct results of many women's lack of desire to have a husband with whom they can conceive a child with. He claimed that the women's suffrage movement has done nothing to help women, and especially not women who are in service positions, despite cries for equal pay (Pembrey 1913).

George J. Romanes is another theorist who relied on Darwinism to explain the mental differences between men and women. He described his beliefs on this in his essay, "Mental Differences Between Men and Women". Similar to theorists like Broca, Topinard, and Le Bon, Romanes used explanations like the difference in weights of male and female brains as a way to show that there was "clearly" a difference between male and female intellectual capabilities (Romanes 1887).

Beyond this, Romanes had a rather interesting view on the intellectual capabilities of females compared to males. He claimed that while the female mind was inferior in certain capabilities, it was superior in others. For example, while females were considered to be of a lesser capability when it came to judgment and impartiality, when tested on it, they were found, by Romanes, to be faster readers who retained information much better than their male counterparts (Romanes 1887).

Romanes found other notable differences between males and females, including their supposed respective faults. These supposed faults are characterized completely differently between the two sexes. The faults of females, such as their overly emotional mind, their lack of ability to control and compose these emotions, and superficiality, which are all considered to be faults born of weakness. In contrast, the masculine failings, such as indifference, callousness, and aversion to touch, are ones born of strength (Romanes 1887).

Unlike Le Bon and Pembrey, Romanes actually thought that the introduction of women into the world of higher education would be a good idea. While he agreed that there were differences in the intellects of men and women, this, he felt, should not limit women's ability to seek higher education. They would not necessarily have a system established in the exact same way as the one men learn in, but one that would suit their respective strengths and weaknesses best. He wished to see a reform in the already established education system for girls around during the late nineteenth century, which he thought was an important system to exist, but needed serious changes in order to work more efficiently. But, he stresses, this system must remain different from that of the one established for men (Romanes 1887).

Romanes' views, then, give us a rather interesting perspective on this particular topic. Unlike the theorists mentioned above, Romanes did not believe that women were dumber than men, only belonged in the domestic world, and if they wanted better education, then that was too bad because it would not be beneficial to everyone *else* if they got it. Instead, Romanes, while still believing in this distinct difference in mental capabilities between men and women, did not necessarily think this made women inferior or dumber, just more proficient in other areas than men. He also believed that there should be better education for women, without it necessarily

being about whether or not this would be beneficial to men, but simply because it was fundamentally unfair that they were being treated differently (Romanes 1887).

One other topic that Romanes briefly touched upon was sexual selection, a theory of Darwin's about the process by which a member of one biological sex chooses someone of the other sex as a mate, usually based on certain features considered to be attractive by the species for one reason or another (Starr et. al. 2013). A variety of studies have been done over the years examining this phenomena. The most famous examination of this was done by Angus Bateman, who, after examining the sexual and reproductive behaviors of fruit flies, came to the conclusion that ultimately, it was the females who are the most influential in deciding who they mate with, as they must invest much more energy into the reproductive process than males, as they are the ones who must carry, lay, and nurture the offspring, whereas male produced several sperm cells a day with little effort (Bateman 1948).

This theory was then compounded upon by a theory developed by Robert Trivers, called the parental investment theory. This theory states that whichever sex invests more in the care of the offspring is also going to be the more selective sex when it comes to choosing a mate. The sex with lower investment, then, is more likely to compete with one another in order to be able to mate with the other sex. The obvious implication here is that females are almost always the most investing sex, and those who are not very selective are considered to be evolutionarily backwards. This also means that they are a valuable resource to men; whereas females ability to choose a mate relies on their body's ability to healthily produce and nurture the offspring, while males ability to choose a mate relies solely on the amount of females who are available to mate with (Trivers 1972).

This combination of theories, called the Bateman Trivers principles, was widely used in the scientific community for years, with scientists finding no fault in the logic it presented. Several other evolutionary biologists used the principles in their analysis of various different species. This includes those species who subverted the norm, with males being the more investing sex, and females competing to mate with them (Elgar & Fine 2017).

However, in more recent years, there has been a reevaluation of these theories. It was noted, for example, that the theory regarding how little energy is required for males to copulate regularly was not always the case; several species of animals had males who took especially long periods to recover from mating sessions. Overexertion can lead to the males having an insufficient number of sperm needed to properly conceive, which makes mating with them a risk to females. There are also several species of creature that feature males who demonstrate monogyny, in which they only mate once, maximizing their reproductive success (Elgar & Fine 2017).

Application of the Bateman-Trivers principles to human behavior shows even more faults within the theory. The theory implies that there is a preference in male humans towards promiscuity, and in females a preference towards monogamy. This is not the case, for the most part. When the British National Survey of Sexual Attitude and Lifestyles surveyed a random sample of over 12,000 people ages 14-44, an overwhelming majority of both men and women reported that they preferred monogamy (Elgar & Fine 2017).

That being said, promiscuous behavior is not too uncommon amongst humans, but this is true for both males and females. While in the past, male promiscuity was the only one with any level of social acceptance or indifference, things have been changing. With the advent of the birth-control pill and the sexual revolution, female promiscuity has risen, and continues to be on

the rise, in recent years, although social stigma is still present today about this (Elgar & Fine 2017).

It is this stigma around the promiscuity of women that weighs heavily on this theory. As mentioned above, there is an unfortunate set of implications within Triver's theory of parental investment: females are inferred to be almost always the most investing sex, and female promiscuity is considered to be counterproductive to their reproductive capabilities. This implies that female promiscuity is evolutionarily disadvantageous. In contrast, *male* promiscuity is supposedly evolutionarily beneficial (Elgar & Fine 2017).

Another noted failing of the Bateman-Trivers principles is the lack of acknowledgement of sex for non-reproductive purposes. Sex can often be done as a way for couples to become closer together, without necessarily meaning to reproduce in the meantime. The very existence of contraception methods, like condoms and birth-control pills, and abortion clinics proves this (Elgar & Fine 2017).

This lack of acknowledgement of non-reproductive sex is also important to the next section of the paper.

Homophobia

Darwinism as a whole has a rather complicated relationship with the existence of homosexuality. When discussing the two concepts together, they are often referred to as a "paradox" or a "puzzle". This is because evolutionary theories in general do not often factor non-reproductive sexual behaviors into their work. This is especially true when it comes to the discussion of mate selection methods, as in the sexual selection and parental-investment theories

mentioned above. Mate selection theories rely on the desired traits in mates being ones that are evolutionarily beneficial.

Multiple people have tried to figure out, then, how homosexuality fits into Darwinism. This includes a variety of different explanations, from homosexuality being a social development and not a biological one (Barron 2020), it being a non adaptive development (Munévar 2014), and one that is beneficial for the purpose of kin selection, in which the childless homosexual will invest time in their siblings' children ("The Darwinian Paradox").

Others, however, have completely written homosexuality off as being a purely abnormal behavior. Michael Levin is one such theorist. Levin argues, in "Why Homosexuality is Abnormal", that homosexuality is the complete misuse of bodily parts, as the genitals should be utilized for their biological purposes only. The misuse of these parts, Levin posits, can and will lead to unhappiness in the long run (Levin 1984).

Levit argues that there is a rewarding aspect to a penis entering and coming to an orgasm within a vagina, where there is none in the process of entering a penis in another man's anus (or in the case of lesbianism, a woman entering another woman's vagina with her fingers or some other object). The reward, in this case, is the descendants they leave behind when they perform this normal behavior. Those who perform the abnormal behavior, Levit states, leave no descendants (Levit 1984).

Now, this is of course ignoring a variety of things. For one, there are several homosexual men who have children, via a variety of means. There are many homosexual men and women who were in heterosexual marriages for several years and have children within that marriage, and then came out as gay and ended that marriage. There are homosexual couples who have had

surrogates carry a child for them (and in the case of lesbians, sperm donors). In both cases, they are “misusing their parts” but are still leaving behind descendants.

Two, this is clearly in reference to biological descendants. Several homosexual and lesbian couples have adopted children, whom they consider to be just as much their offspring as they would a biological child. In this sense, even if they are not necessarily carrying on their bloodline, they are still considered to be their descendants. The same can be said for these adoptive children’s own offspring.

Three, this ignores the very existence of bisexual and pansexual men. These men participate in sex with both males and females, and as a result, use their parts “correctly” and “incorrectly”. There are still several bisexual and pansexual men who have had children, despite this.

Four, this ignores the existence of people who are simply incapable of conceiving children. There are many people who have a hard time with fertility issues, as well as many women who have a hard time with carrying children. There are some who have had health issues that have required them to go through surgeries that eliminates their ability to have children in the future.

Finally, five, it ignores the fact that there are several individuals who do not want to have children anyways. Now, not all of these people are homosexual, and there are homosexual people who want children. That being said, it is still a rather absurd suggestion to say that homosexuals are misusing their parts for sex, when many heterosexual couples have non-reproductive sex every day. To many, the simple feeling of pleasure that comes with sex *is* the reward in-and-of-itself.

Levin continues by giving a small acknowledgement that yes, he is generalizing by stating that there is no happiness to be found in the long run for homosexuals. There are “well-adjusted homosexuals”, but they are few and far between in Levin’s eyes. He finds that heterosexual behavior is one that is self-reinforcing, with built-in “rewards” (this reward being the reproduction of a child), while homosexuality is not. He continues to compare the happiness of homosexuals vs. heterosexuals to the happiness of fat men vs. men who exercise (Levin 1984).

