

**Between Quality and Quantity:  
The Population Council and the Politics of "Science-making"  
in Eugenics and Demography, 1952-1965**

by Edmund Ramsden

Ph.D. Candidate  
Department of Political and Social Science  
European University Institute  
Florence, Italy  
[ed\\_ramsden@hotmail.com](mailto:ed_ramsden@hotmail.com),  
[edmund.ramsden@iue.it](mailto:edmund.ramsden@iue.it)

© 2001 by Edmund Ramsden

Editor's Note: This research report is presented here with Mr. Ramsden's permission but should not be cited or quoted without his consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center, a division of The Rockefeller University. Edited by Ken Rose and Erwin Levold under the general direction of the Center's director, Darwin H. Stapleton, Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center or The Rockefeller University.

The Population Council is one of the leading demographic organizations of the post-war era and was a powerful force in the reconstruction of post-war population studies in the United States. It is thus of critical importance to my attempt to understand the relationship between demography and eugenics in Britain and the United States. Regarding this relationship, an analysis of the Population Council records and the papers of John D. Rockefeller 3rd allow us insights into two closely interrelated processes, that of the institutionalization of demography in the United States as a social science, becoming both an intensely rigorous and "hard" discipline, yet one of the most practical and policy oriented areas of expertise; and the transition in the official eugenic position, that is of the American Eugenics Society (AES), from a conservative and biologically determinist, "mainline" eugenics, to a more "environmentally friendly," welfare and democracy-oriented, "social" or "reform" eugenics. I believe that despite the stigma of Nazism attached to earlier studies in differential fertility that supposedly drove a wedge between demography and eugenics (now defined as "objective science" and "pseudo-science" respectively), an analysis of the Population Council's work reveals that eugenics continued to exist, albeit in reduced form, within the new post-war population science-policy nexus. The new relationship between "social eugenics" and social demography

reflected a consensus regarding the role of empirical statistical research in revealing the causes and consequences of population dynamics with a view to improving population quality. The new consensus in population studies comprised a modernist project *par excellence*. It was believed that not only man's environment, but himself and his society, were made susceptible to understanding through statistical science and thus more responsive to human intervention. I am restricting my study to demographic research and population policy concerning Western nations, not the developing world, for reasons that will become clear in this report.

In 1952 a small group of thirty-one scientists, demographers, social scientists and birth control activists, all leaders in the field of population, met in Williamsburg for a two-day meeting at the invitation of John D. Rockefeller 3rd and with the sponsorship of the National Academy of Sciences. It was from this meeting that the Population Council was founded. This group also included a number of eugenicists, such as H. J. Muller and Frederick Osborn, for whom the "problem of population" was most importantly a question of the hereditary quality of the human population. Detlev Bronk, Theodore Schultz, Lewis Stadler, and W. S. Thompson also expressed varying degrees of concern about the possible detrimental effects of population dynamics on the genetic quality of the human population. Yet it was decided at this meeting that the problems of population growth were more immediate and more threatening than those of quality, particularly since the objectivity of eugenics as a science and its effectiveness as a policy had been made so problematic over recent decades. Marshall Balfour summed up the position of many in the field, suggesting that while claiming to be interested in the genetic quality of population, as life was "so cheap" in nations with severe population growth, "there is little or no understanding or interest in the subject of eugenics or racial or individual improvement; in spite of the fact that Japan has a Eugenic Protection Law, that aspect of the law is very little effective." For Balfour, the problem of population growth "is so pressing that it is much better to consider quantity first, and when something has to be accomplished in that direction one might move on to quality."

Yet, in a memorandum to John D. Rockefeller 3rd that preceded the meeting, the eugenicists were identified as "moderates" in contrast to the extreme birth control activists and conservationists such as William Vogt. The leader of the AES and respected promoter and spokesman for demography, Frederick Osborn, was elected vice-president of the new Population Council and later served as its executive vice-president and president until 1959. An initial draft charter of the Council submitted by Rockefeller stated that it aimed to "promote research and apply existing knowledge to help develop such changes in the attitudes, habits and environmental pressures affecting the life of human beings so that within every social and economic grouping parents who are above the average in intelligence, quality of personality and affection will tend to have larger than average families." This was taken directly from the back cover of the *Eugenical News* by Don McLean, and would later be dropped when Thomas Parran, a Catholic and former surgeon general, told Rockefeller, that he was "sorely troubled by the implications. . . . Such questions arise as the following: Who is to determine the 'parents who are above average in . . . affection?' The psychiatrists tell us that parental affection is a good trait but only if it is manifested in moderation. Also, who would decide the

persons having better than average personality? Frankly, the implications of this, while I know they were intended to have a eugenic implication, could readily be misunderstood as a Nazi master race philosophy. I have, therefore, recast this paragraph."

