

Eugenics: History, Ideology, And Ethical Implications

Dr. Pragya Khanna

Principal, Girdhari Lal Dogra Memorial Govt. Degree College, Hiranagar-184142 (Dist. Kathua), J&K, India.

Abstract

The concept of Eugenics is derived from a social philosophical notion supporting the improvement of human genetic traits through selective breeding that has had a debatable history since its inception in the late 19th century. This paper surveys the origins, ideas, beliefs, global ideological expansion, and consequences of eugenic thought. Through a historical and ethical lens, it inspects how eugenics became intertwined with scientific racism, leading to harmful policies, particularly in Nazi Germany, but also influencing practices in countries like the United States, Britain, and Canada. The paper also discusses the modern genetic research and its potential for reviving eugenic ideologies in modern contemporary society.

Date of Submission: 06-10-2024

Date of Acceptance: 16-10-2024

I. Introduction

The word ‘Eugenics’ is derived from the Greek words ‘eu’ meaning ‘good’ and ‘genes’ meaning ‘born’, referring to the science of improving human populations by controlled breeding to increase the incidence of desirable heritable traits. The concept of Eugenics was proposed by Francis Galton in the late 19th century, later, eugenics grew from a scientific theory to a global movement that has had a great and significant impact on public policy in various countries (Bashford & Levine, 2010). It has left an inextinguishable mark on the course of human history, mainly through its role in supporting racial superiority theories, sterilization programs, and genocidal movements (Kevles, 1985). This paper encompasses a study and analysis of the history of eugenics, tracing its intellectual roots, development, and its continuous ethical debates over several decades.

II. History And Origin Of Eugenics

Francis Galton and the Early Foundations (Aliya, 2021).

The term and concept of Eugenics was founded by Francis Galton, a cousin of Charles Darwin, in the 1860s. Being influenced by Darwin’s theory of natural selection, Galton believed and laid the idea that human beings, like animals, could be selectively bred to improve future generations. According to him the intellect and other such desirable traits were hereditary, and therefore, they could be improved through controlled reproduction (Nicholas, 2001). Francis Galton proposed two primary divisions of eugenics, viz., ‘positive eugenics’, that promoted the reproduction of individuals deemed genetically ‘superior’, and ‘negative eugenics’, which sought to limit the reproduction among individuals considered genetically ‘inferior’ (Galton, Francis. 1876).

Expansion of Eugenic Thought

In the beginning of 20th century, eugenics became increasingly predominant, particularly in Europe and North America (David & Phelan, 2022). Eugenic doctrine was given propulsion by eminent scientists, social reformers, and politicians emphasizing that societal problems such as poverty, crime, and mental illness could be addressed by preventing the ‘unfit’ of the population from reproducing. Institutions like the Eugenics Record Office in the United States and the Eugenics Education Society in Britain were set-up to support these ideas (Susan McKinnon, 2021).

The movement gained a boost by exploiting fears concerning issues like urbanization, immigration, and the perceived degeneration of national populations. It was heavily supported by both conservative and progressive thinkers, who believed that scientific advancements could be utilized to create a more efficient and morally superior society (Benjamin, 2022). This era also saw the rise of pseudoscientific methods for measuring ‘fitness’, such as IQ tests and skull measurements, which were used to justify the exclusion and oppression of certain groups (Chris Renwick, 2011).

III. Eugenics And Public Policy

Eugenic Sterilization and Marriage Laws

One of the most damaging effects of eugenic thought was the execution of sterilization laws in many countries. The United States, in particular, led the way with the passage of sterilization laws in over 30 states,

starting with Indiana in 1907 (Stern, 2005). These laws were rationalized on the grounds of improving public health by preventing people with mental disabilities, hereditary diseases, or criminal tendencies from passing on their genes. The infamous 1927 U.S. Supreme Court case *Buck v. Bell* upheld the constitutionality of sterilization for the 'unfit', with Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes declaring, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough". (*Buck v. Bell*, 274 U.S. 200, 47 S. Ct. 584. 1927).

Countries such as Germany, Canada, and Sweden also supported sterilization policies, some of which were predominant towards the mid-20th century (Daniel J Kevles, 1999). In addition to sterilization, eugenicists promoted marriage restrictions that prevented certain individuals from reproducing, particularly interracial couples and those deemed mentally ill or disabled (Garland-Thomson, 2012).