Levin also concedes that homosexuality is not a choice that a person gets to make about themselves, but he doesn’t consider this to be an excuse for acting on it. In this he compares homosexuality to sickle-cell anemia; while no one blames those with sickle-cell anemia of their condition, they also still clearly have a problem, a sickness, within them. So, too, do homosexuals have a sickness within themselves (Levin 1984).

Throughout the entire article, Levin offers several erroneous overextensions of his authority and of just how widespread his worldview is. He offers little in the way of empirical evidence of the supposed unhappiness of homosexuals in the long-run. He also continuously makes connections to other, completely unrelated groups, as though homosexuality even remotely resembles sickle-cell anaemia.

Perhaps the most startling connect he makes is on the fourth page of this article, where he says, “One crucial test of my account is its prediction that homosexuals will continue to be unhappy even if people altogether abandon their "prejudice" against homosexuality. This prediction...coheres with available evidence. It is consistent with the failure of other oppressed groups, such as American Negroes and European Jews, to become warped in the direction of "cruising," sado-masochism and other practices common in homosexual life” (Levin 1984; 236).

Not only is this statement not supported by any evidence or sources, it is also blatantly racist and anti-semitic. The idea that black Americans and Ashkenazi Jews are miserable simply because of their identity, something that, like sexuality, they cannot change about themselves, and not because they have been subjugated for hundreds of thousands of years, and that this “self-caused misery” will lead to *deviant sexual behavior* is such an utterly absurd-sounding fact given with absolutely no sources whatsoever that I have a hard time believing a single word this man says is fact.

It may very well not be. Levin started off the article by stating that there was supposedly no evolutionary argument he was trying to make. Despite this, one of the only reasons he gave for why homosexuals for the most part cannot be happy in the long run is the fact that they cannot produce children via homosexual sex. This inability to reproduce, a core aspect to the process of the evolution of a species and to the simple maintenance of a population of a species, and one of the reasons why several other people have argued that homosexuality is evolutionarily unnatural, supposedly is not an evolutionary argument of Levin’s (Levin 1984).

The next theorist I will be discussing in terms of this topic is Gordon G. Gallup Jr., who offers a different perspective on homosexuality, and more specifically, homophobia. Gallup, in his article “Have Attitudes Toward Homosexuals Been Shaped by Natural Selection?”, examines whether it is a result of natural selection that homosexuals are discriminated against, on the basis of homosexuals exposure to children. He examined this via a series of surveys administered to adults and college students (Gallup 1995).

In the first survey, Gallup asked a group of undergraduates at the State University of Albany about how they would feel about homosexuals being in a variety of different occupations, and then based on their contact with children. Three of the nine occupations

selected were ones with heavy contact with children, while the other six had minimum contact. He found that there was a significantly higher level of discomfort when they were in occupations with high levels of contact with children (Gallup 1995).

In his second survey, he asked another group of undergraduates about their discomfort level with homosexuals being in different medical occupations, with similar conditions as the first survey. Pediatricians and child psychiatrists scored, out of 100, 93 and 88 respectively. In contrast, gerontologists scored very low, which makes sense, as they are in much closer contact with the elderly. Gallup stated that this may be that pediatricians have access to the children's genitalia, and thus, are believed to have control over their sexuality, and because of the belief they may spread AIDS to them. It can also be inferred from this that the level of discomfort towards child psychologists is because of the mental vulnerability of the children towards them (Gallup 1995).

In the third survey, he asked another set of undergraduates how they would feel about their prospective child having a sleepover at a friend's house, when that friend has a homosexual parent, based on whether that child is 8 or 21, and based on the parent's gender. Gallup found that there was an increase of concern when the child was 8, and when the parent was the same sex as the child. The highest levels of concern were towards a homosexual mother paired with an 8 year old daughter, and, the very highest, a homosexual father with an 8 year old son (Gallup 1995).

In the final survey, a random set of people in the greater Albany area were asked about their attitudes about homosexuals. They were also asked their marital status and how many children that they had. The results showed that respondents with children scored higher on the scale of discomfort than those without. It also showed that, on the Hansen scale, those with more

children scored higher, while those with only one child scored highest on the threat scale (Gallup 1995).

Gallup takes this to mean that yes, there is a basis to suggest that natural selection affects the way homosexuality is viewed. This implies that Gallup thinks that homosexuals are predators, especially towards children, and that parents instinctually protect their children from homosexuals because they are naturally inclined to think that they are predators. This is also suggesting that Gallup thinks that homosexuality is counter-evolutionary, and that homosexuality can be spread, thus hindering further population growth (Gallup 1995).

Anti-Semitism

The final topic that I will be discussing in this half of my capstone project is that of anti-semitism. I will start my discussion on this particular topic here, but will most likely be elaborating on it much further in the second half of my capstone, in which I will be covering the usage of Social Darwinism as a justification of discrimination. There are simply more works elaborating on the ways Social Darwinism caused anti-semitism than there are for the physical/biological side of the equation.

One of the most prevalent aspects of anti-semitism is the racial aspect of it. While, in recent years, people have started to stop thinking of Jewishness as a race, that wasn't always the case. Because of this, anti-semitism tends to have an oddly racist tone to it, even though most Jews are what we would consider to be white, and this is one of the few world religions other than Christianity made up of mostly white people. These racist echoes exist even to this day, and even though we do acknowledge that there are Jews of all colors in the world, we still have

people who identify people on whether or not they “look Jewish”, based on traits that have been around since the time when Jews *were* considered a different race.

For our first theorist, we return to an old “friend”, who we discussed all the way back in the section on racism, Carleton S. Coon. Coon had a lot to say about the features of the Jewish population, as well. In his work, *The Races of Europe*, Coon separated the Jews from other racial classifications, because to him, “they do not as a whole fit into any single racial classification...” (Coon 1939).

Coon also classified four different racial types of Jews. The first, Hellenistic Jews, are Jews who remained in the area of Asia Minor and the Black Sea Region after being forced to migrate there during Hellenistic rule over ancient Palestine. The Sephardic Jews come from the Jews who were expelled from Spain, where many of them had settled during Roman rule, and migrated to the Mediterranean area. Rhineland Jews are a result of subjugation during the time of the First Crusade. These Jews lived in central European countries like Poland and the Ukraine. The final group of Jews came about when Hellenistic Jews began to move westward, where they came into contact with the Rhineland Jews, promptly being absorbed by them. The result of this union was the Ashkenazim, Yiddish speaking Jews located primarily within eastern Europe and Germany (Coon 1939).

Notably, two of these classifications actually persist to this day, however, they are not considered to be racial groups, and instead are ethnic groups. The first of these is Sephardic Jews, located in Spain, France, and the Mediterranean. The other group, and the largest ethnic group of Jews by far, is Ashkenazi Jews, who originated from eastern Europe, and who can be primarily found in the U.S. and Russia. There is also a third, much more recently conceived major ethnic group of Jews known as Mizrahi Jews, who are direct descendants of Middle

Eastern Jews from Biblical times, and can be primarily found in Northern Africa and Western Asia (Khazzoom).

While Coon did separate Jews into these four racial categories, he did not differentiate between them too much. Coon still believes that these races have a distinctly similar look to them. Coon believed that was such a thing as “looking Jewish”, a belief that, unfortunately, is one that is not limited to Coon alone, and is still around today (Coon 1939).

This “Jewish look”, according to Coon, cannot be characterized by any one feature. It cannot be just the nasal cavity, as there are different typical nasal cavities between different ethnic groups of Jews. It cannot be the eye shape, for the same reason. It cannot be tip depression, or high attachment of the nasal wings on the cheek, or slant to the ear. These, Coon acknowledges, are all traits that are not necessarily the same in every group of Jews (Coon 1939).

Instead, Coon says, it is based more on social and psychological traits than physical. This includes the clothing they wear, the way they talk, the things they do, etc. But, even then, there is still a facial quality to looking Jewish. Even if he can’t necessarily identify what that look even is. He also suggests that, even though he notes that there are a variety of different nose types that are common amongst Jews, there is still a distinct, “Jewish nose”. He also still believes that there is in fact an existing, singular Jewish race (Coon 1939).

Joseph Jacobs further discusses these characteristics that distinguish Jews from the rest of their peers in his article “On the Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews”. Jacobs calls upon two familiar classifications of Jews for this: Sephardim (Sephardic) and Ashkenazim (Ashkenazi). Jacobs aims to find the exact racial characteristics of these groups, which allows them to be

distinctly different from gentiles, and why these differences in characteristics exist at all (Jacobs 1886).

Jacobs lists out several characteristics found in Jews that set them apart from other groups around them. One such characteristic is the craniometry of these Jews. Specifically, they are noted as having brachycephalic shaped heads, meaning that their heads are not typically very long. They are also noted as having distinct hair, eyes, and complexion. According to Jacobs, Jews typically have darker eyes and hair than other nationalities. Despite this there is also notable a large percentage of the Jewish population that is blue eyed, blonde haired, and/or redheaded. Sephardim, notably, has three times as many redheads as Ashkenazim do. In terms of complexion, they are mostly white-skinned. One physical characteristic Jacobs notes, which still persists as a distinctive feature of Jews, is their nose, which he elaborates little on because of just how well known this distinctive feature is (Jacobs 1886).

