

# Applying Selected SRV Themes to the Eugenic Movement in Canada & the United States, 1890-1972

Thomas Malcomson

## Introduction

**T**HIS ARTICLE EXAMINES THE eugenics movement in Canada and the United States, from its first appearance to the 1970s, as it relates to several of the ten themes in Social Role Valorization (SRV) theory.<sup>1</sup> The present article can only provide a brief history of the eugenics movement in each country.<sup>2</sup> First, however, is an even briefer overview of the context in which eugenics theory and practice made its appearance.

The turn of the twentieth century found Canada and the United States immersed in a period of great change and perceived turmoil.<sup>3</sup> The populations of both countries were growing primarily as a result of immigration. Rather than from Great Britain and Northern European countries, as in the past, both Canada and the United States drew immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe and Asia. Viewed as significantly negatively different, concerns over the immigrants' potential corruption of North American society occupied the pens of the press and others. At the same time the urban centers, fuelled by great industrial development, were growing at an alarming rate. Unbridled urban expansion and overcrowding brought with it an increase in crime and outbreaks of contagious disease. No clearer is the overcrowding demonstrated than in the work of Jacob A. Riis, who reported on and photographed the horrid living conditions of New York City's working class poor.<sup>4</sup> Various reformers presented solutions

for the identified social problems, from the incidence of prostitution and drunkenness to the apparent increase in people labelled 'feeble-minded.' Into this milieu came the idea of eugenics.

## The Origin of Eugenics

**F**RANCIS GALTON COINED THE TERM eugenics in 1883, from the Greek words "eu" meaning well and "genos" meaning birth. Deeply moved by *The Origin of Species*, written by his cousin Charles Darwin, Galton set out to apply the principle of evolution to humans, quickly identifying superior from inferior races within the species.<sup>5</sup> The differences Galton noted ran largely along class lines, with the middle and some members of the upper class being hereditarily superior to members of the lower class and those of the upper class who demonstrated characteristics deemed to be degenerate. This division favoured Galton and his supporters with the privileged position of superiority over the 'other.' Eugenics reflected the middle class values of late Victorian Britain, which labelled the socially devalued characteristics as 'degenerate.' The list of degenerate characteristics included many possibilities, from intellectual, mental or physical disability or instability, to poverty, alcoholism, and/or any sexual behaviour deemed aberrant. Eugenicists believed that degenerate conditions were inherited and would be passed on to future generations by afflicted parents.

Galton developed several definitions for eugenics over the years. He first defined it as the science of improving the human stock, with the focus on providing the “most suitable races and strains of blood” with every advantage to prevail over the “less suitable.”<sup>6</sup> In his collection of essays on eugenics he defined it as “the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also with those that develop them to the utmost advantage.”<sup>7</sup> To obtain this end Galton encouraged the use of “positive eugenics” which involved promoting an increased birth rate among those people with superior stock or blood. The alternative action was “negative eugenics,” which called for preventing procreation among the people deemed to be of inferior stock or blood by various methods including institutionalization and sterilization. The impact of negative eugenics on the labelled human is all too clear: devaluation and subsequent multiple wounding of the person through the experience of institutional life and/or the experience and stigma of sterilization.

Few British academics and professionals paid attention to Galton’s ideas until 1900, when the famous statistician Karl Pearson made it his life’s work to spread the eugenic gospel.<sup>8</sup> Pearson brought Galton out of a self-imposed retirement to deliver public lectures on eugenics. In one lecture, given to the British Sociological Society in 1904, Galton laid out the steps necessary to realize the goals of eugenics. Beyond continued research into the hereditary transmission of traits, the exploration of the “conditions” of eugenics, and the study of marriage, he encouraged an active program to inform the public of eugenic ideas. Concerning the public education in eugenics effort, Galton said,

*Firstly it must be made familiar as an academic question, until its exact importance has been understood and accepted as fact; Secondly it must be recognised as a subject whose practical development deserves serious consideration; and Thirdly it must be*

*introduced into the national conscience, like a new religion.*<sup>9</sup>

### An Overview of the Eugenic Movements in Canada & the United States

SIMILAR PROGRAMS OF PROPAGANDA, to indoctrinate the professional and lay person to the necessity of eugenics, played a central role in the growth of the eugenics movements in Canada and the United States. The idea of eugenics came to North America in the late 1880s as a number of academics and physicians, influenced by Galton and other European writers on eugenics, began to apply the concept to the citizens of their own countries.<sup>10</sup> The North American eugenicists used lectures, articles in both academic and the popular press, books, films and contests to advance their ideas of increasing the numbers of superior people, and removing and eliminating those judged inferior. The creation of national and provincial or state eugenic societies ensured a nation wide channel for conveying eugenic ideas.<sup>11</sup> The eugenic societies provided a base from which members could lobby government officials to enact eugenic laws. As in Britain, the eugenic ideals of Canadian and American eugenicists were built on middle class values.

Wolfensberger has stated that as a theory Social Role Valorization (SRV) is open to creating either positive or negative outcomes for people. A negative application of the ten central themes in SRV would create groups of devalued and vulnerable people.<sup>12</sup> With this in mind, seven of the SRV themes can help us understand how the various methods employed by the Canadian and American eugenic movements, to advance their ideas, promoted the acceptance and practice of eugenics. The seven themes are the role of unconsciousness, the dynamics and relevance of social imagery, the power of mind sets and expectancies, role expectancy and role circularity, personal competency enhancement and the developmental model, interpersonal identification between valued and devalued people, and personal social integration and

valued social participation.<sup>13</sup>

Eugenicists produced a mountain of papers, articles and books extolling the scientific grounds of eugenics, the necessity to engage in it, and the types of humans most in need of the restrictions, segregation and administrations which eugenics entailed.<sup>14</sup> Dr. John H. Kellogg, in an 1897 pamphlet, assured his readers that the human race was “certainly going down physically toward race extinction.”<sup>15</sup> The culprits he claimed were not only the physically disabled, blind and deaf but the criminal, indigent and pauper. All owed their “deformities” to hereditary factors, and were each unable to change their assigned lot in life. His solution was for individuals to eat properly, and develop good personal hygiene habits and morals. Kellogg promoted positive eugenics by encouraging society to focus on the strengthening of the healthy individual, instead of attempting to help the defective person. Dr. H. C. Sharp, of the Indiana Reformatory, published an eleven page pamphlet advancing the case for the sterilization of all degenerates.<sup>16</sup> Sharp stated that more than half of all the people with any form of mental or nervous defect were so because of hereditary problems. He suggested sterilization as the most effective way to protect society from the growing numbers of people unable to care for themselves and who posed a threat to the safety of society. Marriage restrictions would be a second alternative, but Sharp lamented that marriage was not a naturally mandatory condition for procreation. Incarceration, to segregate the male and female defectives, offered a solution but would fail due to the high costs and frequent escapes. He then discussed the ease of performing vasectomies (without “anesthetic either general or local”) on the inmates of the reformatory in which he worked. Eleanor Wembridge in 1927 wrote a fantasy article for *The American Mercury* in which ‘Morons’ and ‘the Neurotics’, who hailed from ‘Moronia’ and ‘Neurotica’ (respectively), accounted for all the crime, immorality, and disability in the ‘Normal’s’ world.<sup>17</sup> Historian Deborah Dolan states that in the early twentieth century the eugenic movement

and other progressive era reformers had created a pro-involuntary sterilization movement across the United States.<sup>18</sup> Central to this movement was the concern over the social costs to society of supporting the people declared ‘defective.’