However, Parran argued that population quality was "nevertheless... another area that needs exploration." The final draft of the aims of the Population Council stated that it would conduct "research in both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of population in the United States in relation to potential material and cultural resources." Eugenics became increasingly delineated as the study of "quality," a position that was compatible with Osborn's delineation of a "qualitative demography," the study of the qualitative aspects of population problems, which he had developed with the demographer Frank Lorimer in 1934. While the concept of "quality" as relating to the desirability of people had retained the stigma of "race hygiene," reflected in the correspondence between Boudreau, Osborn, Kirk, Kiser and Lorimer with regards the Milbank Memorial Fund symposium on "Genetic and Cultural Characteristics," the term "quality" became increasingly acceptable through the blurring of boundaries between social, economic and genetic quality. As Dudley Kirk, the Director of the Demographic Division of the Population Council, wrote to Osborn in 1958, "Fortunately this nature versus nurture controversy has died down and there seems to be a tendency for synthesis. I guess no one today really thinks it is possible to make a clear distinction between the influences of heredity and of environment."

The Committee on Program and Succession, under Haskins in 1958-1959, even considered geneticists such as Bentley Glass and Morgens Westergaard for the presidency of the Council, with Notestein writing to Haskins in April 1959, that the Council was "convinced that, so far as the Western world was concerned, the important issues were likely to be qualitative rather than quantitative" and yet they were "unimpressed with the approaches made thus far made to problems of quality." Westergaard however, proved more interested in genetic problems than population ones and, as Haskins replied to Notestein, "he might well be a person to whom we would want to turn for special assistance *in coming years*, even though it is clear that he is not now relevant to the general needs of the Council."

In order of importance, quality was now seen as second to quantity. While there is no doubt that this shift reflected the new social, political and economic realities of the Cold War and "population explosion" and demographers attempts to reconstruct its theories, methods and substantive research as relevant to these realities, demographers also sought to separate themselves from the stigma of earlier research which had centered upon population decline and differential fertility between classes and races, culminating in the demographic apocalypse of "race suicide". This shift was facilitated by the "baby boom," which, although still perceived by most demographers as a temporary phenomenon, removed the specter of 'race suicide' from the demographic agenda. The upsurge in births was the result of the increased fertility of the educated and white-collar classes, and it allowed many to sidestep the issue of dysgenic selection through class differentials in fertility. Despite the embarrassment of having failed to predict this upsurge, demographers had much to be satisfied with. Population dynamics were, in many ways,

more rational than had previously been presumed as population increase was interpreted as a direct response to the improved social and economic prospects following World War II. A large number of demographers would now turn their attention to the necessity and means of imbuing this rationality to non-western peoples whose excessive fertility comprised the new demographic threat. The realm of fertility control was now to be placed firmly in the hands of science. The 'radical' birth controllers, while fulfilling a useful task, lacked a proper understanding of the necessary policies for particular countries at particular stages of economic and social development. Furthermore, their propagandist rhetoric could often dissuade leaders in adopting population policies.

Yet eugenics also adapted to this new social and political reality. Eugenics increasingly turned its attention towards demography as it became an increasingly powerful and policy-relevant discipline and largely integrated itself with demography's dominant theoretical framework, that of transition theory. As Fraser Roberts stated at the 1946 Galton Lecture, at their most basic formulations eugenics and the theory of demographic transition "placed all countries on a grand evolutionary scheme running from pre transitional ("traditional") to transitional or post transitional ("modern")." Different nations needed different policies, which could be determined through identifying the stage of transition a nation had reached. The British leader of eugenics, C. P. Blacker (1952) expanded Thompson's three stages of population growth (pre-industrial, expanding and stationary) to five stages: the 'high stationary', the 'early expanding', the 'declining', 'late expanding', and finally the 'low stationary'. Eugenics, concerned with the final phases of qualitative improvement, was only relevant to nations in the final stages of transition, or indeed evolution, where the elimination of gross social inequalities had allowed the inherent genetic quality greater phenotypic expression.