Jacobs argues that one of the reasons why there is a difference is because of the social isolation of Jews from the rest of the population. The persistence of these features is proof of this isolation. Jacobs argues that the Jewish race may in fact be a pure one because of this isolation from other populations. While Darwin himself had already examined this very subject matter in his work “Le Judaisme comme race et comme religion” in 1883, and came to the conclusion that the Jews were not in fact a pure race, Jacobs decided to make his case on it against Darwin (Jacobs 1886).

One defense of this theory is that Jews have a law in which intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles are not recognized as being valid marriages. However, he also notes that this law was not around in the days of ancient Israel. That being said, as far back at the 4th century intermarriage between faiths was becoming a dangerous practice, and one with a severe enough

punishment that it was a law that was rarely violated. Prior to Jacobs' time, the last time where there was any notable great intermixture between Jews and Gentiles occurred before Charlemagne (Jacobs 1886).

The other defense Jacobs had for his argument for Jewish purity responds to the question of how there are differences in the physical characteristics amongst Jews. He argues that a few divergences in a type does not necessarily mean that that type does not exist. He states, "An organic type therefore exists not where there is no variation, but where the variations follow the law of error, and where the modulus of variation is tolerably constant" (Jacobs 1886; pp. 46). While there is maybe a likelihood that these variations are a result of intermixture, it is also likely that these are a result of simple divergences that are not at all unusual to see even in a "pure" population (Jacobs 1886).

Another notable aspect of anti-semitism that tends to be discussed less than the discussion of using physical traits to identify Jews is that of intelligence. Similar to the previously discussed topics of racists and sexists, intelligence is a common point of discussion when it comes to distinguishing Jews from their peers. However, unlike in the prior two cases, Jews are often regarded as being of a significantly higher intelligence than gentiles. If you're thinking, "wow, how can that be anti-semitic? It seems like it's a compliment!", I can understand why you would think that at first. Ashkenazi Jews do appear to have an average IQ slightly above the average IQ of the general population, but they are not this mastermind geniuses. This is a common tactic used by the far right in conspiracy theories that try to say that Jews are in control of the world, and are behind a multitude of other major world events (Pinker 2006, Lenz 2012).

One such example of this happened in March of 2020. A far-right Polish lawmaker by the name of Janusz Korwin-Mikke implied that Jews were, via the use of pogroms (aka, a mass slaughter of a particular group of people) against them and natural selection, extremely powerful. Basically, what Korwin-Mikke was trying to say is that the Holocaust, one of the worst and bloodiest events in the history of the entire world, considered to be the genocide with the highest body count to this day, was actually a good thing for the Jews, as it meant that the weakest amongst them died in the concentration camps, and the strongest amongst them survived (Liphshiz 2020).

Because of this act of supposed natural selection, as well as their long, long history of being subjugated, Jews were actually extremely powerful. In fact, he even suggested that rabbis had purposefully instigated these events. This, he argued, would be done so that only the strongest Jews would survive these events of mass murder against them. Over time they would become even stronger because of it (Liphshiz 2020).

Reflections

As you can see, Darwinism, since it has been introduced to the world, has been used by so many different people in order to justify a variety of different forms of discrimination. This includes, as discussed within this first portion of the capstone project, racism, sexism, homophobia, and anti-semitism. There were a variety of tactics used by each type of bigot in order to get their agendas across, including ones that overlap with tactics used by those in other forms of bigotry.

This includes the use of intelligence in racism, sexism, and anti-semitism, although in the case of anti-semitism it is used in the opposite way as the other two, but with the hopes of the same or similar outcomes. There is also the use of sexual selection in both sexism and homophobia.

So what, then, does this tell us about American society?

Well, for one, it is very revealing about the past way of thinking that this country's very culture is built upon. As much as I wish I could say that I haven't ever seen people spewing these same sorts of ideas around the country even to this day, I can't, in good faith, do so. Take, for example, the protestors that show up to our campus every semester, at least once a semester, shouting about how feminists, Jews, gays, and all sorts of other marginalized groups of people are going straight to hell for having the nerve to not be afraid to be themselves or stand up to authority. All around the country there are people who still believe the kind of things being said by people like the theorists discussed above, even if, in many of these cases, I doubt just how much they actually believe in what they're saying.

And how many of these people are using sources like the ones above as defenses for their bigotted beliefs, taking the usage of a big name like Charles Darwin, and the application of a commonly accepted theory like natural selection as proof that these theories are anything more than just ways to try and get away with oppressing those beneath them. The scientific stamp of approval to be a racist, sexism, homophobic, anti-semite.

This is just the start of it. In the next part of my capstone project, I will be covering the ways in which Social Darwinism has been abused by bigots to further their agendas. While the biological side of the coin seemed to be very blatant in how it was presented, I suspect that there

will be much more subtlety to their approach to bigotry, as has been my experience with reading Social Darwinian theories.

Social Darwinism

Origins of Social Darwinism

When Charles Darwin published his theory of evolution, the academic world of anthropology changed, especially that of the physical anthropologists. Darwin had revolutionized evolutionary thought, and possibly given the world an answer as to how humanity, as well as all other species, had come to be. As shown in the first part of this Capstone project, the conclusions many anthropological and biological theorists came to after hearing Darwin's theory were problematic.

The same can be said for many sociologists, as well.

When Herbert Spencer first read Darwin's *On the Origins of Species*, he described the theory with the phrase "survival of the fittest" (Stucke 2008; Spencer 1864). Spencer had several theories of his own surrounding evolution, including ones that applied it to society. At least as early as 1850, Spencer promoted imperialism as a way to rid the world of supposedly lesser evolved peoples (Spencer 1850). The association of Spencer's ideas with Darwin's may have stemmed from their shared belief of competition, specifically the aforementioned phrase of Spencer's "survival of the fittest," but applied to society instead of biology. This, ostensibly, is where the ideas of Social Darwinism come from.

Thomas Malthus, too, was an important figure in the world of Social Darwinism. Malthus believed that the world population growth rate was outpacing the food production growth rate. Malthus believed that eventually, many would have to fight for the remaining resources, before there would ultimately be a catastrophe, resulting in the collapse of society (Malthus 1826). Despite predating Darwin's theory of evolution, Malthus not only influenced Darwin himself, but some of his ideas can definitely be found in Social Darwinism. Malthus believed that population control was very important, especially when it came to certain populations. Lower classes, for example, tended to reproduce rapidly, which, in his opinion, is what actually led to their economic status, and not economic exploitation by the upper classes (Neurath 1994). Malthus believed that charity to the poor would do nothing but exacerbate this issue. He proposed two different types of population control, in the form of checks: preventative checks, which would make it so that certain groups of people could not reproduce (this would later manifest in practices like the forced sterilization of certain populations), and positive checks, which limited the life span of certain groups of people (this would later manifest in practices like genocide) (Malthus 1798).

Already, Social Darwinism was showing its most problematic tendencies. Notable early Social Darwinists, such as Ernst Haeckel (who was inspired by Darwin himself, but was also a Social Darwinist), William Graham Sumner (Hawkins 1997), and John Fiske, already began to preach the importance and superiority of certain populations of people over others. One Social Darwinist in particular, once exposed to Darwinism, was inspired to create an ideology of his own. In doing so, he completely changed the ideological world of Social Darwinism, and, in the long run, quite possibly the entire course of history, causing one of the most horrific events in the history of mankind.

Origins of Eugenics

When the sociologist Francis Galton read *The Origin of Species* by Charles Darwin, he was absolutely fascinated with the work, especially his section on selective breeding with domesticated animals (Forrest 1974). Galton, a cousin of Darwin's, became fixated on discovering how hereditary human ability was, exploring the topic in his book *Hereditary Genius*. In the book, Galton presents his beliefs that, in the best kind of civilization, the “weak” should remain celibate (and thus, not able to procreate), and that only the “best” and most “genetically superior” immigrants should be allowed to enter it (Galton 1869). It wasn't until Galton wrote his book *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development* that he coined the name of his most infamous theory: eugenics. Galton believed that those with the most “noble qualities” to prevail over the “less suitable” by “improving stock” better than they would have without intervention; aka, he believes that utilizing selective breeding towards humans would allow for the “best” of humanity to grow in numbers, and for the “worst” to die out (Galton 1883).

Charles Davenport, one of the leading historical eugenicists, and one of the earliest American eugenicists, upon meeting Galton, fell in love with the subject of eugenics (Allen 2000). He defined eugenics as “the science of the improvement of the human race by better breeding” (Davenport 1912). Davenport was a major proponent of eugenics research. He served as a member of the faculty at Harvard University from 1892 to 1899, where he influenced many of his students to go on and become eugenicists themselves. Several of the most prominent

American eugenicists of the time, such as William Ernest Castle and Robert Mearns Yerkes, owed their ideology to his tutelage (Lombardo 2014).

Other early American eugenicists were fearful of the threat to the so-called “American race” by the mentally disabled, criminals, and immigrants (Stillwell 2012). Davenport founded the Eugenics Record Office (ERO), an organization based in Social Darwinism, developed measures meant to reduce this “problem”. They also believed in the encouragement of “fit” Americans’ reproduction, and the use of segregation to prevent the mixing of certain populations (Stillwell 2012).