Nazi Germany and the Holocaust

Eugenics reached its most outrageous expression in Nazi Germany. The Nazis adopted a revolution clarification of eugenic principles, which they combined with virulent anti-Semitism and Aryan supremacy doctrine (Weindling P. 1989). The Nazi regime implemented the Nuremberg Laws, which prohibited marriage and sexual relations between Jews and non-Jews, and enacted a comprehensive sterilization program that targeted disabled individuals, as well as those considered racially inferior (Kevles, 2002).

The eugenic support of Nazi policies terminated in the Holocaust, in which over six million Jews, along with Roma, disabled individuals, and others, were methodically exterminated (Emily Wittmann, 2004).

The hold of eugenics is widely considered as the most intense and destructive of these principles during the Nazi Regime, emphasizing the precarious attempts to engineer human populations through selective breeding (Kelves, 1999).

Eugenics in the Post-World War II Era (Garver & Garver, 1991)

After the viciousness committed during World War II, eugenics fell into ignominy. The divulgence of the Nazi death camps, combined with an increasing understanding of human genetics, led to widespread denunciation of eugenic practices. However, elements of eugenic thought prevailed in some parts of the world. Sterilization programs continued in countries such as Sweden and the United States until the 1970s, often targeting poor women, ethnic minorities, and individuals with disabilities (Broberg & Roll-Hansen, 1996).

IV. Modern Eugenics And Genetic Engineering

With the unfolding of modern genetic research, including the Human Genome Project and the development of technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9, concerns about a revival of eugenics have re-surfaced (Charpentier, 2014). While these technologies hold huge potential for curing genetic diseases and improving human health, they also raise ethical concerns about the possibility of designing "perfect" humans or creating a genetic disadvantaged class (Duardo-Sanchez, 2017).

A. Ethical debate in Contemporary Genetics (Braverman, 2018)

The ethical concerns encompassing modern genetic interventions centres on the issue of consent, potential misuse, and the danger of worsening of the existing social inequalities (Katz, 1994; Faden & Beauchamp, 1986). While positive interventions such as the prevention of hereditary diseases are largely accepted, there is concern that genetic engineering could reinvigorate old eugenic principles, leading to the enhancement of certain traits (such as intelligence or physical appearance) in a way that could reinforce social hierarchies and discrimination (Derek So, 2021).

Moreover, the commercialization of genetic technologies raises concerns about access and equity. Wealthy individuals may be able to afford genetic enhancements for their children, while poorer families are left behind. This could lead to a new form of social stratification based on genetic 'fitness' (Mayo & Nanjundiah, 2024; Clark, 2023).

V. Conclusion

Eugenics represents one of the darkest chapters in modern history, reflecting on the wrong exploitation of science that lead to widespread human suffering. From its origins in the late 19th century to its gruesome termination in the Holocaust, eugenics has left a lasting impact on the world.

While modern genetics holds great promise for improving human health, it also carries the risk of revival of eugenic ideologies in new forms. As scientific advancements continue to evolve, it is vital that society remains vigilant in addressing the ethical and social implications of these technologies to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past (Aultman, 2006).