The two leading national figures in the American eugenic movement were Charles Davenport and Harry Laughlin. Davenport headed the Station for Experimental Evolution at the Biological Research Station at Cold Spring Harbor (1904-1939) and worked tirelessly at promoting the eugenic idea throughout the United States.<sup>19</sup> Davenport raised funds, trained eugenic field research workers and conducted research.<sup>20</sup> Harry Laughlin, a former school principal, joined Davenport at the Cold Spring facility in 1910. Together they opened the Eugenic Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor in 1929 to coordinate eugenic research and the dissemination of eugenic information. Their mission reflected the same goals as Galton’s call for informing the professional and the public of the truth of eugenics. Laughlin focused on sterilization and immigration legislation. Serving as advisor to the 1923 House Committee on Immigration that wrote the Immigration Act of 1924, his eugenic ideas forged one of the most restrictive pieces of immigration legislation in the history of the United States.<sup>21</sup> Laughlin’s venture into sterilization law is discussed below.

The family pedigree studies formed the central evidence for the American eugenics movement. In these studies a researcher(s) traced the ancestors of a particular group of people back several generations. In each generation they identified the health or illnesses of the various family members. The studies were used to show that defective characteristics (e.g., feeble-mindedness, alcoholism, immorality) were hereditary diseases. Providing social or financial support for these individuals and their families would only lead to an increase in the numbers of ‘defectives.’ The obvious answer to the problem of defectiveness was to prevent the procreation of these people. Nicole Hahn Rafter has brought together eleven family

studies in her book *White Trash*, providing some annotation and excellent analysis of the various reports.<sup>22</sup> Common across the studies was the use of extremely negative language to describe members of the defective families. Language conveys valued and devalued roles to the audience.<sup>23</sup> The titles given to the studies alone clearly indicate the final conclusion; for example, “The Smokey Pilgrims,” “The Hill Folk,” and “Dwellers in the Vale of Siddem.”<sup>24</sup> None of these titles leave a positive image of the families they explore. Many family pedigree studies carried photographs supporting the negative labelling of particular study subjects as defective. Classic among these photographs was a picture of the ‘family’ home. The home of the alleged ‘degenerate’ was always a run down shack, while the good family had a neat, well maintained, whitewashed home.<sup>25</sup> Along with words, pictures can shape positive or negative ideas and expectations in the minds of the audience. The photographs of the Family Studies portrayed the targeted individuals in a negative light. The obvious biases and methodological flaws in the studies seemed to escape most contemporary readers.<sup>26</sup>

In Canada, Dr. Helen MacMurchy was one of the main promoters of eugenic ideas and methods to deal with the pressing social problems of poverty, intemperance, crime, immorality, feeble-mindedness and insanity.<sup>27</sup> Her book, *The Almosts: A study of the feeble-minded*, demonstrated to the reader, through the review of the fictional lives of various characters in works by authors such as Shakespeare, Hawthorne, and Dickens, the hopelessness and threat to society of people judged to be not normal.<sup>28</sup> In the final chapter, she advocated for the segregation and isolation of all feeble-minded people. Institutionalization, with the separation of the males from females, would provide the safety both the feeble-minded and society required. It would also ensure the prevention of further generations of undesirable people by prohibiting their procreation. MacMurchy took her message from coast to coast in Canada attempting to influence provincial legislators to create laws to

support her views.

Psychiatrist Charles K. Clarke also wrote and spoke on the need to prevent the people he labelled ‘defective’ from reproducing. These individuals included many of the new immigrants from Eastern Europe who, he claimed, figured prominently among the growing numbers of the epileptic, the feeble-minded, the criminal and the insane.<sup>29</sup> Immigrants received a good deal of attention from Canadian eugenicists. Social Gospeller James S. Woodsworth proclaimed that the immigrant represented a threat to every part of Canadian society due to the immigrants’ inherent defectiveness.<sup>30</sup> Historians Jean-Pierre Beaud and Jean-Guy Prevost found a clear association between the eugenic movement’s concern over the degenerative influence of the immigrant on Canadian society and efforts to limit immigration by government bureaucrats.<sup>31</sup> In British Columbia the province took matters into their own hands, deporting immigrants judged to be defective.<sup>32</sup> The deportations are an extreme example of physical distantiating.<sup>33</sup> In some of these cases, the deported devalued person had no one to assist them on their return to their country of origin. The ‘casting out’ by deportation in these circumstances meant sending the person into severe deprivation, if not to their death.

But it was not only the Canadian physician or government official that advanced the idea of eugenics. A. R. Kaufman, who owned and operated the Kaufman Rubber Company in Kitchener, Ontario, also supported eugenics.<sup>34</sup> He belonged to the ‘Eugenics Society of Canada’ and was a key person in the local birth control movement. He found that many of his workers, when laid off, fell into poverty. Kaufman saw this as an indication of a hereditary weakness, so he instructed his factory nurses to discuss birth control with his employees. During the 1930s Kaufman offered sterilization to his workers whom he regarded as inherently inferior in intellect or character. As this was the depression and work was scarce, the pressure he held as an employer was significant. Between 1930 and



1969 he claimed 1,000 male sterilizations had occurred in his factory.<sup>35</sup>

The broader eugenic appeals to the public were less academic in their content. Eugenic posters and diagrams at county fairs and public health displays portrayed the ideal marriage mate as strong, tall, healthy, and above all someone with whom you had “compatibility.” The poster might warn men “not [to] get married unless you are MAN enough.”<sup>36</sup> The ideal male and female were portrayed with stereotypical muscularity for the man and buxom beauty for the female. The less than ideal male and female figures in the posters were small, not well defined and given dialogue indicating a lack of self confidence as they gazed at the perfect human forms. The message in such images was plain for all to understand. The Fitter Family contests held across North America in the first half of the twentieth century allowed the eugenicists to promote proper family breeding among the general public. Families would compete for the title by performing physical feats of strength, providing a record of good health and presenting a flawless appearance. For Dr. John Kellogg the competitions were an important way to get the average citizen aware of and working toward improving their family stock. Those who came to watch might have felt moved to copy or imitate the eugenically good families.

Films also advanced the eugenic message. One such film was *The Black Stork* made by Dr. Harry Haiselden and journalist and writer Jack Lait. In late 1915, Chicago doctor Harry Haiselden encouraged Allen and Anna Bollinger, parents of a baby born with severe physical anomalies, to let the baby die.<sup>37</sup> While some of the anomalies could have been corrected with surgery and allowed the baby to live, Haiselden’s view that defective infants were better dead directed his advice to the parents. Haiselden announced publicly that he had allowed other ‘defective’ infants to die in the previous ten years and continued his withholding of care from various ‘defective’ infants through 1918.<sup>38</sup> The case garnered national news media attention as ques-

tions arose over the doctor’s actions. No legal action was taken against the doctor as it was considered the parent’s right to deny treatment for their child. The only medical organization to respond negatively to Haiselden’s stance was the Chicago Medical Society which removed him from the society for his being too public about the case, not for his withholding of treatment.

Dr. Haiselden made *The Black Stork* for theatrical release to convey his eugenic message to the public. In the movie a doctor, played by Haiselden, instructs a woman who marries a man from a family with a hereditary defect not to allow a newborn defective child to survive. Haiselden shows the woman and the movie viewers a number of people with disabilities, each highlighting a negative aspect of living with a disability. The woman then has a series of visions of the child’s future, again all very negative. She elects not to save the baby. As the baby dies, Jesus appears and carries away the child’s soul.

The film shows the other side of the hereditary debate as well. A woman refuses to marry her perfectly healthy fiancé because their children will inherit her mother’s epilepsy. In the end, they learn that the ‘mother’ is actually only a step-mother. The woman marries and produces a very healthy child. The imagery in the film clearly sends the message that defective children were an emotional burden, an unjust social expense, led a painful life, contributed nothing to society and should be killed. The film in several different edited forms played in theatres between 1916 and 1942. Haiselden’s pronouncements of killing babies born with disabilities and his film are examples of casting the devalued person into the roles of ‘defective’ and ‘better off dead.’<sup>39</sup>

The eugenic movement offers a frighteningly vivid example of the power of images (both pictorial and literary) to convince the public and the professional in training of the validity of a particular theory. Eugenicists carefully used imagery to advance their cause. A constant stream of negative images reinforced the acceptance of the deviancy

of the targeted group and the necessity of using eugenic answers to solve the depicted eugenic problem. Images of parents with disabled children complying with the eugenic demands served to reinforce the eugenic movement's authority.