One notable approach of early 20th century eugenics was that of racial hygiene. The approach was developed by biologist Alfred Ploetz (Bashford & Levine 2010). Ploetz had been a proponent of racial purity for years, ever since his youth. Ploetz’s first wife, Agnes Bluhm, was also a proponent of racial purity, and wanted German women to improve the race (Ogilvie & Harvey 2000). Ploetz’s theory of racial hygiene was first proposed in 1895, and can best be defined as “race-based eugenics”. Ploetz desired to see a German society in which who citizens married was determined by their intellectual capabilities. This would also affect the number of children a couple was allowed to have. Those who were “unfit” would either not be allowed to reproduce, or their reproduction would be severely limited. The disabled would be euthanized at birth, and everyone would be forced to go through an examination at puberty to determine how “fit” they were to reproduce (Lerner 1992).

Disturbingly, the history of birth control in America is ingrained in the history of eugenics. Margaret Sanger, the founder of the very first birth control clinic in America, as well as one of the most prominent proponents and the commissioner of the first birth control pill (*Scientific American* 2012), was a prominent female eugenicist of the early 20th century (*Public*

Broadcasting Service). She, however, did often clash with Davenport and other leading eugenicists on their ideas, especially because she never defined fitness in the racial terms that Davenport did (Chesler 2007; Engelman 2011). However, Sanger did believe in eugenics based on class, seemingly believing in the lower class as being “irresponsible and reckless people” who do not want to control the size of their family, who should not be able to reproduce (Sanger 1921).

There is another, much more ominous connection that eugenics has to an important world movement.

Nazism (and Anti-Semitism)

There is a deep connection between Nazi ideology and the ideology of Social Darwinism. They are perhaps the most famous group of eugenicists known to mankind. A great deal of the Nazi agenda was about the promotion of the so-called “Aryan race”, a concept that was founded by French aristocrat Joseph Arthur de Gobineau (Blue 1999). The Nazis tried to promote the Aryan race through the use of policies that tried to encourage or force the selective breeding of traits that were considered ideal to them (Longerich 2010). Those who were not considered to be the ideal Aryan were either killed en masse, put into concentration camps, and/or forcibly sterilized. The Nazis had entire list of diseases of which the sufferers should be sterilized, and physicians who encountered these people in their work were forced to comply, or they would suffer a fine. These diseases included schizophrenia, manic-depressive insanity, and hereditary forms of epilepsy, blindness, and deafness (DHDI).

The group most targeted by the Nazis was, of course, the Jews of Germany, and ultimately, the rest of Europe. To the Nazis, the Jews were considered to be the lowest of the low. Ideologies like that of de Gobineau, who believed that the Jews were a lesser group of whites compared the Aryan race, who were the most superior race, and Wilhelm Marr, who first coined the phrase “anti-Semitism” (Entymonline) and believed it to be a natural feeling, for it meant that society could “avoid becoming Jewish” (Marten 1999), inspired their beliefs that the Jews were lesser than. While earlier anti-Semitism was based almost entirely on religion, the anti-Semitism of the late nineteenth century and onwards began to take on a new form. With the rise of Darwinism and Social Darwinism, Judaism began to be believed to be biological. Those who were born Jewish, thus, could not simply convert, as they would always remain a Jew biologically (Marten 1999).

Another form of anti-Semitism was also taking form, this one based more on the economic status of Jews (Marten 1999). When capitalist systems were starting to rise up around the world, the Jews were amongst those who adjusted to the new systems the quickest. They had a history of having to compete for resources in the first place, and this history allowed for the Jews to be better for an economic system based entirely around competition. This intimidated the Christians, who adjusted to the new system at varying rates, with Catholics especially adjusting slower and more poorly. The speed at which Jews were advancing in society economically led to backlash, especially among groups like tradespeople, farmers, and clerks, who were hit the hardest by the changing system. These groups began to see “Jewish insidiousness” everywhere, an ideology that can still be found in modern times (Marten 1999).

Several people who believed in this so-called “Jewish insidiousness” believed that Jews were inherently greedy, and had been since the beginning of time. They believed that Jews

wished to spread their influence all across Europe by a variety of methods, including political and economic means, but also through the “pollution” of Aryan blood via the means of intermarriage. This “contamination” would weaken the nations of Europe, and allow for Jewish world domination. This was a conscious plan on the part of the Jews, according to these anti-Semites (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum).

It is this sort of ideology that eventually led to the rise of the Nazi party following the end of World War I, and the events of the Holocaust. The Nazis did not just want to sterilize the Jews like they did with several other groups that they targeted. The Nazis’, and especially the paramilitary Nazi organization Schutzstaffel’s (SS), ultimate goal with the Jews was their ultimate destruction; they wanted to murder all 11 million Jews that were living in Europe, and ultimately, all Jews in the world. This goal was one they considered to be more important than anything else they hoped to achieve. The “Final Solution”, as this genocide of all European Jews was called, was emphasized even more than the defense of the German fatherland, and despite becoming embroiled in war in the 1930s and 40s, as the war began to reach its ultimate end, they still prioritized this eradication. This prioritization is, ultimately, what led to the defeat of Nazi Germany. It would seem as though the Nazis were fine with ultimately losing the war, so long as they were able to achieve that “Final Solution” (Lindquist & Goodman 2004). While they did not manage to kill all 11 million European Jews, they did get over halfway to their ultimate goal; around 6-7 million European Jews were estimated to have been killed in what came to be known as the Holocaust, making it one of, if not the largest genocides in human history (Berenbaum 2006).

The teachings of Aryan superiority were central to Nazi education systems. Lesson plans were dedicated to identifying someone’s race, both physically and through their writings.

Notable German scholars were also outspoken eugenicists. These scholars were among the Nazis best and brightest numbers, and helped to create some of the most infamous policies created by the Nazi state. They wanted to bring Social Darwinism to its most “logical” conclusion: the betterment of the human race by eradicating the “inferior”, and growing the “superior” (Lindquist & Goodman 2004).

Even outside of Nazi Germany, however, Jews were often seen as insidious creatures. Karl Pearson, a proponent of Social Darwinism and eugenics, considered Jewish immigrants in Great Britain to be a “parasitic race”. To Pearson, they were also inferior mentally and physically to the British natives. For this reason, Pearson vehemently opposed the immigration of Jews into Great Britain (Pearson & Moul 1925). In the United States, an image of what the so-called “typical Jew” looked and sounded like began to make its way into the media, as several million Ashkenazi (Eastern European) Jews immigrated from Europe into America. The image portrayed Jews as greedy, hook-nosed fiends with heavy accents who were either doctors or lawyers. This became as prevalent as other prominent stereotypical figures of the time, like those of the drunken Irishman, the dumb Swede or Pole, the volatile Italian, etc. Jewish women became notorious for their supposed nature as a bunch of nagging mothers, shrill in voice and nosy towards the lives of their children. This spawned from the era of Social Darwinism, which emphasized that all groups had recognizable characteristics that would make it easy to identify members of the group (Koffman et al. 2020).

The Jews are not the only ones who were targeted by Social Darwinists, eugenicists, and Nazis, however.

Racism

As with Darwinism itself, Social Darwinism was used to justify the racism of several, as they believed that certain races were inferior, resulting in the radicalization of a new wave of scientific racism. This also further enabled the likes of Nazi Germany, whose belief of Aryan supremacy and the inferiority of others extended beyond Jews.

Spencer's belief of "survival of the fittest", as mentioned above, was often applied to practices such as imperialism, in which primarily white, "civilized" nations would conquer less technologically advanced, non-white nations. These non-white nations were often considered to be made up of barbaric, savage peoples, who were usually black. This practice of conquering these groups of people was not only seen as the natural way of things, but also as the most morally correct thing to do, as it allowed them to "civilize" these groups of people (South African History Online 2011).

This belief of European supremacy was present long before Darwin first published *On the Origin of Species*, but never before had certain racists felt so justified as when they were first introduced to Darwin's findings. Late nineteenth century Social Darwinists like Karl Pearson and Benjamin Kidd were responsible for the eagerness of American and European colonialism in the last part of the nineteenth century (Dennis 1995). These Social Darwinists viewed these acts of imperialism against Asia, South America, and Africa as a necessity to ensure the survival of the white race. Those of the white race who were considered to be less than ideal, such as the lower classes, were, supposedly, to be the true benefactors of this imperialist agenda, and because of this, they needed to ally themselves with upper class whites against these "lesser races" (Dennis 1995).

These acts of imperialism had a more intangible motive as well. While having control over “lesser” races allowed whites to maintain power over them, it also served to prove how much “better” they were than these “inferior” races. Practices like slavery, capitalism, and other pre-existing institutional structures would be validated if they could succeed in controlling these “lesser” races. It is because of this legitimization of these practices that Social Darwinism was so popular in countries like England and the United States, who both had stake in the matter; America had (and still has) several internal, systematic issues with racism, and England, at the time, was a vast empire, spanning across several continents, and containing several colonies that were made up of racial groups other than white Europeans. This “required” them to create policies that discriminated against these racial groups, so as to maintain a certain level of power over them (Dennis 1995).

Many simply felt that it was the destiny of the white race to control other, “inferior” black races of the world. These races, to them, were little more than beast, or were, at the very most, “sub-human”. The laws of nature dictate that the black man will be ruled by the white man, no matter how cruel it may seem. This, to them, was simply how “survival of the fittest” would prove itself to be true (Dafler & Callaghan 2005).

