Journal of the History of Biology (2013) 46:31–72
DOI 10.1007/s10739-011-9317-1

"Culling the Herd": Eugenics and the Conservation Movement in the United States, 1900–1940

GARLAND E. ALLEN
Department of Biology
Washington University
St. Louis, MO
USA
E-mail: alllen@biology2.wustl.edu

Abstract. While from a late twentieth- and early twenty-first century perspective, the ideologies of eugenics (controlled reproduction to eliminate the genetically unfit and promote the reproduction of the genetically fit) and environmental conservation and preservation, may seem incompatible, they were promoted simultaneously by a number of figures in the progressive era in the decades between 1900 and 1950. Common to the two movements were the desire to preserve the "best" in both the germ plasm of the human population and natural environments (including not only natural resources, but also undisturbed nature preserves such as state and national parks and forests). In both cases advocates sought to use the latest advances in science to bolster and promote their plans, which in good progressive style, involved governmental planning and social control. This article explores the interaction of eugenic and conservationist ideologies in the careers of Sacramento banker and developer Charles M. Goethe and his friend and mentor, wealthy New York lawyer Madison Grant. In particular, the article suggests how metaphors of nature supported active work in both arenas.

Keywords: Charles M. Goethe, Madison Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Boone and Crockett Club, eugenics, ecology, conservation, preservation, National Parks, Save the Redwoods League, National Socialists, immigration restriction, Sterilization

Introduction

I first began thinking seriously about the topic of eugenics and the environmental conservation movement of the early twentieth century in the spring of 2008 on a leave provided by the Humanities Center at Washington University. I had been searching for a way to bring together the work I had been doing on the history of eugenics for the

past 25 years when I read a short but provocative article by Grey Brechin, ''Conserving the Race: Natural Aristocracies, Eugenics and the U.S. Conservation Movement (Brechin, 1996),'' which suggested that there was a natural affinity between ''conserving the race'' and ''conserving natural resources'' and that many eugenicists were active in both movements. A subsequent discussion with Gregg Mittman convinced me that the topic was one that bore closer scrutiny; and since we by now have many books on all aspects of eugenics, a more thorough examination of the relationship between eugenics and the conservation movement in the United States might fill an important gap. This paper is meant only to be an overview and outline of this larger project, and is primarily aimed at inviting comments and suggestions from interested readers.

Contradictory Ideologies?

When I tell my students, colleagues and friends that I am interested in the relationship between eugenics and conservation in the early twentieth century, they usually express some measure of surprise. In our modern post-Earth Day context it has been customary to think of eugenics and environmental conservation as two opposed and ideologically incompatible views. In the period after World War II eugenics, ''the improvement of the human race by better breeding'' (Davenport, 1910) and its lingering associations with racism, fascism and elitism, seemed the height of right-wing reactionary politics. On the other hand, conservation of our natural environment, ''the productive use [of resources] for the permanent good of the whole people'' (Pinchot, in Roosevelt, 1970, p. 17; Spiro, 2009, p. 56) has emerged as the focus of liberal, progressive politics, most dramatically embraced in the recent debates over global warming. Whether this political dichotomy is as real as some people think of it today may be controversial. But what is possibly more interesting is that historically these two movements emerged in the early decades of the twentieth century, within a broad Progressive umbrella, as contemporary social and political programs whose ideologies were not only compatible, but for those who adhered to them, mutually reinforcing.

Existing Discussions of the Eugenics–Conservation Nexus

Other authors have noted that a number of individuals in the early twentieth century shared an interest in both eugenics and

conservation. The compatibility of the two views was an important part of Ron Rainger's and Brian Regal's biographies of Henry Fairfield Osborn (Rainger, 1991; Regal, 2002) and has also been touched upon in the numerous biographies of Theodore Roosevelt (Lovett, 2007, pp. 118–122). It is a theme running through Alexandra Stern's *Eugenic Nation* and Tony Platt's *Bloodlines* (Stern, 2005; Platt, 2006) both of which include a discussion of California eugenicist and conservationist, Charles M. Goethe. The most thorough treatment has to be found in Jonathan Spiro's 2002 thesis on Madison Grant and his 2009 book, *Defending the Master Race: Conservation, Eugenics and the Legacy of Madison Grant* (Spiro, 2000, 2009). Among environmental history books that treat the subject directly, Kevin Dann's *Across the Great Border Fault*, details the relationship between nature, the public, and aspects of eugenics in the Ramapo Mountain region of New York (Harriman Park) in the early twentieth century (Dann, 2000). Other than Brechin's article, however, none of these studies had the eugenic-conservation nexus in its wider scope as a main focus.