All of these efforts to convince the professionals, politicians and lay people of the correctness of the eugenic movement's view of humans and the treatments they advanced had a profound impact on Canadians and Americans.<sup>40</sup> While there were people and organizations who opposed the eugenic movement, enough people were convinced of its correctness to see social policy and practice swing to support eugenics at various federal, state and provincial levels.<sup>41</sup>

### The Eugenic Solutions

**E**UGENICISTS IN BOTH THE United States and Canada advanced three major solutions to the perceived problem of degeneracy. **First** was the incarceration of people assessed as defective, from the feeble-minded, the epileptic, the insane, and the alcoholic, through to the immoral. Dr. Helen MacMurchy campaigned for more funding to construct large institutions in Canada to eventually house all the feeble-minded.<sup>42</sup> The cost of the institutions would be offset by the reduction of what she termed wasted spending to keep the feeble-minded in the community. Others suggested that many of the institutionalized could work at producing a good or at farming, raising money to offset some of the cost of institutionalizing them.<sup>43</sup> All provinces built more and larger institutions during the first half of the twentieth century to segregate labelled individuals from the larger community. Although not created solely on the grounds of eugenics, these institutions did at least support the eugenic ideas of segregation and the inhibiting of procreation. Some eugenicists rejected the long term feasibility of the institutions because of their ongoing costs. MacMurchy herself suggested that the only sure way to eliminate the threat of the mentally defective was through mandatory sterilization programs.<sup>44</sup>

The **second** line of attack on the 'problem' people was via laws dictating marriage restrictions. Thirty states had passed marriage restriction laws by 1914 to prevent people considered defective from marrying. The 'defective' label was applied differently across the thirty states, with some banning marriages of people diagnosed as insane or as idiots, while others simply voided marriages of those considered physically or mentally incapable of understanding.<sup>45</sup> Lucien Howe, a leading American ophthalmologist and eugenicist, "led the charge to segregate, sterilize and ban marriages of blind people and their relatives" during the 1920s.<sup>46</sup> By the end of the 1930s, the eugenic message on marriage restrictions had spread across America, producing forty-one states with laws prohibiting mentally ill and feeble-minded people from marrying.<sup>47</sup> These laws denied the valued roles of husband, wife, and in-law to people already subject to devaluation through labelling. This increased their devaluation and added further wounding in the person's experience of life. The laws carried various penalties for those who broke the law, ranging from one to three years in prison, fines and even exile from the state. In Canada, the eugenic concern over marriage did not impact on law makers until the eve of the First World War. In 1913, the Ontario government amended the Marriage Act to fine or imprison for a year any minister or license issuer who authorized the marriage of "'an idiot or insane' or ... who was 'under the influence of intoxicating liquor'."<sup>48</sup> Eugenicists however were not convinced that marriage restrictions offered a sure guarantee for halting the procreation of degenerates.

The **third** solution concerned the use of sterilization to guarantee the absolute prevention of reproduction among those judged inferior. The first state to pass a sterilization law was Indiana in 1907. Sterilizations occurred prior to this law, but in 1907 the state felt a law was necessary to facilitate stopping "the procreation of 'confirmed criminals, idiots, imbeciles, and rapists'."<sup>49</sup> By 1920, nineteen states had laws concerning steril-

ization, but many states did not act on their laws as a result of issues over their constitutionality. Harry Laughlin entered the fray, creating a model law that would stand a constitutional challenge. Virginia legislators took Laughlin's model and created a sterilization law in 1923, challenged in the Supreme Court in 1927 (this story appears below). After the Supreme Court's decision, the number of states with sterilization laws rose to thirty. Almost all of the states with pre-1927 laws re-wrote their laws to conform to the new legal standard. By 1975, when the last sterilization law fell in California, the number of Americans subjected to state sanctioned eugenic sterilization had climbed to over 65,000.<sup>50</sup> The numbers of individuals sterilized outside of the state system, through private arrangements with consenting physicians, is unknown.

In Canada, only two provinces (Alberta in 1928, and British Columbia in 1933) passed eugenic sexual sterilization laws.<sup>51</sup> The eugenic movement in Alberta firmly established itself in the years following the First World War. An investigation of the rising numbers of feeble-minded people in Alberta, by the Canadian National Committee on Mental Hygiene, pointed to the increase in Eastern European immigrants as the cause. Committee members believed Eastern Europeans were more likely to be feeble-minded.<sup>52</sup> In 1922, the United Women of Alberta adopted a eugenic position towards 'the growing problem' of the mentally defective. They worked to educate the public and the politicians of Alberta on the need to adapt the eugenic theory and use segregation in institutions or sterilization to prevent the reproduction of mentally deficient individuals.<sup>53</sup> The United Farmers of Alberta, who formed the provincial government, passed a sexual sterilization law in 1928 based on the eugenic understanding of mental disorders and feeble-mindedness. The Sexual Sterilization Act created a commission of four people who reviewed the candidates' files and decided on which people to sterilize.<sup>54</sup> Inmates of institutions were the targeted group. At first the

people selected had to give their approval for sterilization to occur, unless they were considered incompetent, in which case a family member or court appointed guardian could give permission. In 1937, an amendment to the law loosened the necessity of getting the institutionalized person's permission, by allowing the compulsory sterilization of anyone deemed mentally defective.<sup>55</sup> In 1942, the category of candidates was enlarged to include mental patients with syphilis, epilepsy, and Huntington's Chorea (who had to give their permission).<sup>56</sup> During its forty-four years of operation the committee reviewed 4,785 cases. It never said no, but held judgement on forty-six cases and recommended 4,725 people for sterilization. Of those recommended, sterilization was performed on 2,822 people. Peter Lougheed's Conservative government repealed the law in 1972.<sup>57</sup>

British Columbia followed Alberta's example in 1933 when it passed a Sexual Sterilization Act.<sup>58</sup> A commission of three people reviewed the files of those individuals put forward for sterilization by their institution's director. The arguments for the law included the suggestion it would be cheaper to sterilize and release people than keep them institutionalized during their period of fertility. The eugenic positions, that mental disorder and deficiency were hereditary, and the need to keep them from multiplying and thus destroying society, were front and centre. Women's groups, the medical community and input from American eugenicists convinced the government to pass the law. The numbers actually sterilized under the law are unknown as the records have been destroyed.

### The Stories of Carrie Buck & Leilani Muir

THE STORIES OF TWO PEOPLE subjected to the eugenic theory and treatments reveal the impact of the unconsciousness of deviancy making and the creation of the supporting mindset and expectancies.<sup>59</sup> Carrie Buck was born into the family of Emma and Frank Buck in 1906.<sup>60</sup> After her husband left the family, Emma fell into hard times and frequent contact with

the local police. Emma lost custody of Carrie in 1909. Carrie went to live with John Dobbs (one of the deputy-sheriffs familiar with Emma Buck) and his wife. In 1920, Emma was committed to the Virginia Colony for the Epileptic and Feeble-minded for life. The grounds for her committal included prostitution (although not selling sex) and repeated lying. Her intelligence test revealed a mental age of seven years or the label of low grade moron.<sup>61</sup> The Dobbs regarded Carrie as a house maid for the family, kept her distant from the Dobbs' children and even hired her out to clean houses for local neighbours. At age seventeen Carrie became pregnant. The father of the child was a nephew of the Dobbs. As the social mores of the 1920s in Virginia did not approve of single pregnant adolescents in the homes of 'respectable' families, Carrie needed to be gotten rid of. The answer was to have her placed in the colony where her mother lived. The grounds for Carrie's committal included "outbreaks of temper," "peculiar actions" and "hallucinations."<sup>62</sup> At the time of her entry into the colony Carrie's intelligence measure indicated a mental age of a nine year old, a middle grade moron.<sup>63</sup> The Dobbs took in Carrie's daughter, Vivian.