Some believed that this was not just the natural order of things for the white man to thrive, but also for racial minorities to thrive. Paul B. Barringer, the president of Virginia Tech from 1907 to 1913, once presented a lecture about the supposed “negro problem” in the South, and made the erroneous argument that African Americans were better off when they were slaves. “Although he came to us a savage,” he said, “with fifty generations of unalloyed savagery behind him, two hundred and fifty years of close association, as slave and master, produced changes in the race, the like of which has never been seen before or since” (Barringer 1900). He goes on to

claim that despite that, no matter how much socialization black Americans may have, they will never be able to get rid of the supposed “savagery” that lives in their blood. It is interesting that a well-respected institution was led by someone who has the nerve to say something as bold as “black people would be better off as slaves”.

Nazi Germany did not exclude those from other non-Aryan races besides Jewish from their subjugation. Black people in particular were targeted by the Nazis, especially those of mixed-race. There was a large population of mixed-race children in Germany following World War I. The children were often the result of black French soldiers who were from French African colonies and German women in the towns that these soldiers occupied during the war. These children, often dubbed “Rhineland Bastards” (Campt 2004). Despite the low numbers of these so-called “Rhineland Bastards” (only around 600, at most), a program was put in place to sterilize these children (Evans 2005).

Despite this, African Germans had no concrete policy against them in Nazi Germany (Campt 2004). While there certainly weren’t any programs in place that gave them any legal equality, and there certainly was discrimination against them in various realms of life, including laws that stated that they were not allowed to have sexual relationships or marriages with Aryans (Kesting 2002; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum 2021), there were no laws that mandated a certain treatment of them. Several African Germans actually served in the army during World War II, although this number was relatively small (Lusane 2003). Black prisoners of war, however, did often endure harsher treatment than white ones. They were often separated and executed instead of being taken prisoner, and when they were taken prisoner, they were mistreated with often no repercussions against the soldiers mistreating them (Scheck 2006). They

were segregated from white prisoners and kept in worse conditions, which deteriorated even further near the end of the war (Killingray 1996).

As the world rounded into the twentieth century, Social Darwinism truly began to increase in popularity. American psychologists and Social Darwinists began to use intelligence as a means to prove the inferiority of people of other races, especially those who were of African descent. This is a cornerstone of scientific racists' theories, and even persists in certain circles nowadays (Stanfield 1995).

As time went on, the belief amongst American Social Darwinists that imperialism was the most effective of seeing the theory come to its natural conclusion began to diminish. In its place, the theory of eugenics began to become more popular in the United States. Certain birth control policies written in the 1960s during the civil rights movement were seen as an act of attempted eugenics against African Americans. The announcement of President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965 that there would be federal funding of birth control for the poor especially inspired backlash (Lombardo 2016). Many saw this as a way to limit the growth of the African American population, and subsequently reduce their ability to gain the power that they had been fighting for. This, in their minds, was the equivalent to black genocide, which was believed to be the ultimate goal.

There was also a disturbing trend occurring in the South between the 1920s-1980s known as the "Mississippi Appendectomy". Black women would go to the hospital, either to give birth or to get some other form of medical treatment, and after getting treatment there, they would mysteriously be unable to have children afterwards. This turned out to be caused by forced, unnecessary hysterectomies that were being performed by these doctors (Ko 2016). By the 70s, this became more openly practiced, but it also spread to the rest of the United States. By then,

doctors would coerce women of color into being sterilized by making them sign waivers and consent forms for surgeries that they either did not desire, or were unable to understand (Kluchin 2009). Latina women were also undergoing abnormally high rates of forced or coerced sterilization, to the point where the procedure in which they were sterilized became simply known as “la operación” (Andrews 2017).

The forceful sterilization of women of color was often associated with the forced sterilization of certain other groups, especially when these women were part of these groups as well.

Classism

The lower class and poor populations of the world have been a major focus of Social Darwinism since its inception. Both Spencer and Malthus emphasized the importance of upper class peoples over the lower class. This evolution-based classism manifests in several different ways.

With the advent of Social Darwinism, those who were the wealthiest in society finally felt as though they had a way to justify their ever increasing wealth while many were living in squalor. This was becoming especially necessary as the Gilded Age, a time where industrialization was becoming quicker and quicker and the income gap was becoming astronomically bigger and bigger, marched on. In order to justify this income gap, and capitalism in general, the most wealthy British and American men, who almost all happened to fall under the category of WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant), began to proclaim themselves as being

the most biologically superior of all of mankind, and thus, deserved their astronomically growing wealth (Rudman & Saud 2020).

Many Social Darwinists believe that helping the poor not only defies the natural order of the world, but it also supposedly encourages the qualities that the upper class believe to be common amongst the lower class. Addiction, laziness, and criminality are all behaviors that the upper class associate with the poorest in society, and giving them what they refer to as “handouts”, aka, charity, would do nothing but encourage these behaviors (Dobkin). These traits, Social Darwinists believe, are all hereditary, as what are perceived by them to be the best traits of the upper class.

It is because of this that the upper class feel justified in their transference of wealth from one generation to the next. While someone may be extremely wealthy because of work that their great-great-great-great grandfather did, the theory of Social Darwinism posits that heritability means that those hard working traits have been passed down all the way to them, meaning that they don't actually need to do the work to justify having that money. They are also often motivated to help those of a similar background as them over people with differing backgrounds, which, in the case of those who were born into upper class families, often means that they are just helping other rich people get even richer (Green 1995).

This cooperation of the most rich people in society to maintain that level of wealth amongst themselves is often conducted by those C. Wright Mills referred to as the “power elites”. These are the most powerful elites in society, although they may not be fully aware of their elite status. These elites are often found in one of six categories: the “Corporate Rich” (corporate shareholders and major landowners), “Warlords” (the highest military officers), “Chief Executives” (heads of major companies), “Celebrities” (entertainers and personalities in

the media), the “Metropolitan 400” (members of families who are notable in their local area in certain cities), and the “Political Directorate” (members of the executive branch of the United States federal government). It is these people, all members of the upper class, who run not only America, but in some ways, the world (Mills 1956).

These people, even if they truly haven't, often like to believe that they've earned their wealth and status, because it would delegitimize them if they didn't. To those on top, the lower classes are not kept down because the most powerful people in the world are working, either consciously or unconsciously, to keep them down. They are at the bottom of society because they are inferior genetically. This is where the theory of social class essentialism comes from. The upper class especially, but even some members of the middle and lower classes, believe that differences between classes that appear to be only on a surface level are actually caused by innate, biological differences between them. To them, there is no room for social mobility (Hutson 2014).

This defense of the current social order often relies on the fallacy of the “appeal to nature”; it is natural for these people to be on the bottom of the economic brackets, because that is where they are naturally meant to be. It is beliefs like these that encourage the lengthening of prison sentences for criminals who are from the lower class; they believe that these lower class people are naturally inclined to commit these crimes again, so what would be the point in letting them out? They believe that there is no way a human being can truly change who they are, especially when it comes to social class (Hutson 2014).

While certain programs are trying to make it so that these beliefs of social class essentialism start to die out, there are still those in the world who believe that it should stay this way. Unsettlingly, several of these people are people in high positions of power, like politicians.

One such politician is the former Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, Andre Bauer. In 2010, Bauer equated giving charity to the poor to feeding a group of stray animals, “because they breed” (Hutson 2014).

This leads us into the next part of Social Darwinism’s campaign against the poor: eugenics. Obviously, there were already forms of what Malthus would have classified as “positive checks” (limitation of the life spans of people) of social control of the lower classes, by denying them the resources that they need to survive. However, there were several policies put into place in order to perform forms of “preventative checks”.

A lot of the women of color who were being forcibly sterilized during the period of the 1920s-1980s were also poor. Poor men and women have been targets of forced sterilization since the inception of eugenics. The upper class of America feared that an increased number of those who belonged to the working class (who they believed to be genetically inferior) would ultimately lead to an uprising, Marxism-style. They also wanted to restrict the number of immigrants who could enter the country, as they would most likely end up joining those numbers. Thus, they often supported bills that prevented that increase in numbers, like the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924 (Allen 1974).

Classist eugenicists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth often used the defense of the larger size of lower class families compared to upper class families as a justification for their eugenics against them. This, mixed with the belief that the lower classes carried more defective genes down to their children, was a cause for much alarm to eugenicists. Knowing that wide scale sterilization programs for the poor would be far too large to conquer and most likely hard to pass as a general law, they realized that they had to find other ways to prevent the growth of lower class populations. One way that they realized they could limit the growth of lower class

populations was by advocating for the limitation of who could marry. At the time, the idea of having children with someone you were not married to was considered to be immoral and sinful, and was not a common practice done willingly. Eugenicists lobbied to make it so that one needed to meet certain requirements in order for them to be able to marry. This included the requirement of a license, which many in the lower class did not have in their possession. This made it so that the only people who could get married were those who the state (and thus, the eugenicists) deemed worthy of reproducing (Lyster 2014).

Ableism

If there is one group that has been heavily targeted by Social Darwinists and eugenicists in history that I have yet to mention in any notable way throughout this paper so far, it is the disabled. Those who are considered to be of feeblemind, the inheritors and passers-on of certain genetic disorders, and the epileptics, among many others, are all considered to be genetically inferior to those who are of able mind and body. Some believe this fear of the disabled to be rooted in the evolutionary fear of the sick, contagious, and dead, and the disabled resemble these categories to a certain extent (Nario-Redmond 2019).