Transition theory formed the basis of the Population Council's approach to population problems. In *This Crowded World* (1960), "prepared in cooperation with the Population Council," Osborn claimed that "population problems may be of different kinds. Each nation and each area has its own problems. But there is a world problem of population which overshadows all the rest." Yet "in countries which are industrialized and include about one-third or less of the world's people, population problems are of a different sort... They are faced with the problem of whether the quality of their people may be changing from one generation to another and not always for the better. There is apparently a fairly high correlation between intelligence and character, and these qualities tend to run in families. If, in the countries whose populations are now fairly stable in numbers, families at the lower level of intelligence and education have more children than their proportion of children, the country will suffer a serious handicap in its efforts to improve the quality of its people."

The policy approach outlined by *This Crowded World* grew out of the Population Council's Ad Hoc philosophy committee on policy, established in 1955 under Osborn. The Ad Hoc committee held a number of meetings on "The Philosophy and Public Relations of the Rational Control of Family Size." These meetings were developed to "bring about a cross fertilization of ideas on this topic" and composed of highly respected people "with broad general experience" and "specialists qualified in population, foreign

affairs, the psychology of communication, and public relations," which included representatives from the Rockefeller Reference Bureau, the Population Reference Bureau, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the Conservation Foundation, and leading eugenicists, economists, demographers, physicians and embryologists. As Irene Taeuber wrote in a memorandum to Osborn in 1954, the committee hoped to establish "a philosophy" towards population problems which was seen as being directly related to "the respectability of scientific research and the acceptability of population policy" through furthering "the development of demography that is scientific rather than propagandist." As it was discussed at a meeting in Tarrytown, October 1956, the final action of the group would be to "produce a mature statement... defining the major problems of population in different parts of the world... indicating some of the steps to be taken in their solution... proposing means of meeting sensitive problems of public relations involved in such solutions." The final action of the group was thus a proposal for American Population Policy.

The meetings were primarily oriented towards population control in developing nations, and thus questions of quantity rather than quality. However to ensure the discussion of quality and genetic inheritance in particular, Osborn included two sessions to deal primarily with population problems in the United States, which, as he stated in the memorandum, he hoped would be "related to the present unequal distribution of births with respect to educational levels and cultural group; and some indication of the attack being made on problems of genetic change." In a memorandum to the committee in 1954, Osborn wrote that the question of family planning in the United States "requires a more complicated philosophy than that which would be required simply to get a lower birth rate," since some parents needed to be encouraged to have large families and others small families. At a 1956 meeting, the committee distinguished between Western countries where birth control began as 'personal choice' and newly-sovereign countries whose colonial history precluded birth control. Whereas developing nations lacking access to birth control suffered a problem of population quantity, in liberal western countries personal choice was considered partly responsible for deficiencies in population quality. As Osborn wrote in the final statement of the committee in 1958, entitled *Population: An International Dilemma: A summary of the conference committee on population problems, 1956-1957*, while "responsible people have gradually over the last hundred years come to think of two or three children as the ideal number... Many less thoughtful parents, careless about the upbringing and education of their children, have continued to have large families without the social penalty and apparently with the approval of society" and thus "they tend to lower in each generation the quality of the people."

Yet, just as eugenicists were wary of examining global population differentials in terms of quality, the Population Council would not attempt to directly influence policies abroad. Wary of being seen as dedicated to anti-communism and U.S. interests in ensuring access to global resources, they would rather hope to influence government elites into instigating population policies themselves and then provide them with the needed technical assistance. With regards the United States, its members were wary of the controversy linked to attempts to instigate population policies and the fact that any attempt to control reproduction from the 'top-down' could be linked in the public consciousness to extreme

nationalism, racism, eugenics and Nazi race policies in particular. As its president, Bernard Berelson, claimed in 1978, "The purpose of the Council, I take it, is not to develop demography as a scientific discipline (even less, public health or reproductive physiology) not to "solve the population problem." Rather, it is to develop sound knowledge and knowledgeable people to guide intelligent policy in the population field. We are not here 'to do the job'- but we are here to develop the scientific information, the technical plans, the training programs, and the professional personnel that will be available for 'doing the job' in the population field, however that is responsibly defined." (Population Council, 1978, pp. 80-81).