As noted above, in the early 1920s many states with sexual sterilization laws did not enforce them due to a concern over their vulnerability to constitutional challenge. Harry Laughlin, a self-professed expert and strong advocate of sterilization, wrote a model law for legislators to follow when re-writing or creating new sterilization legislation. Laughlin suggested that sterilization laws needed four main elements to withstand constitutional challenges. **First**, they needed to establish a rigidly adhered to procedure that would be applied to all candidates for sterilization. **Second**, once chosen, notification of their selection and the process for an appeal had to be given to the patient in writing. **Third**, an appointed advocate would help with the appeal process as it moved through the courts, creating an adversarial system to protect the person's rights.<sup>64</sup> **Fourth**, the method used to

sterilize the person needed to be the least invasive technique available.

Dr. Albert Priddy, the director of the Virginia Colony for the Epileptic and Feeble-minded where both Carrie and her mother resided, used Laughlin's ideas to help draft a sterilization law for the state of Virginia, along with the colony lawyer Aubrey Strode. The Virginia legislature passed the act in June 1924. What eugenicists required was a test case to contest the law all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States. To do this Priddy needed to select an inmate from the colony who would perfectly represent the eugenicists' notion of the hereditary progression of degeneracy. Priddy selected Carrie Buck for this role when he put her name forward for sterilization in September 1924. A diagnosis of Carrie's seven month old daughter Vivian as mentally defective would prove the hereditary nature of the case.

Carrie's assigned advocate was Robert Sheldon who hired a lawyer Irving Whitehead to defend Carrie through the courts. Whitehead had had prior involvement with the colony's administration and was a supporter of eugenics and sterilization. Aubrey Strode acted as the colony's lawyer throughout the series of appeals. The Circuit Court of Amherst County heard from a social worker who assessed Vivian as having an odd look about her. It also had a deposition from Harry Laughlin attesting to Carrie's untrustworthiness, her inability to support herself independently and her potential inclination towards prostitution. Laughlin's deposition closely resembled portions of the letter Priddy had sent to him describing Carrie. Laughlin never saw Carrie, nor had access to any family information other than what Priddy wrote.<sup>65</sup> In court, Priddy gave a damning description of Carrie and her family, calling her the lowest of low grade morons. Whitehead apparently did not note the discrepancy between Priddy's diagnosis and that in Carrie's colony file. The court upheld the sterilization order.<sup>66</sup> The lower court's decision was appealed to the Supreme Court of Appeals for Virginia, where once again the judge



ruled to uphold the sterilization order. The stage was set for the Supreme Court.

Whitehead argued throughout the appeal process for the reversal of the order based on two arguments.<sup>67</sup> **First**, he offered that the state did not have the right to inflict any harm on a person's body without due process (a Fourteenth Amendment to the US Constitution issue). **Second**, he questioned the state's sterilization of only the feeble-minded people in the colony on two grounds; one, they were already unable to procreate by reason of segregation and two, sterilization did not apply to the feeble-minded in the state not living in an institution. This last condition noted that the law unfairly targeted a select group of citizens, constituting a violation of the Eighth Amendment to the US Constitution. Whitehead did not argue against eugenics or sterilization.

Aubrey Strode, representing Dr. Bell and the colony, argued that the sterilization was correct and the law proper. He offered the evidence again of the inheritance of feeble-mindedness, and that Carrie, her mother and daughter were feeble-minded. As to Whitehead's objections, Strode noted the new law's process to inform and defend the person selected for sterilization, and that sterilization was akin to the "compulsory vaccination" laws. As to the Eighth Amendment issue, Strode noted that any feeble-minded person in the state could be institutionalized and then subject to sterilization.

On 2 May 1927, Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes read the court's decision.<sup>68</sup> The Supreme Court upheld the order to sterilize Carrie Buck, claiming that due process was served, and sterilization was not a cruel or unusual request to make of a citizen. In his statement Holmes said it was not inappropriate for the country to call the weak members to sacrifice what he felt they would not miss, given the unselfish sacrifice of good men in times of war. He concluded with the plea that, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough." It is unfortunate that the Justice did not listen to, or understand better, the labelling system the eugenicists' advanced. Neither Emma or

Carrie were labelled imbeciles. Emma and Carrie were diagnosed as morons, which was indicative of a higher level of functioning than an imbecile. Vivian's 'defective' label hung on her having an odd look, for she was never diagnosed as moron or imbecile. This reveals how people, even Justice Holmes, did not have to understand the eugenic theory and evidence, but only believe the eugenic message was correct in order to act. Holmes' inability to relate personally to Carrie Buck's life is reflective of the natural tendency to reject and distance one's self from that which is perceived as an "unpleasant stimulus."<sup>69</sup> Carrie's sterilization took place at the Colony for the Epileptic and Feeble-minded in Lynchburg Virginia on 19 October 1927. When Vivian died of measles, at eight years of age, her school teachers claimed she was a bright normal student.<sup>70</sup>

The story of Leilani Muir reveals the crushing influence and flawed nature of eugenics in a Canadian pro-sterilization province in the years after the Second World War.<sup>71</sup> Leilani was born in Calgary, Alberta on 15 July 1944. With her mother in poverty, Leilani and her siblings frequently moved.<sup>72</sup> Her mother tried to 'dispose' of Leilani three times before finally convincing the province to confine her in the Provincial Training School for Mental Defectives in Red Deer, Alberta. The early home life involved neglect and abuse, including the refusal to allow Leilani to eat with the family and at times to eat at all. As a result, Leilani stole food from other children's lunches at school. These incidents provided the rationale for her mother's third effort to remove her daughter from the family home. Leilani entered the Provincial Training School in the summer of 1955 on the eve of her eleventh birthday.

Her mother completed the application for admission, forging the required signature of the man with whom she lived. The legally required home visit by a social worker never occurred. The required medical and intellectual assessments of Leilani also did not take place before her entry into the institution. To the question concerning

any hereditary problems in the family the mother wrote “nil.” Leilani’s mother used the ‘prompting words’ on the application form to describe her daughter as “‘indolent,’ ‘bossy and impulsive,’ and ‘bad tempered’.”<sup>73</sup> Finally she forged her partner’s signature for the consent to sterilize Leilani if the Provincial Eugenics Board deemed it appropriate. This last strike against her daughter was a requirement for admission to the institution.

Dr. le Vann, superintendent of the Provincial Training School, recorded only two comments on Leilani’s assessment sheet, “Pleasant looking child. Talks easily and volubly.”<sup>74</sup> Two years later she appeared before the Provincial Eugenics Board for an order to have her sterilized. While her file revealed she was doing fine in school, able to read and do math well, it recorded an intelligence quotient of 64, placing Leilani in the “defective category.”<sup>75</sup> The file predicted that she would require long term strict supervision. The report also noted her Irish-Polish and Catholic background, quick temper, a frequency to be without privileges due to bad behaviour, and an interest in boys.<sup>76</sup> The board ordered the sterilization due to the “[d]anger of the transmission to the progeny of Mental Deficiency or Disability, also incapable of Intelligent parenthood.”<sup>77</sup> Leilani Muir was sterilized on 19 January 1959. She was told that she was having an appendectomy (which they also performed) and not told that she had been sterilized. She left the institution in 1965. Fifteen years later Leilani finally learned why she could not have children. Her adult life was fraught with difficulties, including failed marriages, depression and the deep wounding from the stigma of institutionalization, labelling as a moron, and the loss of her potential to give birth.<sup>78</sup>

The Alberta Eugenics Board passed more people for sterilization prior to 1945, but saw more actual sterilization of the people passed for sterilization in the years from 1946 to 1972. In part, this was the result of limited resources due to the depression and the war, and the need to have the targeted person’s permission. In the post war years, with

consent no longer required from those labelled mental defective, the Board turned to the sterilization of the people living in the Provincial Training Schools, those who could not object.<sup>79</sup> In 1996, Leilani Muir won a lawsuit against the Alberta government and received an award of \$740,780 in damages and \$230,000 for her legal fees.<sup>80</sup>