The discrimination of the disabled is often ignored or overlooked by certain parties, deemed as either insignificant or nonexistent. This is despite the sheer amount of policies that exist even to this day that completely limit the capabilities of disabled Americans to live a comfortable life, the same as their non-disabled peers, and live without their basic human rights being violated. It took until 1990 for a law to pass in the United States that would help to prevent

discrimination against those with disabilities (see: The Americans with Disabilities Act) (Pfeiffer 1994).

Many Social Darwinists believed that disabilities often caused other problems in the lives of these individuals, like crime, poverty, and addiction. This, of course, ignores the various social factors surrounding disabled individuals who faced these issues. Of course, Social Darwinism's adherence to biological determinism meant that looking at social context was simply out of the question for their intellectual scope. Many Social Darwinists even reduced those with disabilities as animalistic, which only further emphasized why they believed that they were lesser than (Beckman 2017).

The very roots of the eugenics movement are almost entirely entangled with ableism. Eugenicists wished to remove the worst of society, and to many, the disabled *are* the worst that society has to offer. They are not the only ones who wished to find some way to control the disabled population of the United States, but they are certainly one of the most prevalent movements, especially during their rise in the United States during the early twentieth century (Powell 2021).

The forcible sterilization of those with disabilities was a disturbingly common practice during the 1900s. Many people thought that the disabled were unfit to be parents. Because of this, they were prevented from reproducing, especially because people believed that they would pass on these disabilities (Powell 2021).

Part of the problem is that people with disabilities are often perceived to be asexual. They are believed to have little to no desire to have sex, and would be poor partners. This infantilizes those with disabilities, reducing them to little more than intellectual toddlers. Disability, either

intellectual or physical, does not simply reduce sex drive; those with disabilities are just as much sexual beings as their peers are (World Health Organization 2014).

In 1927, a case was brought in front of the Supreme Court that tried to challenge this disturbing practice. Carrie Buck, a disabled Virginia woman, was committed to a state mental institution for supposed feeble-mindedness, a condition her mother and daughter both reportedly shared with her. Part of the process of admitting patients into mental institutions in Virginia is the sterilization of these patients. Therefore, if these patients were ever readmitted into the world outside the institutions, they would not be able to pass on their disabilities, and possibly would be able to live “normal” lives. In the case, the Court ruled that the Fourteenth Amendment was not violated by this state mandate, because it supposedly promoted the “protection and health of the state” (Buck v. Bell 1927). The only justice that voted in dissent of the ruling was Pierce Butler (Gould 1995).

In the years following this court case decision, many programs and decisions were put into place to reduce the effects of this court decision. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, for example, has allowed for the guarantee of certain protections of those with disabilities from the federal government. As another example, Skinner v. Oklahoma made it so that inmates with more than two convictions could not be forcibly sterilized (Powell 2021). Despite this, the Court’s decision in this case has never been officially overturned, meaning that it is still technically legal to forcefully sterilize disabled individuals admitted into state institutions, at least in Virginia (Ellis 2008).

Over the course of the next several decades, over thirty other states across the United States enacted laws that had similar intentions to that of the one in Virginia. They all proclaimed that they were being passed with the hope of preventing those with disabilities from passing their

afflictions on to their offspring. These laws ultimately resulted in the sterilization of over 65 thousand Americans by 1970. A large portion of this number was made up of disabled individuals (Powell 2021). Minors were not excluded from these practices; disabled children that were admitted to psychiatric institutions were almost as likely to suffer from these procedures as adults.

Another method used to limit the reproduction of disabled was by limiting their marriage rights. This was a method previously described as having been utilized against those in the lower class. However, while those laws only made it (admittedly, significantly) more difficult for the poor to get married, the laws put in place limiting marriage of the disabled often outright prohibited it altogether. These laws often emphasized the importance of the “protection” of the disabled individuals, the resulting children that would come from these unions, and the state itself. Certain states had laws that made any form of sexual intercourse illegal for disabled individuals until they reach the age of forty-five (and are thus, at an age where reproductivity is incredibly low). As late as 1997, there were still around thirty-three states that prohibited or greatly limited the access to marriage of disabled individuals. This was only about twelve less than the number about 23 years prior (Powell 2021).

There was another method being used to limit the population of disabled individuals in the United States. This method is involuntary euthanasia. Euthanasia is defined as the mercy killing of a patient so as to end their intense, unbearable, and/or unending suffering (American Medical Association). There are three forms of euthanasia: voluntary euthanasia (in which the patient willingly ends or willingly lets someone else end their life), non-voluntary euthanasia (in which the patient is a child, or is comatized, and thus cannot consent to the practice), and involuntary euthanasia (in which the patient is killed without given consent when the patient can

give consent; this is considered to be murder nearly everywhere now) (BBC). It is important to distinguish the difference between these forms of euthanasia, because it was the latter being conducted against disabled individuals. While the first form of euthanasia is someone deciding to have their own life ended, and non-voluntary euthanasia involves a parent or guardian being forced to make the hard decision for those who cannot make the choice on their own, involuntary euthanasia involves taking away a person's right to choose, and killing them without their consent.

Involuntary euthanasia was first suggested as a means of eradicating those with "defects" in 1900 by W. Duncan McKim. McKim, a eugenicist in the early part of the twentieth century, did not even believe that the disabled were human. "The idiot and the low-grade imbecile are not true men, for certain essential human elements have never entered into them, and never can," McKim claims (McKim 1900). McKim advocated for the involuntary euthanasia of those with disabilities, promoting the use of carbonic gas a quick and easy method to grant these individuals a painless and speedy death (Cheyfitz 2000).

One of the earliest organizations advocating for the usage of involuntary euthanasia was that of the Euthanasia Society of America (ESA). The organization advocated for the legalization of euthanasia in general. Many members were also believers in the positive use of involuntary euthanasia as something that they should work towards legalizing as well as voluntary euthanasia. This is particularly evident with the Society's first president, Charles Potter, who was advocate for both the previously mentioned eugenics method of coercive sterilization, as well as the use of involuntary euthanasia as a means to eradicate the "undesirables" from society (Dowbiggen 2002). It was only after the end of World War II, in which Nazi Germany began enacting programs that performed the very procedures that these early advocates were

promoting, that the ESA decided to no longer publicly support the practice of involuntary euthanasia (Dowbiggen 2002).

America wasn't the only country to toy with the idea of using euthanasia as a means of controlling the population of disabled in their country. In Nazi Germany, a notable program was passed in 1939. This program, known as Aktion T4, was implemented to eliminate those who were "inferior" amongst the Aryan race. These "inferior" people included the incurably ill, disabled, and elderly (Strous 2006). Both adults and children were victims of these acts of involuntary euthanasia. By the time the Allied soldiers finally shut down the program in 1945, well over 70,000 disabled people were victims to this program (Weiss & Klee 1983), with the upper estimate being over 300,000 people (*Quellen* 2018). Over 5,000 of these victims were children (Browning 2005).

Sexism

If there is one group of people that continually is victimized by Social Darwinists and eugenicists in nearly all forms of discrimination, while never actually being a target themselves, it is women. In nearly all groups that are discriminated against by them, women are the ones who end up with the most focus against them, even in places that affect both men and women in society.

Sterilization, for example, has disproportionately affected women in several ways. As previously mentioned, several organizations in the American South were practicing programs during the 1920s-1980s in which women, especially women of color, were being sterilized without their knowledge, against their will. This was done through the use of forced, unknowing,

and unnecessary hysterectomies in what was commonly known as the “Mississippi Appendectomy”, performed whenever these women visited the hospital for some unrelated reason (Ko 2016).

Even groups like the Nazis tended to target women in their social systems. Nazis considered women to be worth little more than their roles in the domestic sphere as mothers, wives, and daughters. They believed that these women served little purpose other to bear the children of their Nazi soldier husbands. The stereotypical gender roles were a little spoken of, but prominent part of Nazi social regime (Bock 1983).

This did not mean that all women in Nazi Germany were considered to be viable candidates for the role of motherhood. As mentioned earlier, certain populations were considered to be lesser than and worthy of extermination, and thus, they were not allowed to reproduce. These populations (and especially the women who belonged to them) were sterilized to avoid the risk of them reproducing (Bock 1983).

It is the “racially pure, Aryan” women who the Nazis encouraged to serve in the roles of the domestic life. It is their role in the domestic sphere that Nazis believed helped encourage these racial ideals. The more children that these women were having with their pure, Aryan husbands, the greater spread the race would have throughout the world. This traditional role of women was seen as the ideal to Nazi domestic life (Bock 1983).

Part of this may have been caused by the lowering birth rates in Germany between the first and second World Wars. This was perceived as possibly being caused by a “birth-strike” by the women of Germany. Women were having less children than their mothers were having at their age (Bock 1983).

Still, the Nazis did not want just any woman having children, and they implemented many programs to make sure that so-called “degenerate” women were unable to or were prevented from have children. One such program made it secretly legal to have “defective” pregnancies aborted, and if the woman getting the abortion was deemed to be of “inferior values”, she would be forcibly sterilized. After 1938, they even made it a part of the law that the women getting this abortions could not take their initial consent to the abortion back (Bock 1983).

There was also a law put in place that made it so that frequent offenders would be castrated. This eventually was expanded to include female castration via destruction of the gonads. This particular method of sterilization would become one of the most popular methods amongst officials in the prison camps, who could perform it quickly and easily without the patient’s knowledge (Bock 1983).