The Population Council report of 1978 then reiterated this position. "There is an opportunity here not only to disseminate knowledge, but to forestall an emotional approach to the complex and potentially explosive problems of population. The science of demography deals with the quantitative analysis of measurable units. Its findings, like those of any scientific inquiry, present demonstrable facts. These can provide a noncontroversial approach to human problems. . . . An emotional or ideological approach could rapidly turn questions of population into highly divisive issues, and postpone their solution to a distant future when it would be too late to avert disaster. The scientific approach lays a base for the understanding of population problems by intellectual groups."

Such an approach was compatible with reform eugenicists' attempt to provide eugenics with firmer scientific credentials through the medium of "objective" statistics, a task which benefited significantly from a respected organization such as the Population Council addressing eugenic concerns. The AES claimed to be critical of previous eugenicists' extremist tendencies, emphasizing the need for further research in human genetics, psychology, anthropology and the social sciences. Through Osborn's influence the Population Council provided grants to the AES for the NAS and SSRC's planning of major field study of twins under the anthropologist Harry Shapiro, the vice president and future president of the AES,. It was decided that the central study would be built around the intelligence and personality of normal twins directly attacking the mechanism of polygenic inheritance of interest to geneticists, and to establish the relative influences of the environment and heredity, so important to the field of psychology. As Shapiro, Osborn and the psychologist Gardner Murphy wrote in a memorandum in 1953, "social science research of the post-war period has been disproportionately devoted to studies of the effects of differences in the environment with regard to differences in the genetic material on which the environment reacts. The more progress is made with such environmental studies the more the gap in our genetic knowledge hinders further advance." The study would be large, longitudinal, and, with the help of medical practitioners such as Alan Guttmacher at Mt. Sinai Hospital, who also held an intense interest in eugenics, would include all twin births occurring over three-year period at New York City hospitals, and, it was hoped, would eventually result in a Twin Clinic.

In time the renowned geneticists L. C. Dunn and Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University would take an active part in the informal joint committee of the SSRC and NRC. Having established the Institute for the Study of Human Variation, for "Research

on the Biological Factors Causing Evolutionary Changes in Populations," they employed Stanley Gartler for a study into the variability of selected discrete biochemical reactions in twins. In 1955 Gartler received a grant of \$5,000 per annum for two years, \$1,000 of which was from the AES and the rest from the Population Council. Lorimer wrote to Osborn congratulating him on his accomplishment of "bringing life into the American Eugenics Society" through the twin study.

Gartler's work was funded through two Population Council fellowships for medical genetics established partly as result of advice given to Osborn by James V. Neel and Nash Herndon in 1954, that this would comprise a most significant step forward for both genetics and eugenics. In 1956, with the findings of the study at the Institute for the Study of Human Variation being rather insignificant, the Council decided to direct the fellowships more directly towards medical genetics. The grant was transferred to two fellowships in medical genetics with Krooth at Harvard and the other to a Southern medical college in order to establish a Chair of Medical Genetics.

The grants supplied by the Population Council for medical genetics were aimed at the establishment of hereditary clinics, a necessary complement to family planning. A grant \$3,000 for the first year was also approved for a Medical Genetics Conference in 1959 at the Cornell Medical School. This conference, to be held annually for 3-4 days, had the aim according to the Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Norman Ketchmer, of stimulating interest in hereditary clinics as well as direct teaching in genetics.

Population Council funds also were released for other programs of training in genetics, for attendance to a Bar Harbor course in medical genetics, 1960-63, and for a study into a survey of sterilization in cases of Huntington's Chorea conducted by John Whittier with approval of the Human Betterment Association of America (HBAA).

The Population Council also contributed significantly to seminars and conferences which included human genetics. The American Society of Human Genetics received funds for the First International Conference on Human Genetics to be held in Copenhagen in 1956, as a result of correspondence between Osborn and the staunch eugenicist, F. Kallmann, and a grant of \$3,000 was made to Cornell University to establish an annual seminar-conference on human genetics, as proposed by Norman Kretchmer.

The Population Council also donated \$5,000 towards the 1957 Cold Spring Harbor Symposium in "quantitative biology" between ecologists, geneticists and demographers to focus on theoretical and mathematical developments of mutual interest since the "biosocial" approaches of Raymond Pearl and A. J. Lotka. The conference included geneticists of evolutionary synthesis such as Dobzhansky, R. C. Lewontin, and Bruce Wallace and demographers such as A. J. Coale, N. B. Ryder, John Hanjal and Henry from France. The Population Council then went on to support the first of a series of conferences between demographers, geneticists and eventually psychologists at Princeton in 1963, under the auspices of the AES.