### Selected SRV Themes the Eugenics Movement

**T**HE EXPERIENCES OF BOTH Carrie Buck and Leilani Muir are symbolic of the impact on devalued individuals of the course steered by the eugenic movement. Segregation, stigma and physical mutilation were the primary outcomes of the eugenicists’ flawed effort to reach their warped sense of utopia. Along this course the eugenicists created a malicious image of people placed in the role of ‘deviant.’ The professionals whose training involved the eugenic theory, and many among the public exposed to eugenics, absorbed the negative images into their conscious and unconscious minds. The frequently repeated evidence created a mind set about the labelled individuals which produced negative expectations within the perceiver. The negative expectancies produced in the professionals cast their understanding of the labelled people with whom they dealt. Justice Holmes already believed before he heard the *Buck vs. Bell* case of the worthlessness of a defective’s life and the inappropriateness of society supporting anyone declared defective. His pre-orientation allowed only one hearing of the evidence presented, that which conformed to his mind set. Laws which institutionalized, sterilized and/or restricted the marriages of defective people appeared appropriate to legislative members who had accepted the mind set created by the eugenicists. The alleged ‘deviant’ individual faced institutionalization, sterilization or restrictions to relationship in order to prevent their further reproduction. In some cases (as with the baby *Bollinger*) they were killed at birth.

Images and the resulting mindsets established a set of expectations for the targeted group, leading people to see only the expected behaviours and to act in ways to elicit those behaviours from the targeted group members.<sup>81</sup> This illustrates the SRV theme of role expectancies and role circularity.<sup>82</sup> Acceptance of the eugenic theory, along with isolating and manipulating people with techniques based on the eugenic ideas, severely limited the behaviours in which the devalued people could engage. This offered further false verification for the eugenic theory, encouraging deeper commitment to it by the believer. In their analysis of Alberta's Provincial Eugenic Board's decisions, Deborah Park and John Radford found that poor "home environment" was just as likely to appear as justification for sterilization as inheritance of the alleged defectiveness.<sup>83</sup> In their zeal to fulfill the eugenic mission, board members looked for reasons to sterilize outside of the biological foundations of the eugenic theory. These theoretically incoherent pieces of data simply reinforced the eugenicists' belief in their quest to save the middle class, Anglo-Saxon Albertans from the supposed onslaught of defectives. The fact that the Alberta Provincial Eugenics Board never said "no" to sterilization, to even one of the nearly 4,800 cases put forward for their perusal, indicates the profoundly rigid eugenic mind set they held.

The family pedigree studies served as a major piece of evidence in the American eugenicists' efforts to convince people of the hereditary nature of defectiveness. With their repeated 'demonstration' of social cost, generation after generation, the eugenic solutions appeared mandatory. These sources of evidence took the dispositional perspective to its ultimate end, disallowing any influence of the environment to account for the behaviour and physical conditions that the eugenicists deplored. No matter what you were, if you were illiterate, poor, a single mother, and/or any other of the many characteristics they placed within the influence of the labels of feeble-mindedness or insanity, the only explanation was hereditary. The devalued person held the entire blame for their

assigned place in society, as no acknowledgement of the social construction of devaluation ever occurred. With eugenic lenses firmly in place, the eugenic researcher 'discovered' their data supported the eugenic theory. Their mind sets and expectancies did not allow for any other interpretation of the conditions in which these families lived. In the process they wrote and displayed photographic images in a way that reinforced the readers' mind set of and expectations for people labelled defective or degenerate. The eugenic researcher cast the targeted person into a vicious cycle of 'role circularity,' resulting in the labelled person's devaluation and abuse by the eugenicists. The believers in eugenics lost themselves in a closed cycle of 'belief circularity,' unable to see that their mind sets interpreted the data in front of them in a way to support their beliefs, which in turn served to enhance their confidence in the correctness of their mind sets and expectancies.

Since eugenicists held the idea that hereditary endowment explained all human development, the developmental model as understood within SRV did not apply. Furthermore, the environment and especially modelling was not the behaviour shaping force that Wolfensberger has clearly demonstrated it is.<sup>84</sup> Although eugenic theory was critically flawed, the evidence manipulated and distorted, it persisted as a result of the deep unconsciousness among professionals and the public of the deviancy role assigned to people perceived as negatively different or as problematic to society. Eugenicists could not see any competency whatsoever in the degenerate person. The labelled person would never develop any socially redeeming or economically valuable qualities, although many eugenicists advanced the idea that they could work to offset the costs of the institutions in which they lived. Eugenicists repeatedly stressed the inability to enhance defective people. In this way they worked directly against what SRV would offer within the theme of personal competency enhancement.

In both Canada and the United States, eugenic approaches to dealing with individuals with intellectual, physical or mental problems squashed any

possibility for social integration and the holding of valued social roles. Institutionalization of people completely denied them social integration and severely reduced the opportunities for holding a valued role. Marriage restrictions socially isolated the individual in the community, by denying them the valued role of spouse and in-law. Sterilization socially isolated the individual within the fabric of society in the twentieth century, as mother and father were esteemed social roles sought by most people. All these interventions created a profound wounding of those who fell under the eugenicists' glare.

### Conclusion

**T**HE STORIES OF THE Canadian and American eugenics movements' efforts to become the authorities for the understanding and treatment of people with a wide variety of devalued qualities and conditions demonstrate the processes for creating negative images and experiences for devalued people. This lesson illustrates the power and utility of SRV, and how the ideas described by SRV can be used to create either positive or, sadly, negative outcomes for people (a point made earlier). The eugenic movement in both countries was predicated on middle class values and the false assumption that the so-called science of eugenics could solve the perceived problems that both countries faced at the turn of the twentieth century.

The dominant middle class that led the eugenic movement claimed professional control over those with intellectual and physical disabilities, addictions, behaviour considered immoral and those experiencing economic difficulties. Their use of imagery, both written and visual, presented the targeted groups of individuals in the most negative light possible for the general public and their fellow social reformers. Their rhetoric of impending national doom at the hands of an out-of-control degenerate class of 'others' was meant to raise fear and hurry the eugenic techniques into practice.

The singularity of direction, taken by the institutionalized eugenic mindset, placed all who came

under their gaze into the same treatments: segregation, isolation, and physical mutilation (institutionalization, restrictions on marriage, sterilization). The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Buck vs. Bell*, and the Alberta Eugenics Board's failure to say "no" to any of the cases put before it, demonstrates this single mindedness.

Eugenics' assault on the lives of Carrie Buck and Leilani Muir provides a small window of insight into the profound wounding of those individuals subjected to the theory and technology of the movement. Baby Bollinger experienced the extreme of eugenics, the desire to kill those born with supposed dysgenic qualities. Yet those eugenicists who promoted institutionalization and/or sterilization also worked to make the targeted individuals dead, through isolation and depersonalization, and the destruction of their ability to participate in the creation of life.

### Afterword

**M**UCH OF THIS ARTICLE has been 'historic' in orientation. Some of the stories, like Carrie Buck's, occurred over eighty years ago. Leilani Muir's experience with eugenics appears finished, as she received compensation for what happened to her. There might be a tendency for the reader to think that this is all behind us and that this piece was an academic exercise in applying SRV themes to past devaluation; but this would be a mistake.

Eugenics is alive and proliferating. The 'new' eugenics distances itself from the 'old' eugenics use of family pedigree and its failure to comprehend the complexity of genetics.<sup>85</sup> The 'new' eugenics suggests that it will serve our society well if we remove people it declares are unwanted. The unwanted are those born with intellectual, emotional or physical disabilities, whose lives the 'new' eugenicists portray as filled with pain and suffering, as a burden to others, and/or as an economic drain on society.<sup>86</sup> Thus, the people targeted by the 'new' eugenic movement are the same as were targeted by the 'old' one. The reasons for their



elimination are also the same. So what is different to warrant the title of 'new'? The science offered to explain and justify the present eugenic effort, the experts claim, is far more accurate than the science of the old eugenics. The new science is the science of genetics.