Reflection

Unlike its parent theory of Darwinism, Social Darwinism has been shown to do nothing but justify discrimination in the world. The belief that there could be people who are better suited for society, not because of the society itself or its inherent social biases, or programs that blatantly make it unsuitable for certain populations to live in, but because the groups that aren’t suitable to live in the society are biologically inferior, is one based solely in the desire to maintain power amongst the ruling classes, as well as the other majority populations of the world.

Time and time again, the works of the Social Darwinists were used as a justification for horrible world events and policies. Nazi Germany's ideals were based heavily on the ideology that biological inferiority made it imperative for those who were "superior" to take over. Nazi's ultimate goal was complete domination of Europe, and eradication of those they deemed "unworthy" of life. The Jewish people of Europe, people of color, and the disabled were all among the groups most targeted by their regime, and Nazis sought to eradicate them through a variety of methods known as eugenics.

The ideals of American society, too, have been based heavily on those of the Social Darwinists, even if they are not always so open about it. Many Americans believe, even to this day, that the reason why the rich are as rich as they are is because they are simply the most hardworking people in the country. They ignore the history of worker abuse, exploitation, and generation wealth, and instead try to make it seem as though these upper class people are simply better than those in the middle, and especially the lower class, who are often deemed to be the laziest in society.

Eugenics programs still exist today in American society. Programs that are based on the eugenics movement or were founded by historical eugenicists still exist in American society. While not all of these movements are inherently wrong on their own, there is something spine-crawling-ly disturbing about eugenics being the background behind something as important to the women's rights movement as the birth control pill, and birth control clinics.

Final Thoughts

While there are certainly several overlapping theories and ways of speaking between both sides of the coin, the hatreds taken on by Darwinists and Social Darwinists have their own

identities and ways of justification. While Darwinism-motivated discrimination is often quite blatant, relying on completely outdated science that has since been disproven time and time again, Social Darwinists use more insidious methods to convince people of their correctness. They weasel their way into people's minds by convincing them that they are simply looking to improve society, but ultimately, all they are doing is trying to maintain a grip on their power whenever they see it slipping.

Darwinists' theories and hopes for the future have long since been (rightfully) dashed by the efforts of time and actual, real scientists to disprove them. Part of this may be that society has advanced past the need for something to be evolutionarily advantageous for it to be okay to have present in the world. Part of it may be that we, as a society, have almost entirely moved past bigotry.

But I doubt that. Social Darwinists and their younger brothers, the eugenicists, have maintained a steady presence in American society, even though the concept has lost its popularity. Part of their appeal to many seems to be that they don't simply seek to call out something that is supposedly not evolutionarily advantageous. They instead rely on the belief of biological determinism to stir up hatred against those with "less than ideal" traits. They seek to remove those with the traits, so as to prevent it from propagating onto the next generation, as these are often seen as being hereditary.

There is no getting rid of these people, and there shouldn't be. Jews, homosexuals, the disabled, the lower class, people of color; none of these people have done anything to warrant the intense hatred that these Darwinists or Social Darwinists harbor for them. As they seek to continue to try to eradicate those they deem less than desirable from society in less and less visible ways, remain vigilant to those who would seek to do so. And remember: the phrase you

should live by in society should not be “survival of the fittest”, it should be “survival of *everyone.*”

References

Allen, G. (1974, March). A History of Eugenics in the Class Struggle. *Science for the People*, 6(2), 32–39.

Allen, G. E. (2000). Davenport, Charles Benedict (1866-1944), geneticist, eugenicist, and science administrator. *American National Biography Online*.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/anb/9780198606697.article.1300392>

Andrews, K. (2017, October 30). *The dark history of forced sterilization of Latina women*.

Panoramas. Retrieved from

<https://www.panoramas.pitt.edu/health-and-society/dark-history-forced-sterilization-latin>

a-women/

Anti-Semitism (n.). Etymology. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.etymonline.com/word/anti-Semitism>

Barringer, P. B. (1900). *The American negro, his past and future*. Edwards & Broughton.

Barron, A. (2020, November 17). *Homosexuality may have evolved for social, not sexual reasons*. The Conversation. Retrieved November 19, 2021, from

<https://theconversation.com/homosexuality-may-have-evolved-for-social-not-sexual-reas>

ons-128123

Bateman, A. J. (1948). Intra-sexual selection in drosophila. *Heredity*, 2(3), 349–368.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.1948.21>

BBC. (n.d.). *Ethics - euthanasia: Voluntary and involuntary euthanasia*. BBC. Retrieved from

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/euthanasia/overview/volinvol.shtml>

Beckman, L. (2017). Undoing Ableism: Disability as a Category of Historical and Legal

Analysis. *On Culture: The Open Journal for the Study of Culture*, (3).

Berenbaum, M. (2006). *The world must know: The history of the Holocaust as told in the United*

States holocaust memorial museum. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Biddiss, M. D. (1970). *Father of racist ideology: The social and political thought of count*

gobineau. Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Blue, G. (1999). *Gobineau on China: Race Theory, the "Yellow Peril" and the Critique of*

Modernity (Vol. 10, Ser. Journal of World History).

Bock, G. (1983). Racism and sexism in Nazi germany: Motherhood, compulsory sterilization,

and the State. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8(3), 400–421.

<https://doi.org/10.1086/493983>

- Bowler, P. J. (2003). *Evolution: The history of an idea*. University of California Press.
- Broca, P. (1861). "Sur le principe des localisations cérébrales". *Bulletins De La Société D'anthropologie De Paris*, 2(1), 190–204.
- Browning, C. R. (2005). *The origins of The final solution: The evolution of nazi jewish policy, September 1939-March 1942*. Arrow.
- Buck v. Bell (Supreme Court May 2, 1927).
- Campt, T. (2004). *Other Germans: Black Germans and the politics of race, gender, and memory in the Third reich*. University of Michigan Press.
- Chesler, E. (2007). *Woman of valor Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America*. Simon & Schuster.
- Cheyfitz, K. (2000). Who decides? the connecting thread of euthanasia, eugenics, and doctor-assisted suicide. *OMEGA - Journal of Death and Dying*, 40(1), 5–16.
<https://doi.org/10.2190/djfu-aawp-m3l4-4alp>
- Dafler, J. R., & Callaghan, G. (2005). SOCIAL DARWINISM AND THE LANGUAGE OF RACIAL OPPRESSION: Australia's stolen generations: A review of general semantics. *Et Cetera*, 62(2), 137-150. Retrieved from

<https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/social-darwinism-language-racial-oppression/docview/204060590/se-2?accountid=11920>

Dalrymple, G. B. (2004). *Ancient earth, ancient skies: The age of Earth and its cosmic surroundings*. Stanford university press.

Davenport, C. B. (1912). *Heredity in relation to eugenics*. New York: Williams and Norgate.

Dennis, R. M. (1995). Social Darwinism, scientific racism, and the metaphysics of Race. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 64(3), 243. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2967206>

Dobkin, P. (n.d.). *Social Darwinism and the poor*. Disability History Museum. Retrieved from <https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/issues/social-darwinism-poor/>

Document. GHDI. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1521

Dowbiggin, I. (2002). “A rational coalition”: Euthanasia, eugenics, and birth control in America, 1940–1970. *Journal of Policy History*, 14(3), 223–260.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/jph.2002.0017>

Elgar, M. A., & Fine, C. (2017). Promiscuous men, Chaste women and other gender myths.

Scientific American, 317(3), 32–37. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0917-32>

Ellis, J. W. (2008). Disability Advocacy and Atkins. *DePaul Law Review*, 57(3), 653–666.

Engelman, P. (2011). *A history of the Birth Control Movement in America*. Praeger.

Euthanasia. American Medical Association. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/ethics/euthanasia>

Evans, R. J. (2005). *The third reich in power*. Penguin Books.

Everson, T. (2007). *The gene: A historical perspective*. Greenwood.

Gallup, G. G. (1995). Have attitudes toward homosexuals been shaped by natural selection?

Ethology and Sociobiology, 16(1), 53–70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095\(94\)00028-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(94)00028-6)

Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius*. Macmillan.

Galton, F. (1883). *Inquiries into human faculty and its development*. Dent.

Gould, S. J. (1995). 22. does the stoneless plum instruct the thinking Reed? *Dinosaur in a*

Haystack, 285–295. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674063426.c32>

Gould, S. J. (1996). *The Mismeasure of Man*. W W Norton.

GREEN, P. A. (1995). Evolutionary Insights Into Problems of Sexism, Classism & Racism,

Including Prospects for their Elimination. *Race, Gender & Class*, 2(2), 65–83.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41675379>

Haeckel, E. (1887). *The history of creation* (Vol. 2). D. Appleton & Company.

Hawkins, M. (1997). *Social Darwinism in European and American thought, 1860-1945: Nature as model and nature as threat*. Cambridge University Press.

Hutson, M. (2014, January 3). *Social Darwinism Isn't Dead*. Slate . Retrieved from

<https://slate.com/technology/2014/01/social-darwinism-and-class-essentialism-the-rich-think-they-are-superior.html>

Jacobs, J. (1886). On the racial characteristics of modern Jews. *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 15, 23–62.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2841906>

Kesting, R. (2002). The Black Experience During the Holocaust. In M. Berenbaum & A. J. Peck (Eds.), *The Holocaust and history: The known, the unknown, the disputed, and the reexamined* (pp. 358–365). essay, Indiana University Press.

Khazzoom, L. (n.d.). *Ancient jewish history: Jews of the Middle East*. Jewish Virtual Library.