Overlapping Themes in the History of the Environmental and Eugenics Movements

My aim is to explore the various levels at which eugenics and environmental conservation invoked similar biological, economic, social and political currents, including the metaphorical language in which both were couched in the early twentieth century, and exploited them for similar ends. In the process several persistent themes in both environmental history and the history of eugenics have emerged, illuminating a number of the deep cultural connections in at least the minds of those who pursued them actively. Among the most prominent are: common metaphors comparing conservation of the human germ plasm with the nobility of nature in its pristine form; a typological mode of thinking that saw species in nature and human groups in society as represented by certain essentialist or uniform types (the largest elk or the pure Nordic) as some sort of abstract entity existing in a romanticized past that is being eroded away by the modern world; the distinction, most prevalent in the environmentalist movement, between *preservation* (maintaining resources for future use) and *conservation* (maintaining resources for their own sake with no utilitarian aims), and the ways in which this distinction affected allegiances and legislative programs; conflicting class differences over ownership and use of

resources, particularly as programs were developed by one group (usually an elite) affecting another (usually local, less powerful, and poor); and finally, a pervasive sense of imminent degeneration on all sides: human physical and mental traits, the very fabric of society, the wilderness and natural environment that were being destroyed *en masse* for commercial expansion and profit.

Not all of these themes, of course, are equally important in understanding each specific aspect of the environmental and eugenics movements. Different themes might be more prominent, for example, in promoting game management compared to compulsory sterilization laws, but to whatever degrees they functioned most can be detected implicitly or explicitly in analyzing any particular aspect of either movement. In the two individuals that form the focus of this paper, virtually all of the themes listed above come into play in one way or another, though with different emphases in each case. For reasons of space, I will focus on only a few of the most important of these themes in the conclusion.

As a cautionary note, I should emphasize that I am *not* claiming that these various themes are exclusive to either the environmental or to the eugenic movements, or that there is a *necessary* logic that pushed people who supported eugenics to support conservation or vice versa. Numerous eugenicists had little or no connection with various environmental movements of the day, and numerous environmentalists had little or no interest in eugenics. Racism, sexism, elitism, the use of nature metaphors and the like can be found equally among those who opposed eugenics, or those (like the mining, ranching or lumber interests) who opposed environmental regulation. And while all those who promoted the combination of eugenics and conservation operated more or less under the general tenets of Progressive Era ideology, the converse is not true: not all progressives promoted eugenics or large-scale conservation efforts, especially at the federal level. What I *am* particularly interested in exploring is how the two ideologies interacted in those people who actively supported both. I also hope a study of the interaction of eugenics and conservation as combined interests can throw some light on the breadth of the Progressive movement in the United States in the early decades of the twentieth century.

Background

Historically, the eugenics and conservation movements in the United States were roughly contemporaneous, with the conservation movement perhaps having achieved an earlier and more public beginning with the

founding of the first national parks in the latter decades of the century (Yellowstone, 1872; Yosemite and Sequoia, 1890). Eugenics also had its roots in the late nineteenth century, with Galton's coining of the term in 1883, if not actually establishing an organized movement at that time.[1] While environmental legislation persisted from the late nineteenth century through to the present day, overtly eugenic legislation was largely limited to the first half of the twentieth century, in the form of the various state eugenic sterilization laws and the Reed-Johnson Immigration (Restriction) Act of 1924. In the United States the parallels in time reflect only that both were reactions to a common set of economic and social problems arising from the rapid expansion of industry, urbanization and immigration.