References

- [1] Aliya R. Hoff. 2021. The Galton Society For The Study Of The Origin And Evolution Of Man (1918–1935). Embryo Project Encyclopedia. <https://Embryo.Asu.Edu>.
- [2] Bashford, A., And P. Levine, Eds. 2010. The Oxford Handbook In The History Of Eugenics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [3] Benjamin K. Sovacool. 2022. Beyond Science And Policy: Typologizing And Harnessing Social Movements For Transformational Social Change, Energy Research & Social Science, Volume 94.
- [4] Braverman G, Shapiro Ze, Bernstein Ja. 2018. Ethical Issues In Contemporary Clinical Genetics. Mayo Clin. Proc. Innov. Qual. Outcomes, 8;2(2):81-90. Doi: 10.1016/J.Mayocpiqo.2018.03.005. Pmid: 30225437; Pmcid: Pmc6124343.
- [5] Broberg G, Roll-Hansen N, Editors. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press; 1996. Eugenics And The Welfare State: Sterilization Policy In Denmark, Sweden, Norway, And Finland.
- [6] Buck V. Bell. 1927. 274 U.S. 200, 47 S. Ct. 584.
- [7] Chris Renwick. 2011. From Political Economy To Sociology: Francis Galton And The Social-Scientific Origins Of Eugenics. The British Journal For The History Of Science, 44(3) , Pp. 343 – 369.
- [8] Clark G. 2023 The Inheritance Of Social Status: England, 1600 To 2022. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. Usa 120, E2300926120.
- [9] Daniel J Kevles. 1999. Eugenics And Human Rights. Bmj, 319 (7207): 435–438.
- [10] David Mcconnell, Shanon Phelan. 2022. The Devolution Of Eugenic Practices: Sexual And Reproductive Health And Oppression Of People With Intellectual Disability. In: Social Science & Medicine.
- [11] Derek So. 2021. From Goodness To Good Looks: Changing Images Of Human Germline Genetic Modification. Bioethics, Special Issue: Iab 15th World Congress.
- [12] Doudna, J.A. 2014. Charpentier E The New Frontier Of Genome Engineering With Crispr-Cas9. Science. 346:1258096–1258096.
- [13] Duardo-Sanchez. 2017. A Crispr-Cas In Medicinal Chemistry: Applications And Regulatory Concerns. Current Topics In Medicinal Chemistry, 17:3308.
- [14] Emily Wittmann. 2004. To What Extent Were Ideas And Beliefs About Eugenics Held In Nazi Germany Shared In Britain And The United States Prior To The Second World War? Ideas And Beliefs About Eugenics Held In Nazi Germany. Vesalius, X, 1, 16-19.
- [15] Faden R.R. And Beauchamp T.L. 1986. Oxford University Press; New York, Ny: A History And Theory Of Informed Consent.
- [16] Galton, Francis. 1876. A Theory Of Heredity. Journal Of The Anthropological Institute. 10.2307/2840896. Vol. 5, Pp. 329-348.
- [17] Garland-Thomson, R. 2012. "Eugenics In America: A History Of Injustice And Continued Implications." American Journal Of Public Health, 102(11), 2026–2031.
- [18] Gillham, Nicholas. 2001. Sir Francis Galton And The Birth Of Eugenics. Annual Review Of Genetics. 35. 83-101. 10.1146/Annurev.Genet.35.102401.090055.
- [19] Julie M. Aultman. 2006. Eugenomics: Eugenics And Ethics In The 21ST Century. Genomics, Society And Policy, 2(2), Pp.28-49.
- [20] Katz J. 1994. Informed Consent—Must It Remain A Fairy Tale. J Contemp Health Law Policy, 10(1):69–91.
- [21] Kenneth L., Garver, T And Bettylee Garver. 1991. Feature Article/ Historical Perspectives Eugenics: Past, Present, And The Future. Am J. Hum. Genet. 49:1109-1118.
- [22] Kevles Dj. 2002. In The Name Of Eugenics - Genetics And The Uses Of Human Heredity, Harvard University Press, Usa.
- [23] Kevles, D. J. 1985. In The Name Of Eugenics: Genetics And The Uses Of Human Heredity. Harvard University Press.
- [24] Macnicol J. 1992. The Voluntary Sterilisation Campaign In Britain, 1918-39' Journal Of The History Of Sexuality, 2, 422-37, P. 428 As Referred To In King D And Hansen R 'Experts At Work: State Autonomy, Social Learning And Eugenic Sterilisation In 1930s Britain', British Journal Of Political Science 29, 77-107.
- [25] Oliver Mayo And Vidyanand Nanjundiah. 2024. Reflections On Assortative Mating, Social Stratification, And Genetics. Journal Of Genetics, 103:15.
- [26] Paul, D. B. 1995. Controlling Human Heredity: 1865 To The Present. Humanities Press.
- [27] Stern, A. M. 2005. Eugenic Nation: Faults And Frontiers Of Better Breeding In Modern America. University Of California Press.
- [28] Susan Mckinnon. 2021. The American Eugenics Record Office, Technologies For Terminating 'Degenerate' Family Lines And Purifying The Nation. The International Journal Of Anthropology, 65(4).
- [29] Weindling P. 1989. Health Race And German Politics Between National Unification And Nazism, 1870-1945, Cambridge University Press P. 125.
- [30] Weindling, P. 1989. Health, Race And German Politics Between National Unification And Nazism, 1870-1945. Cambridge University Press.