These Princeton conferences represented an important shift in approach for Osborn, who following the success of establishing genetics as a part of medicine in the form of hereditary clinics, decided that a period of expansion for eugenics as a discipline was upon them, this time through the rise of population genetics. The new population genetic orientation of Osborn is reflected in the transfer of the program in Genetics and Population Characteristics to the Demographic Division of the Population Council in 1965, and an increase in its funding to \$20,000, because of the new emphasis being placed on the demographic aspects of genetics. Osborn was no longer seeking a severely reduced eugenics program in the form of medical genetics as part of a health- and welfare-oriented family planning program, but was rather seeking a new synthesis between demography and genetics. Geneticists had begun to return to the question of human evolution, and with the population genetics approach being 'populational', the time was ripe for a renewed relationship between the biological and sociological study of populations. Demographers could produce data of use to students of population genetics, and furthermore, demographic models of population dynamics and the influence of social organization on reproductive behavior were essential to the study of genetics in human populations, whose reproduction was far from random as was assumed by the Hardy-Weinberg law in population genetics concerning the constancy of gene frequency or genetic equilibrium of large populations. Likewise, population genetics could reveal to demographers the significance of population dynamics, assortative mating and differential fertility to genetic frequencies and human evolution.

The meetings directly addressed eugenic concerns, and the papers and summary of the 1963 symposium were published in the *Eugenics Quarterly*. The editor of the 1963 conference, R. H. Post, stated that "population geneticists and demographers both recognize the importance of each other's contributions to the study of present trends in human evolution. Knowledge in this field is essential to the development of eugenic programs. Both groups appreciate that a better understanding of their reciprocal relationship is needed in order that eugenics may have, first, a more sound theoretical basis and, later, perhaps, a more effective application. The American Eugenics Society conceives one of its immediate tasks to be the fostering of a closer relationship between these and other workers in kindred fields."

The conferences centered upon research that bridged population genetics and demography and later psychology, much of which was also funded by the Population Council. The Council's annual report of 1965 stated that "in 1963 the Council began to turn its attention to the effect of demographic trends on the distribution and frequency of genes relating to intelligence and personality, through support for research and conferences that helped to bring demographers and geneticists together to study their common problems." A grant of \$10,000 from the Population Council in 1964 supported the inauguration of a population genetics study, the "University Population Study Pilot Project" at the University of Wisconsin under R. H. Osborne, another leading eugenicist. There was also a grant in 1965 of \$5,000 to the University of Chile School of Public Health for a study of the distribution of various genetic characteristics, correlating the frequency of various genes with the rate of fertility. The finances for this study came from general demographic funds as the specific program authorization of \$20,000 for



1966 had been exhausted. Another grant was used for a fellowship for Carl Bajema, as a "Senior Population Council Fellow in Demography and Population Genetics," to complete the interdisciplinary training program in population genetics and demography at the University of Chicago, an idea that had been developed through the Princeton conferences. Bajema dedicated himself to the study of intelligence and fertility.

The Population Council also directly funded the AES for the support of the Society's conferences and the publication of the *Eugenics Quarterly*. In its annual report of 1962, the Population Council stated that it funded the AES on the basis of its contributions to "the field of medical genetics" and on its intentions "to give more emphasis than in the past to sociological aspects including the problems created by the birth of many children into environments not suited to their proper development." They further stated in 1965 that "through this modest program the Council has kept in touch with the emerging field of genetic quality of populations, which foresees a greatly enlarged future interest. This period has witnessed major advances in cytogenetics, biomedical genetics, and gene identification; yet many great discoveries surely lie ahead, and the Council expects to participate in the search both in grants and in staff work." While the funds provided by the Council were small they were important in the enrollment of leading demographers and population geneticists into the AES, with Kirk and Dobzhansky both serving terms as president of the Society in the 1960s.

Yet to what extent did Osborn and the Population Council eschew policy? While Osborn referred to the United States as "a backward country with regards to population policy," it was claimed that no specific population policy was needed beyond that of raising the 'quality of life' of the population. In fact, most public policies were in effect population policies as they influenced birth, death, marriage and migration rates. Lorimer stated at the Ad Hoc meeting of 1957, that "sound population policy does not require specific population measures, but rather a better application of existing measures." Osborn wrote in the Population Council text of 1958, that, "given a balance of population and resources such as there is in the United States today, sound population policy requires not the enunciation of a 'population policy' but rather the systematic evaluation of all sorts of public measures and programs for their effect on marriage, birth rates and death rates."