The mapping of the human genome has been heralded as the beginning of a new era in understanding human behaviour and disease. Newspaper and popular magazine articles have informed the public that the gene(s) involved in various 'terrifying' conditions from cancer to Alzheimer's, schizophrenia, manic-depression, through the spectrum of autism, have been located.<sup>87</sup> Reporters suggest that eradication of the disease is the next goal for researchers. The materialism of the genetic orientation makes all aspects of humanness biological and thus open to physical alteration or elimination.

The other shift in the 'new' eugenics from the 'old' is the supposed removal of the state in directing eugenic activity. The individual is said to be in charge of the decision, of whether or not to take eugenic choices offered by the professionals.<sup>88</sup> The invocation of the individual right to decide to prevent people being born with the targeted devalued condition is an effort to keep the discussion of the 'new' eugenic approach from the public forum, as it is said to be a private matter. This stance appeals to people holding the current belief that individual rights will provide them with a life free of any 'unwanted burden.'

The 'private matter' argument is voided however with the United States government funding research to prevent children from being born with a 'devalued condition,' such as is the case with the funding for research, treatment and *prevention* of autism.<sup>89</sup> With government funding, eugenic decisions are a matter of state policy and thereby of public concern. The public pronouncement of the Canadian Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists calling for the testing of all fetuses for Down's syndrome, followed with the 'option' of abortion if diagnosed, further erodes the argument that the 'new' eugenics is private not pub-

lic.<sup>90</sup> Since the group has appealed to the public, to hear and accept their stance, the issue is open to public debate. It is also an example of a professional group claiming the place of determining the devalued characteristic that requires denial to be born and the ones to perform the technique to carry out the denial.

The eugenic movement has not ended. Instead, it has taken on a new guise, under the name of genetics, and continues its attempt to eliminate people through 'preventative' measures. The same methods employed in the last century are being redeployed in this one, to convince the public, the relevant professional groups and the politicians of the necessity to follow the eugenic mandate, as are the methods to address the 'perceived problems.' Using Social Role Valorization to enhance the perceived value of individuals at risk for devaluation seems ever more critical in light of the history and the continued story of eugenics.

#### ENDNOTES

1. This article will deal with seven of the SRV themes, not including the conservatism corollary, model coherency, and the power of imitation.
2. For a more detailed exploration of the eugenic movement the reader is referred to the following: McLaren, A. (1990). *Our own master race: Eugenics in Canada, 1885-1945*. Toronto: Oxford University Press; Kevles, D. (1985). *In the name of eugenics: Genetics and the uses of human heredity*. Berkeley: University of California Press; Perkins, D. (1968). *Eugenics and the progressives*. Nashville, Tenn: Vanderbilt University Press; Rose, C. (2004). *Preaching eugenics: Religious leaders and the American eugenics movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Allen, G. (1989). Eugenics and American social history, 1880-1950. *Genome*, 3(2), 885-889; Selden, S. (1999). *Inheriting shame: The story of eugenics and racism in America*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University; Weikart, R. (2004). *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary ethics, eugenics, and racism in Germany*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan; Friedlander, H. (1995). *The origins of Nazi genocide: From euthanasia to the final solution*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
3. For a significantly more detailed exploration of the period referred to as the 'Progressive Era,' see Perkins (1968); Chamberlin, E. & Gliman, S. (Eds.) (1985). *Degeneration:*

- The dark side of progress*. New York: Columbia University Press; Davis, A. (1967). *Spearheads of reform: The social settlements and the progressive movement, 1890-1914*. New York: Oxford University Press.
4. Riis, J. (1901; 1971). *How the other half lives: Studies among the tenements of New York*. New York: Dover Publications.
  5. Darwin, C. (1859). *Origin of species*. London: J. Murray. Galton applied his understanding of Darwin's work to study the genius and ability that was found in families of 400 men deemed to have made significant contributions to British politics, military, science and the arts, in the 1869 book, *Hereditary genius*. London: Macmillan & Co. Darwin published his own ideas on the hereditary nature of humans in 1871, *The descent of man*. London: J. Murray.
  6. Galton, F. (1883/1907). *Inquiries into human faculty and its development*. London: J. M. Dent & Co., p. 17, footnote 1. The 2001 electronic copy of the full text in the online Galton archives was used in this article; available at <http://galton.org>.
  7. Galton, F. (1909). *Essays in eugenics*. London: The Eugenics Education Society.
  8. For a fuller discussion of the British eugenic movement see Kevles (1985); Mackenzie, D. (1976). Eugenics in Britain. *Social Studies of Science*, 6, 499-532; Soloway, R. (1990). *Demography and degeneration: Eugenics and the declining birthrate in twentieth-century Britain*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.
  9. Galton (1909), *Essays in eugenics*, p. 42.
  10. Sebastian Normandin attributes the first lecture on eugenics in Canada to Dr. Alexander Reid, January 1890, in Halifax, Nova Scotia. See Normandin, S. (1998). Eugenics, McGill, and the Catholic Church in Montreal and Quebec. *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History*, 15, 59-86.
  11. Researchers have focused exclusively on studying the national and state or provincial eugenics societies. We have no research on eugenic societies with a more local community focus.
  12. Thomas, S. & Wolfensberger, W. (1999). An overview of Social Role Valorization. In Flynn, R.J. & Lemay, R. (Eds.), *A quarter-century of Normalization and Social Role Valorization: Evolution and impact*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 125-159. Thomas and Wolfensberger demonstrate this point at the end of the article by posing a series of "if-then" statements predicting devalued roles and negative outcomes; see 156-157.
  13. These seven SRV themes can be reviewed in Wolfensberger, W. (1998). *A brief introduction to Social Role Valorization: A high-order concept for addressing the plight of societally devalued people, and for structuring human services* (3rd ed.). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Training Institute for Human Service Planning, Leadership & Change Agency, 103-127.
  14. Numerous pieces are available for view on the websites of the Disability History Museum found at <http://www.disabilitymuseum.org> and the Image Archive on the American Eugenics Movement located at <http://www.eugenicsarchive.org/eugenics/list3.pl> operated by the Dolan DNA Learning Center at Cold Spring Harbor New York, which is the same location as the former American eugenic laboratory.
  15. Kellogg, J.H. (1897). *Are we a dying race?* <http://www.disabilitymuseum.org/lib/docs/797card.htm>. Accessed 12 January 2008.
  16. Sharp, H.C. (n.d., probably early 1900s). *The sterilization of degenerates*. IUPUI Digital Archive <http://hdl.handle.net/1805/1058>. Accessed 12 January 2008.
  17. Wembridge, E. (1927). Dwellers in Neurotica. *The American Mercury*, 10, 460-465. <http://www.disabilitymuseum.org/lib/docs/1746card.htm>. Accessed 12 January 2008.
  18. Dolan, D. (2007). Psychiatry, psychology, and human sterilization then and now: "Therapeutic" or in the social interest? *Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry*, 9(2), 99-108. See 100.
  19. The Carnegie Institute financed the Cold Harbor facility after 1921 and reviewed the Eugenic Record Office's (ERO) work in 1935. This review resulted in the withdrawal of financial support and the closure of the ERO in 1939.
  20. Danielson, F. & Davenport, C. (1912). *The Hill Folk: Report on a rural community of hereditary defectives*. Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.: Eugenics Record Office; and Estabrook, A. & Davenport, C. (1912). *The Nam Family: A study in cacogenics*. Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.: Eugenics Record Office, deal with feeble-mindedness, while Davenport, C. (Sept. 1928). Race crossing in Jamaica. *The Scientific Monthly*, 27(3), 225-238, deals with 'problems resulting from interracial procreation.'
  21. "Immigration Act of May 26, 1924" (Statutes-at-Large 92.1: 153-169). Known as the Johnson-Reed Act, this law restricted European immigration from countries, after 1924, to a limit of two percent of the number of that nationality living in the United States in 1890. This system favoured

British and other Northern European immigrants. It banned most Asians from immigrating into the United States.

22. Rafter, N. (Ed.). (1988). *White trash: The eugenic family studies, 1877-1919*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

23. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 66-67 .