Retrieved December 1, 2021, from

<https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jews-of-the-middle-east>

Killingray, D. (1996). Africans and African Americans in Enemy Hands". In B. Moore & K.

Fedorowich (Eds.), *Prisoners of war and their captors in World War II* (pp. 181–203).

essay, Berg.

Kirk, G., Raven, J., & Schofield, M. (1983). *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Kluchin, R. M. (2009). *Fit to be tied: Sterilization and reproductive rights in America, 1950-1980*. Rutgers University Press.

Knox, R. (1863). On the application of the anatomical method to the discrimination of species. *Anthropological Review*, 1(2), 263. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3024913>

Ko, L. (2016, January 29). *Unwanted sterilization and eugenics programs in the United States*.

PBS. Retrieved from

<https://www.pbs.org/independentlens/blog/unwanted-sterilization-and-eugenics-programs-in-the-united-states/>

Koffman, D. S., Diner, H. R., Goldstein, E. L., Sarna, J. D., & Wenger, B. S. (2020). Roundtable on anti-semitism in the gilded age and Progressive Era. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, 19(3), 473–505. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1537781420000055>

Le Bon, G. (1879). Recherches anatomiques et mathématiques sur les variations de volume du

cerveau et sur leurs relations avec l'intelligence ("Anatomical and mathematical research on the changes in brain volume and its relationships with intelligence"). *Revue d'Anthropologie*, 8(2). <http://acdc2007.free.fr/lebon1879.pdf>

Lenz, R. (2012, May 16). *Agenda 21 and the jews*. Southern Poverty Law Center. Retrieved December 2, 2021, from

<https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2013/agenda-21-and-jews>

Lerner, R. M. (1992). *Final solutions: Biology, prejudice, and genocide*. Pennsylvania State University Press.

Levin, M. (1984). Why homosexuality is abnormal. *Monist*, 67(2), 251–283.

<https://doi.org/10.5840/monist198467214>

Levine, P., & Bashford, A. (2010). Introduction: Eugenics and the modern world. *Oxford*

Handbooks Online. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195373141.013.0001>

Levit, G. S., & Hossfeld, U. (2020). Ernst Haeckel, Nikolai Miklucho-Maclay and the racial controversy over the Papuans. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 17(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12983-020-00358-w>

Lindquist, D., & Goodman, J. (2004). Teaching the ironies of the holocaust. *Jct*, 20(1), 39-58.

Retrieved from

<https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/teaching-ironies-holocaust/docview/194678>

433/se-2?accountid=11920

Liphshiz, C. (2020, March 4). *Far-right Polish lawmaker: Natural selection via pogroms made*

jews powerful. The Times of Israel. Retrieved December 3, 2021, from

[https://www.timesofisrael.com/far-right-polish-lawmaker-natural-selection-via-pogroms-](https://www.timesofisrael.com/far-right-polish-lawmaker-natural-selection-via-pogroms-made-jews-powerful/)

[made-jews-powerful/](https://www.timesofisrael.com/far-right-polish-lawmaker-natural-selection-via-pogroms-made-jews-powerful/)

Longerich, P. (2010). *Holocaust: The Nazi persecution and murder of the jews*. Oxford

University Press.

Lombardo, P. A. (2014). When Harvard said no to eugenics: The J. ewing mears bequest, 1927.

Perspectives in Biology and Medicine, 57(3), 374–392.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.2014.0023>

Lombardo, P. (2016, March 4). *"Social Origins of Eugenics"*. Image Archive on the American

Eugenics Movement. Retrieved from

<http://eugenicsarchive.org/html/eugenics/essay1text.html>

Lusane, C. (2003). *Hitler's black victims the historical experiences of European blacks, Africans*

and African Americans during the Nazi era. Routledge.

Lyster, C. (2014, April 29). *Pauperism*. The Eugenics Archives. Retrieved from

<https://eugenicsarchive.ca/discover/tree/535eed477095aa0000000246>

Malthus, T. R. (1798). *An Essay on the Principle of Population, as it Affects the Future*

Improvement of Society with Remarks on the Speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet,

and Other Writers. London.

Malthus, T. R. (1826). *An essay on the principle of population = a view of its past and present*

effects on human happiness, with an inquiry into our prospects respecting the future

removal or mitigation of the evils which it occasions (6th ed.). John Murray.

Marten, H. G. (1999). Racism, Social Darwinism, anti-semitism and aryan supremacy. *The*

International Journal of the History of Sport, 16(2), 23–41.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09523369908714069>

McKim, W. D. (1900). *Heredity and Human Progress*.

Mills, C. W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. Oxford University Press.

Munévar Gonzalo. (2014). Darwinism and Homosexuality. In F. de Sousa & Munévar Gonzalo

(Eds.), *Sex, reproduction and Darwinism* (pp. 95–108). essay, Pickering & Chatto.

Nario-Redmond, M. R. (2019). *Ableism: The causes and consequences of disability prejudice*.

Wiley Blackwell.

Neurath, P. (1994). *From Malthus to the club of Rome and back: Problems of limits to growth, population control, and migrations*. Sharpe.

Ogilvie, M. B., & Harvey, J. D. (2000). *The biographical dictionary of women in science: Pioneering lives from ancient times to the mid-20th century*. Routledge.

PEARSON, K. A. R. L., & MOUL, M. A. R. G. A. R. E. T. (1925). The problem of alien immigration into Great Britain, illustrated by an examination of Russian and Polish Jewish children. *Annals of Eugenics*, 1(1), 5–54.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1809.1925.tb02037.x>

PEMBREY, M. S. (1913). WOMAN'S PLACE IN NATURE. *Science Progress in the Twentieth Century (1906-1916)*, 8(29), 133–144. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43427222>

Pfeiffer, D. (1994). Eugenics and disability discrimination. *Disability & Society*, 9(4), 481–499.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599466780471>

Pinker, S. (2006, June 26). *Groups and genes*. The New Republic. Retrieved December 1, 2021, from <https://newrepublic.com/article/77727/groups-and-genes>

Plutarch, & Goodwin, W. W. (1874). *Plutarch's morals*. Little, Brown, and Co.

Powell, R. M. (2021). Confronting Eugenics Means Finally Confronting Its Ableist Roots .

William & Mary Journal of Race, Gender, and Social Justice, 27(3).

Pseudo-scientific racism and Social Darwinism. South African History Online. (2011, March

22). Retrieved from

<https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/pseudo-scientific-racism-and-social-darwinism>

Public Broadcasting Service. (n.d.). *Eugenics and birth control*. PBS. Retrieved from

<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/pill-eugenics-and-birth-control/>

Quellen zur Geschichte der "euthanasie ... - bundesarchiv. (2028). Retrieved from

https://www.bundesarchiv.de/geschichte_euthanasie/Inventar_euth_doe.pdf

Romanes, G. J. (1887). Mental Differences Between Men and Women. *Nineteenth Century*,

654–671. <https://doi.org/10.1038/055340d0>

Rudman, L. A., & Saud, L. H. (2020). Justifying social inequalities: The role of Social

Darwinism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(7), 1139–1155.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219896924>

Sanger, M. *The morality of Birth Control - Nov. 18, 1921*. Archives of Women's Political

Communication. (n.d.). From

<https://awpc.cattcenter.iastate.edu/2017/03/21/the-morality-of-birth-control-nov-28-1921/>

Scheck, R. (2006). *Hitler's African victims: The German Army massacres of Black French soldiers in 1940*. Cambridge University Press.

Scientific American Editors. (2012, June 1). *Political attacks on Planned Parenthood are a threat to women's health*. Scientific American. Retrieved 2022, from

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/protect-womens-health/>

Spencer, H. (1850). *Social Statics: The Man Versus the State*.

Spencer, H. (1864). *The Principles of Biology*.

Stanfield, J. H. (1995). The myth of Race and the human sciences. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 64(3), 218. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2967204>

Starr, C., Taggart, R., Evers, C. A., & Starr, L. (2013). *Biology: The Unity & Diversity of Life*. Cengage Learning.

Stillwell, D. (2012). Eugenics visualized: The exhibit of the third international congress of eugenics, 1932. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 86(2), 206–236.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/bhm.2012.0025>

Strous, R. D. (2006). Nazi euthanasia of the mentally ill at hadamar. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 163(1), 27–27. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.163.1.27>

Stucke, M. E. (2008). BETTER COMPETITION ADVOCACY. *St. John's Law Review*, 82(3), 951–1036.

The Darwinian paradox of homosexuality. @neurochallenged. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2021, from <https://neuroscientificallychallenged.com/posts/darwinian-paradox-of-homosexuality>

Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man*, 136–179. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315129266-7>

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2021, July 2). *THE NUREMBERG RACE LAWS*.

United States holocaust memorial museum. Retrieved from

<https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/the-nuremberg-race-laws>

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (n.d.). United States holocaust memorial museum.

Retrieved from

<https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/antisemitism-in-history-racial-antisemi>

tism-18751945

Wallace, W. (1911). Empedocles. In *Encyclopaedia britannica* (11th ed., Vol. 9, pp. 344–345).

essay, Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.

Weiss, S. F., & Klee, E. (1983). "euthanasie" Im NS-Staat: Die "Vernichtung Lebensunwerten

Lebens.". *The American Historical Review*, 90(5), 1225. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1859756>

World Health Organization (2014, June 6). *Eliminating forced, coercive and otherwise*

involuntary sterilization - An interagency statement. Retrieved from

https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/201405_sterilization_en.pdf