Eugenicists were extremely supportive the Population Council's clinical research in contraception control headed by Warren Nelson and Sheldon Segal and also looked with favor at the new relationship that developed between the Population Council and the National Committee on Maternal Health (NCMH). The NCMH had been directly involved with the controversial work in contraception of the Planned Parenthood movement, yet in 1957 it was short of funds and accepted funding from the Population Council. This resulted in its reorganization and a movement away from the birth control movement and birth control clinics. The reorganized NCMH moved towards a new program of research under Christopher Tietze into forms of contraception, including therapeutic abortion and sterilization, to furnish technical assistance (to the Margaret Sanger Bureau, for example) and stimulate new research. It was eventually subsumed by the Population Council in 1967.

Such "type of work," Osborn wrote to Tietze in 1958, "should not be done by the Population Council nor directly associated with it." He pointed out that "one of the reasons we have been able to get large funds from a number of foundations is that we have maintained our position as a scientific group not engaging in any practical applications. This may sound to you like some sort of semantics but it is very important to our work here to maintain this separation." The organization's birth control activists, Margaret Roots and Edith Gates, were transferred to Clarence Gamble's Pathfinder Fund.

The NCMH retained a definite eugenic thread, and Tietze was himself an active member of the eugenics societies of both Britain and the United States. Knowledge of the types of contraception, attitudes towards them and their effectiveness among various population groups, was essential to Osborn's new eugenics of voluntary parenthood. In this respect, the Population Council also funded research carried out by the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia for the HBAA. The project, entitled "The Contemporary Opinion among Physicians about Temporary and Permanent Measures of Conception Control," aimed to understand "the physician's role in facilitating or inhibiting the practice of sterilization and the use of temporary birth control procedures." In a letter attached to the research proposal sent to John D. Rockefeller 3rd in September 1956, the president of the HBAA, Curtis Wood, stated the study was driven by a conviction that "contraceptive methods did not and never would solve the problem for those who really needed fertility control the most -- the morons and the ignorant, irresponsible group. For them voluntary sterilization seems to offer the only practical solution. It can be thought of as permanent planned parenthood." The Population Council agreed to support the HBAA with of an original grant of \$30,000 and then an additional \$20,000 on the advice of Osborn, who wrote to Rockefeller that the organization was "now quite a respectable group." The study, organized under the direction of Guttmacher, was of obvious interest to eugenicists, and certainly had eugenic implications, revealing support for genetic research, pre-marital examination and mandatory sterilization. This study was an example not only of the significant role Osborn played in ensuring that viable eugenic research was supported, but also that the Population Council, while not directly instigating population policies, was a significant force in ensuring policy-relevant research.

Both eugenicists and demographers were committed to the 'Swedish model' of population policy, which was based upon the tenets of democracy and welfare through envisaging 'voluntary parenthood' and ameliorative educational, health and housing policies as mutually interdependent. Osborn and Lorimer perceived this policy as epitomizing the new qualitative approach to population, combining as it did both positive population policy (in the form of tax and welfare incentives) and negative eugenics (the voluntary sterilization laws). Osborn would increasingly invoke the Swedish model, as he did in *Population: An International Dilemma*, claiming that its housing subsidies, free day nurseries, maternal care and other social welfare programs were inducing members of the professional classes to have more children while the general rise in the standard of living, coupled with birth control, was reducing the incidence of unwanted and/or defective births.

Yet there remained an insistence on the genetic effects of differential fertility, even if clothed in the language of equal opportunity and social welfare. As the transcripts of the Ad Hoc meeting in May 1957 reveal, qualitative concerns were paramount. Notestein wished for an improvement "in the distribution of births," as did Lorimer, who referred to Ferguson's claim that the PPFA program was "directed at the wrong people," the rational, and indeed desirable, upper and middle classes. Richard Meier, on the other hand, referred to the positive effects of increased assortative mating on the genetic quality of the population. Osborn claimed that while geneticists had not yet "proof of parent-child relationships in mental and emotional qualities . . . psychologists, taking into account both genetic and environmental influences, have firmly established that children tend to be like their parents." What we can see, therefore, is a continuation of the amalgamation between social and genetic factors reminiscent of the traditional mainline position of eugenics, which saw social behavior as a reflection of inherent ability or 'character'. Osborn still retained the argument that it was probable that social qualities were linked to hereditary potential. Social worth continued to be linked to genetic worth.