24. In Rafter (1998), see The Smokey Pilgrims, 55-65; The Hill Folk, 81-163; and Dwellers in the Vale of Siddem, 341-378.

25. See Elks, M. (2005). Visual indictment: A contextual analysis of the Kallikak family photographs. *Mental Retardation*, 43(4), 268-280.

26. When criticism of Davenport's papers and books occurred, he was quick to react. A case in point is with W.E. Castle's criticism of the "Race crossing in Jamaica" article (and subsequent book) [see Castle, W.E. (June 1930). Race mixture and physical disharmonies. *Science*, 71 (1850), 603-606]. Davenport's response to Castle's comments (and apparently some by British eugenicist Karl Pearson) attacked his critics' research abilities and findings, and offered other researcher's evidence to prove his own case. See Davenport, C. (Nov. 1930). Some criticisms of "race crossing in Jamaica." *Science*, 72 (1872), 501-502. Edwin Black states that Davenport reacted quickly to any criticism, first assuring his financial backers that the critic could be dismissed; see Black, E. (2003). *The war against the weak: Eugenics and America's campaign to create a master race*. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, pp. 102-104.

27. Dr. Helen MacMurchy was an inspector of institutions for the feeble-minded in Ontario from 1906 to 1916; see McLaren (1990), *Our own master race*, 30.

28. MacMurchy, H. (1920). *The almshouses: A study of the feeble-minded*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. In this book, MacMurchy relied on her power of persuasion without the aid of any statistics or real case studies.

29. McLaren (1990), *Our own master race*, 56-57; and Dowbiggin, I. (1997). *Keeping America sane: Psychiatry and eugenics in the United States and Canada, 1880-1940*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 140-158.

30. Chapman, T. (Autumn 1977). Early Eugenics Movement in Western Canada. *Alberta History*, 25(4), 9-17. Chapman suggests that Woodsworth's 1909 book, *Strangers within our gates*. Toronto: Toronto University Press, was a eugenic diatribe espousing segregation and possible sterilization of new comers; see p. 11.

31. Beaud, J. & Prevost, J. (1996). Immigration, eugen-

ics and statistics: Measuring racial origins in Canada (1912-1941). *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 28(2), 1-24. Two key government bureaucrats involved in advancing a eugenic agenda were Robert H. Coats, Director of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics from 1915 to 1942, and Peter Bryce, Chief Medical Officer of the Department of Immigration during the same period.

32. Robert Menzies examined the deportation of people labelled insane and feeble-minded from the province of British Columbia prior to World War II; see Menzies, R. (Fall 1998). Governing mentalities: The deportation of 'insane' and 'feeble-minded' immigrants out of British Columbia from Confederation to World War II. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 13(2), 135-173.

33. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 18.

34. Weber, L. (2006). More than just boots! The eugenic and commercial concerns behind A. R. Kaufman's birth controlling activities. *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History*, 23(1), 119-143.

35. Weber (2006), 129. The majority occurred in 1969, the same year he offered to provide free sterilization to any parents on welfare in the Kitchener area. Weber reports 700 vasectomies were "performed in the factory between September and December 1969."

36. Both messages appear on a 1942 poster entitled "If You are Fit to Marry" reminding Californians that the law required they have a certificate of health prior to marriage. The poster can be viewed at the Disability History Museum website [<http://www.disabilitymuseum.org>] and is held by the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., LC # USF/33/13256-M3.

37. For a complete analysis of "The Black Stork" and other eugenic films see Pernick, M. (1996). *The black stork: Eugenics and the death of "defective" babies in American medicine and motion pictures since 1915*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pernick discusses both anti-eugenic and pro-eugenic films between 1904 and 1930 in chapter 7, "Eugenics on Film," 129-141.

38. In 1919 Haiselden went to Cuba, where he died two and half months later; see Pernick, 11-12.

39. cf. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 16.

40. Lombardo, P. & Dorr, G. (Summer 2006). Eugenics, medical education, and the public health service: Another perspective on the Tuskegee syphilis experiment. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 80(2), 291-316. These authors argue that the medical training of three of the central doctors

in these experiments involved a strong eugenic component, linking race with various diseases, including syphilis.

Dorr, G. (May 2000). Assuring America's place in the sun: Ivey Foreman Lewis and the teaching of eugenics at the University of Virginia, 1915-1953. *Journal of Southern History*, 66(2), 257-296. Dorr suggests that a combination of conditions made Virginia readily accept eugenics and its integration into the university curriculum. Virginia was a more fertile ground for eugenics than other southern states; see 275.

Bozeman, J. (December 2004). Eugenics and the clergy in the early twentieth century United States. *Journal of American Culture*, 27(4), 422-431. Bozeman explores the varied involvement of Christian and Jewish religious sects in the American eugenic movement. See also Rosen, C. (2004). *Preaching eugenics: Religious leaders and the American eugenic movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

41. For the exploration of the contemporary critics of eugenics, see Rosen (2004), 139-164; and Leon, S. (June 2004). "A human being, and not a mere social factor": Catholic strategies for dealing with sterilization statutes in the 1920s. *Church History*, 73(2), 383-411.

42. McLaren (1990), *Our own master race*, 39-40.

43. Smith, J. (Sept. 1914). Marriage, sterilization and commitment laws aimed at decreasing mental deficiency. *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 5(3), 364-370, 368.

44. McLaren (1990), *Our own master race*, 42.

45. Smith (1914), 364-365. See also Kevles (1985), 99-100.

46. Black (2003), 146.

47. Dowbiggin (1997), 75-76. Some states also banned the marriages of epileptics and confined alcoholics. Christine Rosen suggests that Rev. Walter Sumner's call in 1913 for eugenic health certificate decrees before marriages could take place significantly helped to fuel the movement for restrictive marriage legislation in the United States; see Rosen (2004), 53-83.

48. Snell, J. & Abeele, C. (1988). Regulating nuptiality: Restricting access to marriage in early twentieth-century English-speaking Canada. *Canadian Historical Review*, 69(4), 466-489; see p. 472.

49. Landman, J. H. (1932). *Human sterilization: The history of the sexual sterilization movement*. New York: MacMillan, 55, as quoted in Wehmeyer, M. (February 2003). Eugenics and sterilization in the heartland. *Mental Retardation*, 41(1), 57-60.

50. Bruinius, H. (2006). *Better for all the world: The secret history of forced sterilization and American's quest for racial purity*. New York: Knopf, p. 9.

51. Chapman, T. (Autumn 1977). Early eugenics movement in western Canada. *Alberta History*, 25(4), 9-17; Grekul, J., Krahn, H., & Odynak, D. (December 2004). Sterilizing the "Feeble-minded": Eugenics in Alberta, Canada, 1929-1972. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 17(4), 358-384; Caulfield, T. & Robertson, G. (1996). Eugenic policies in Alberta: From the systematic to the systemic? *Alberta Law Review*, 35(1), 59-79; and McLaren, A. (1986). The creation of a haven for 'human thoroughbreds': The sterilization of the feeble-minded and the mentally ill in British Columbia. *Canadian Historical Review*, 67(2), 127-150. Manitoba rejected a sterilization Bill in 1933.

52. Grekul et al (2004), 362.

53. Grekul et al (2004), 362; Chapman, Autumn 1977, 15. See also Park, D. & Radford, J. (1998). From the case files: Reconstructing a history of involuntary sterilisation. *Disability & Society*, 13(3), 317-342; see 318-321.

54. Sexual Sterilization Act, S.A. 1928, c. 37.

55. Grekul et al (2004), 363; Sexual Sterilization Act, S.A. 1937, c. 47.

56. Sexual Sterilization Act, S.A. 1942, c. 48.

57. See Grekul et al (2004), 364; and for a discussion of the law itself see Caulfield, T. & Robertson, G. (1996). Eugenic policies in Alberta: From the systematic to the systemic? *Alberta Law Review*, 35(1), 59-79.