In early twentieth-century America, both eugenicists and conservationists were possessed with a sense of impending doom. They pointed to the imminent disasters that they felt the nation faced if attention were not paid to its most critical problems, what they saw as the "menace of the feebleminded" or the unfit on the one hand (eugenicists), and the wholesale degradation of the natural environment and destruction of natural resources on the other (environmentalists). Not unlike those historians and cultural critics at the end of the nineteenth century who pointed to the Second Law of Thermodynamics as the scientific principle leading all systems to deteriorate (Brush, 1967), eugenicists-environmentalists saw a similar tendency toward degeneration engulfing the social as well as natural world, and called on their contemporaries to act before it was too late. All saw themselves as gatekeepers, stewards who held the legacy for future generations in their hands. They were activists, using various tools at their disposal: personal prestige and/or institutional positions, their own financial resources as well as that of their elite ruling-class associates, old-school ties, networks established through various social and political organizations to which they belonged, and direct lobbying in state and national legislatures.

Eugenicists-environmentalists represented one branch of Progressives in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century sense of the term (Hays, 1959, Chapter 13). They favored a stronger role for government in general and in regulatory practices and agencies in particular – controlling everything from monetary policy, monopolies, foods and drug quality, and interstate commerce, to animal populations, forest use

[1] Galton (1883, p. 25 *n*). As Galton put it, "[the purpose of eugenics] is to express the science of improving stock, which is by no means confined to questions of judicious mating, but which, especially in the case of man, takes cognisance of all influences that tend in however remote a degree to give the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had."

and human reproduction. They were part of the move away from unbridled *laissez-faire* to what was often referred to as ''managed capitalism'' – that is, ''rational'' or ''scientific'' management of economic, social and political processes and institutions, carried out by highly trained experts – of which scientists were starting to become one of the most prominent examples. Most Progressives were devoted to the ''cult of efficiency,'' that is, among other things, preventing problems before they occurred rather than letting them take place and then having to deal with catastrophic consequences. All of this involved the implicit assumption of social control: that is, if left to their own devices, individuals (including corporations) in society were in danger of pursing their own selfish interests to the degradation of everything around them.

Eugenicists-environmentalists in particular saw science as the key to solving problems in all areas of human concern, but none more directly than in developing policies governing environmental and reproductive matters. Common to both pursuits was being selective, that is, conserving the *best* – people as well as the most valuable natural resources – for future generations. This similarity was not mere analogy: Indeed, participants in both movements saw conserving the ''best'' in both the natural environment and in the human population as subject to the same scientific principles, using the new knowledge of Mendelian genetics, animal and plant husbandry, and the social and political tools of Progressive era ideology. Culling the herd in game management and sterilization of the ''unfit'' in the human population involved the same sort of biological intervention into the reproductive process. Preserving the genetically best germ plasm in the population was what any game manager or rational social planner aimed to accomplish. Gifford Pinchot (1865–1946) was a zealous and exemplary Progressive advocating efficiency and scientific management in resource use (his specialty was forestry). Pinchot argued that long-term planning and controlled use of resources was not only wise but ''profitable'' (Balogh, 2002, p. 209). And although not a subject of this study, Pinchot was also an active and influential eugenicist.[2]

There was within the environmental movement of the early twentieth century (and continuing to the present in various forms), a tension

[2] Pinchot pushed for a national forestry program in the 1890s, became one of the seven members of the Federal National Forest Commission in 1896, Chief of the Forestry Division in the Department of the Interior in 1898 and Chief Forester of the newly created U.S. Forest Service in 1905. He served as Governor of Pennsylvania from 1922–1926, and 1930–1934. He was a delegate to the first and second international eugenics congresses (1912,1921) and was a member of the Advisory Council of the American Eugenics Society (AES) from 1925 to 1935. See Mehler (1987, p. 415).

between what were loosely termed ''conservation'' and ''preservation.'' Conservation meant planned use of resources for human betterment – for example, selective timber harvest or reforestation of logged areas. Preservation meant keeping resources untouched in something like was a pristine state. Pinchot stood for the conservationist side of the environmental movement, while John Muir (1838–1914) stood staunchly on the preservationist side, exemplified by his dictum, ''In wilderness is the preservation of the world.'' In reality, however, the distinction was often blurred, and some individuals stood for conservation on some issues (for example, controlled lumbering in national forests) and preservation on others (prohibiting hunting in national parks). Eugenicists tended to be preservationists on eugenical issues while advocating either conservationist or preservationist positions on environmental issues. Unless otherwise specified, I will use the term ''environmentalist'' to refer to general conservation and preservation concerns, and the terms ''conservation'' or ''preservation'' where they apply to the more specific meanings.