The eugenic task was to "create social and psychological pressures" to make those "parents most able to contribute to society" have the most children and reduce the fertility of those men and women known as carriers of serious defects or incapable of raising children. Reform eugenicists argued that even if knowledge was lacking, it was of little consequence, since the eugenic interests were no longer in conflict with present social needs. As Osborn claimed in 1953, a eugenic policy was "acceptable because it would in any event increase the proportion of children brought up in home environments most favorable for development, an objective which everyone agrees is desirable."

Osborn was supportive of the Population Council's sponsorship of studies in motivation, considered by demographers to be the prerequisite to the effective implementation of family planning. A considerable amount of funds came from the Rockefeller Foundation to the Population Council, beginning with a grant for \$50,000 in 1960 to develop training and, in 1963, post-graduate training in a cooperative project in demography with the John Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health. The aim of this program was to examine the potentials of motivation and persuasion in promoting family planning, since traditional, rational and individual approaches had achieved only limited success in developing nations.

The Population Council also funded the University of Chicago in 1962-63 for a research program in "Problems of Bearing and Rearing Children in High-Fertility, Low-Income, Low-Education American Families." This program attempted to uncover general patterns of resistance to birth control that existed in the developed and developing nations and drew parallels between "the crude birth rate of Chicago's Negro population," the rural South, India, and Puerto Rico. "This would be the first grant by the Population Council to evaluate an action program in the United States," and involved the establishment of a mobile communications center and clinic, the employment of medical personnel and social workers, interviewers, technical staff, the preparation of family planning communications materials, machine tabulation costs, and so on. In 1963 this program was enlarged, through Population Council support, with the establishment of the Family

Planning Communication-Motivation Workshop as part of the demographer Donald Bogue's plan to develop "Training and Research Program for Fertility Control Through Action Programs." Speaking to the American Public Health Association in 1964, Bogue and Palmore explained that they were testing hypotheses for hastening the adoption of birth control practices and using mass communication and group motivation "campaigns" among groups with low education and low income. They explicitly stated that they were "using the slums of Chicago as a 'laboratory,'" hoping to develop "principles and theories which could be 'exported' overseas."

The Population Council had confined itself to the populations that were "ready" for birth control, thus avoiding controversy. Yet its support of Bogue reflects a certain transition in the field of fertility research and planning from "family planning" towards a more pessimistic "population control." The Council remained cautious; with regards to the "crash" program in research and training, Kirk removed all references to the Population Council. When Bogue spoke of the dangers of the "population explosion" and "population bomb," to the satisfaction of Kirk, he did so as a "concerned citizen, where hyperbole is so frequently necessary to make a point," not as a scientist, for whom such references would have been unacceptable. The Population Council also funded the Population Reference Bureau's *Population Bulletin*, which was under the direction of the leading eugenicist, Robert Cook, with Osborn and Kirk reviewing its articles to make them more "scientific" and less "propagandist." They were not interested in reducing its eugenic content, but rather its anti-communist "rhetoric" and references to the "population explosion."

This caution is reflected in the development of post-partum programs of fertility control. As Notestein wrote to John D. Rockefeller 3rd in September 1965: "We have given a good deal of thought to the ways in which one could attack the problem of reproduction in indigent and poorly-educated populations without getting into the hornet's nest of ethnic and color discrimination. This project will go to that problem -- we think dramatically." The program again targeted hospitals that serviced the impoverished areas of Harlem, East Harlem, the lower Bronx, and in 1967 was expanded to include the Los Angeles County Hospital and the Wayne County General Hospital near Detroit.

One must be careful not to delineate the Chicago Fertility Control Experiments and the post-partum programs as driven by eugenic or racist interests. I believe that they reflected more interrelated concerns regarding the progress of demography as a science and quantitative population problems. Johnson and Hauser at Chicago, writing to Notestein, believed that the Chicago project would draw sociologists "directly into a consideration of population problems which promise the emergence at Chicago of a new and more fundamental approach to the study of runaway growth." Bogue himself was determined to establish the field of family planning research as a relatively independent yet essential discipline of population studies and saw this new research in communication and motivation as directly challenging "an implicit acceptance of the view that the world's plight of rising population pressure is primarily a matter of biology -- of the human animal expressing its sex drive. This, knowingly or unknowingly, is a vestige of biological determinism." Rather, "Now that the technological means of birth control have

become available, the problem of *continuing* high fertility becomes even more preponderantly a research problem for sociology and social psychology. The persistence of high human fertility when it is dysfunctional for assuring even creature needs involves cultural processes and mass conditioning." Bogue believed that his turn to sociology and social psychology, through the study of motives, attitudes and value systems of individual couples was helping demolish the "ideological wall between demography and the rest of social science."