58. McLaren (1986), A haven for 'human thoroughbreds.' McLaren gives the only detailed overview of the sterilization movement in British Columbia.

59. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 105-106.

60. The story of Carrie Buck is drawn from Black (2003), 108-123; Bruinius (2006), 58-77; and Cynkar, R. (November 1981). Buck vs. Bell: "Felt necessities" vs. fundamental values? *Columbia Law Review*, 81(7), 1418-1461.

61. Bruinius (2006), 44. The scale for the labels assigned to individuals scoring lower mental ages than their chronological age would predict was created by American psychologist Goddard and stipulated the following: an Idiot had a mental age from one to two years, an Imbecile from three to seven years, and a Moron from eight to twelve years.



62. Black (2003), 109.
63. Bruinius (2006), 59.
64. Black (2003), 113.
65. Bruinius (2006), 62; Black (2003), 116.
66. Priddy died before the ruling came down and Dr. Bell became the acting Director of the colony, thus his name appears on the infamous Supreme Court decision, *Buck vs. Bell*.
67. For a summary of Whitehead's position see Cynkar (1981), 1447-1448, and for Strode's argument see Cynkar (1981), 1448-1450.
68. Holmes was regarded as a brilliant jurist, with a liberal leaning. He held that the law should reflect the views and concerns of the "dominant group;" see Cynkar (1981), 1444. Holmes felt that do-gooders wasted their efforts on those they helped, and that the universe was a predatory place. The *Buck vs. Bell* Supreme Court decision can be found at the Eugenics Archive website: <http://www.eugenicsarchive.org/html/eugenics/static/images/260.html>
69. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 122.
70. Cynkar (1981), 1458; Bruinius (2006), 76-77, notes that on her school report cards "the third-generation imbecile noted by Justice Holmes had made the honor roll," 77.
71. Unlike Carrie Buck, and in part by its more recent occurrence, the story of Leilani Muir has not received as much attention. The story of Leilani Muir is drawn from Wahlsten, D. (1997). *Leilani Muir versus the Philosopher King: Eugenics on trial in Alberta*. *Genetica*, 99, 185-198; and *Muir vs. The Queen in Right of Alberta*, *Dominion Law Review* 132.4 (25 January 1996): file no. 8903 20759: 695-762. A film has also been made entitled "The Sterilization of Leilani Muir." Produced by the North West Center. National Film Board of Canada, 1996.
72. At the time of Leilani's birth her mother's husband was serving overseas in the military; see Wahlsten (1997), 193
73. Wahlsten (1997), 193.
74. Wahlsten, 193. Wahlsten suggests that Dr. le Vann preferred "high grade morons ... [who] ... subsequently served as subjects in his drug studies;" see 194.
75. *Muir vs. the Queen in Right of Alberta*, 695-762, 706.
76. Irish-Polish and Catholic worked against Leilani as many eugenicists in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada held immigrants as most responsible for an increase in rates of mental defectiveness in the Anglo-Saxon Protestant-dominant province.
77. Wahlsten (1997), 194; *Muir vs. the Queen in Right of Alberta*, 707.
78. Wahlsten (1997), 195.
79. Grekul et al (2004), 368-369.
80. *Muir vs. The Queen in Right of Alberta*, 695-698.
81. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 104-106.
82. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 106-108.
83. Park & Radford (1998), 334-335.
84. Wolfensberger (1998), *A brief introduction*, 120-121.
85. See Li, C. C. (Jan/Feb. 2000). Progressing from eugenics to human genetics. *Human Heredity*, 50(1), 22-33; Prusak, B. (2005). Rethinking "liberal eugenics." *The Hastings Center Report*, 35(6), 31-42. Prusak suggests that genetics will allow people the full range of possible improvements to the nature of their children and therefore the new eugenics is not the same as the old and should be practiced.
86. See Rifkin, J. (Spring 2005). Ultimate therapy: Commercial eugenics in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Harvard International Review*, 27(1), 44-48; King, D. (Apr. 1999). Preimplantation genetic diagnosis and the 'new' eugenics. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 25(2), 176-182; Hume, J. (1996). "Disability, feminism and eugenics: Who has the right to decide who should or should not inhabit the world?" (paper presented at the Women's Electoral Lobby National Conference, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia, 26 January 1996 [paper is available for reading at <http://www.wwda.org.au/eugen.htm>]); Sills, E. & Palermo, G. (Sept. 2002). Preimplantation genetic diagnosis for elective sex selection, the IVF market economy, and the child—Another long day's journey into night? *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics*, 19(9), 433-437.
87. For example see Herper, M. & Langreth, R. (18 June 2007). Will you get cancer? *Forbes*, 179(13), 52-58; Home test for schizophrenia opens the door on genetic testing. *The Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 4 Aug. 2006, Life Section F3; Rubin, R. Want to know if you're destined for Alzheimer's? *USA Today*, 6 March 2008, Life Section 5; Kirkey, S. Gene

test looks at prostate cancer risk. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 17 Jan. 2008, Health Section A8; Hyman, S. (Sept. 2003). Diagnosing disorders. *Scientific American*, 289(3), 96-103.

88. Li (2000) claims that genetic counselling is never directive but always allows parents to decide the course of action, as individual rights must be held supreme to state interest; see 32-33. The reality of his statements concerning genetic counsellors is subject to debate. For part of this debate see Shriver, T. (9 Nov. 2007). Silent eugenics: Abortion & Down syndrome. *Commonweal*, 10-11. See also Hume's (1996) presentation referenced above.

89. Snow, K. (2007). *21<sup>st</sup> century eugenics*. <http://www.disability-isnatural.com/articles/21stEug.htm>. Accessed 24 March 2008.

90. Doctors say all women who want prenatal genetic testing should get it. *The Canadian Press*, 6 Feb. 2007. Accessed

19 March 2008 from EBSCOhost Canadian reference centre database; Prenatal genetic screening. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 176(8), 1074. See also Shriver (2007) noted above, & Bauer, P. Genetic testing amplifying stigma of Down syndrome. *Guelph Mercury*, 19 Nov. 2007, Opinions A9.

---

THOMAS MALCOMSON, PHD, is a professor at George Brown College in Toronto. Co-author of the textbook *Life-Span Development*, he teaches a course on the history of eugenics.

---

**THE CITATION FOR THIS ARTICLE IS**

Malcomson, T. (2008). Applying selected SRV themes to the eugenic movement in Canada & the United States, 1890-1972. *The SRV Journal*, 3(1), 34-51.

---

## The Citizen Advocacy Foundation of America

### From the Editor

CITIZEN ADVOCACY (CA) is an advocacy model developed by W. Wolfensberger which in practice is informed by and relevant to Social Role Valorization. CA arranges and supports relationships between socially valued, competent citizens, and individuals who are socially devalued. The intent is for the typical citizen to respond to and to represent the devalued person's needs and interests as if they were their own.

The Citizen Advocacy Foundation of America is a non-profit, tax-exempt foundation. It solicits financial contributions to be used to make grants to CA-related projects, providing a means for assuring the continuity of CA and CA programs. Historically, CA programs have had great difficulty finding initial and ongoing funding. The Foundation will only fund projects closely related to CA, striving to achieve the greatest benefit to the CA movement overall.

The viability of this Foundation depends on financial contributions made to it by generous donors. We ask readers of this *Journal* to please consider making a donation, and/or to share this information with others who may be able to make a donation. All contributions are exempt from US taxes. For more information about the Foundation, contact Susan Thomas at 231 Miles Avenue, Syracuse, NY 13210; 315.478.3797.

**To learn more about Citizen Advocacy, three excellent written resources are:**

Wolfensberger, W. & Zauha, H. (1973). *Citizen Advocacy and protective services for the impaired and handicapped*. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Hildebrand, A. (2004). *One person at a time*. Brookline, MA: Brookline Books.

O'Brien, J. & Wolfensberger, W. (1988). *CAPE: Standards for Citizen Advocacy program evaluation (Syracuse test edition)*. Syracuse, NY: Person-to-Person Citizen Advocacy Association.