Yet, the parallels and collusions in interest behind Bogue and members of the Population Council targeting of the 'contraceptively incompetent' and the eugenicists delineation of the 'social problem group' categories -- both of which were defined in terms of race, poverty, and social desirability -- is deserving of our attention. Bogue, like Osborn, was a dedicated social engineer, and the similarity between his description of family planning as "preventative welfare" and the eugenicists' representation of eugenics as "preventative medicine" is significant. Bogue saw large families among certain groups as "a major barrier to progress." For Bogue, as with the eugenicists, it was a matter of tackling the problem at its core: "Removing of the cause of the problem is preferable to an unending program of rehabilitating thousands of adults after they have arrived, unwanted, in urban centers. A program of family planning could help shrink this flow of incompetents by permitting the region to concentrate its resources upon the better training of smaller cohorts of children. Such a program can help make it possible for the region to turn out, someday soon, many more competent workers and citizens."

For Bogue, these "incompetents" were predominately the underprivileged "Negro and Puerto Rican" and other low-income residents on "public welfare" in the rural South, the Chicago slums, and low-income housing developments. He celebrated the development of "wonder drugs" that would "cure" the "really 'sick' patients," such as the birth control pill. He exclaimed ecstatically to Notestein in July 1961 that the "all-Negro, low-income group is taking oral contraception like wildfire." Similarly, the Population Council post-partum program was justified, as in earlier eugenic literature, in terms of a community cost-saving exercise through the reduction of the fertility of socially and "medially indigent population" who reproduced at tax payers' expense.

The Population Council retained a strong interest in the consequences of differential fertility. It was argued that a qualitative population policy is essential to the defense of democracy and to welfare. As the future director of the Demographic Division and acting president of the Population Council, W. Parker Maudlin, stated in a meeting in 1957, "socio-economic differentials apparently have narrowed appreciably since 1940, but the latest statistical evidence that I have seen indicates that the differentials still are large. Should we attempt to reverse them? . . . Relatively high fertility by families with meager resources must be recognized as one of the most potent forces in the perpetuation of slums, poor health conditions, juvenile delinquency, and inadequate education. Thus, there are *a priori* grounds for concern over the relatively large number of children borne by the lower socio-economic groups, including the socially handicapped." The fact that the consequences of differential fertility were not so much framed with reference to eugenic but to social effects was more irrelevant to those such as Osborn than one would

suppose. It was consistent with his new "eugenic hypothesis." The policy, perhaps referred to more cynically by Blacker as "crypto-eugenics," aimed to instigate policies of racial betterment through organizations, propaganda and policy formulations that were not specifically eugenic, but were considered compatible with, and complementary to, the eugenic project. As Osborn later wrote in 1968: "Eugenic goals are most likely to be attained under another name than eugenics." An analysis of the Population Council adds further weight to the often close connections that continued to exist after World War II between eugenicists, demographers and family planners that I have found to exist elsewhere in organizations such as the Population Association of America, the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, and the International Planned Parenthood Federation. The Population Council Archives also contain extremely useful material relating to these organizations and to the development of demography and eugenics in general, although this report has been limited to the case of the Population Council.

### ***References***

Blacker, C.P. (1952) *Eugenics: Galton and After*. (Duckworth: London).

Greenhalgh, S. (1996) "The Social Construction of Population Science: An Intellectual, Institutional, and Political History of Twentieth-Century Demography." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 38 (1): 26-66.

Lorimer, F., and Osborn, F. (1934) *Dynamics of Population: Social and Biological Significance of Changing Birth Rates in the United States*. (The Macmillan Company: New York).

Osborn, F. (1968) *The Future of Human Heredity: An Introduction to Eugenics in Modern Society* (Weybright and Talley: New York).

Osborn, F., (1960) *This Crowded World* (Public Affairs Pamphlet, No. 306), (Public Affairs Committee: New York).

Osborn, F., (1958) *Population: An International Dilemma--A summary of the proceedings of the conference committee on population problems, 1956-1957* (The Population Council: New York).

Population Council, (1978) *A Chronicle of the First Twenty-five Years, 1952-1977* (Praeger: New York).