As good Progressives, most of the individuals who were eugenicists and environmentalists all believed that modern life, especially that associated with wide-scale industrialization and urbanization, was disrupting the natural order, and thus that scientifically informed intervention was required. For environmentalists in general, unrestrained, rapid industrial and urban expansion had rapaciously consumed natural resources and natural landscapes, from forests and minerals to the great redwoods, elk and bison of the west. Many species were becoming extinct or on the verge of extinction (moose, elk, many migratory and song birds). For big-game hunters the disappearing herds threatened to curtail and eventually eliminate the ''manliest'' of sports.[3] As historian John F. Reiger pointed out some years ago, ''American sportsmen, those who hunted and fished for pleasure rather than commerce or necessity, were the real spearhead of conservation'' (Reiger, 1975, p. 21).

On the eugenics side, modern society had provided medical and other technologies that promoted the survival of the unfit – what some referred to as ''the menace of the feebleminded.''[4] Industrial and urban expansion had also brought to North America millions of new

[3] The phrase ''manliest of sports'' to refer to hunting was apparently Roosevelt's; see Roosevelt and Grinnell (1893, p. 15).

[4] The term ''menace of the feebleminded'' was used and promoted, if not originated, by Henry H. Goddard (1866–1957), but it found currency with many from both the eugenics and psychometrics communities, especially in the period before 1920. See Zenderland (1998, p. 232).

immigrants from Central European, Mediterranean and Slavic countries. Their congregation in the great cities of the east (New York, Boston, Philadelphia), mid-west (Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Louis) or west coast (Los Angeles) had created slums that many took to reflect the cultural and biological inferiority of these "new immigrants" (Schrag, 2010, p. 134). Controlling the reproductive rate of such "unfit" populations required rational, scientific intervention. In good Progressive fashion, eugenicists believed that government was the proper agency through which effective action was most likely to be accomplished. Eugenic control of reproduction was necessary as a scientific way to maintain and improve the fitness of future generations. Similarly, eugenicists noted that the same defectives who were producing more children than the old stock Aryans or Nordics, were also the ones destroying nature for their own benefit as commercial hunters (fowl for their own consumption or to sell to restaurants, for plumage, or in the west hunting large game animals for food or hides). Those claimed to harbor defective germ plasm were vastly altering the physical as well as the social and genetic landscape. Early on, the problems of eugenics and environmental conservation could be seen in some eyes as co-joined.

Focus

To provide a focus for exploring the relationship between eugenics and conservation, I will ultimately examine the work of five individuals who represent different socio-economic, institutional and geographic backgrounds: from old-monied "elites" to new-monied entrepreneurs, from confessed amateur naturalists to university trained biologists, and from geographic centers in the east to newly developing communities in the west. Among the individuals included in this group are wealthy New York Lawyer Madison Grant (1857–1937); elite academic biologist Henry Fairfield Osborn (1857–1935) of Columbia University and the American Museum of Natural History; biologist and university administrator David Starr Jordan (1851–1931), first president of Stanford University; California real estate speculator and amateur naturalist Charles M. Goethe (1875–1966) and Frederick Osborn (1889–1981), one-time railroad executive, eugenicist, leader of the population control movement after World War II, and nephew of Henry Fairfield Osborn. Standing behind both eugenic and conservation concerns was one individual of singular

importance, Theodore Roosevelt (1858–1919) who as president (1901–1909) made conservation a key issue in his administration.[5] What all these figures have in common is that they were activists in promoting both eugenics and various aspects of environmental conservation and/or preservation.

In the present paper I will focus on Californian Charles M. Goethe, and the influence on him by New Yorker Madison Grant. Though neither were scientists in any formal sense, both Grant and Goethe (1) revered science and promoted themselves as naturalists, and (2) represent two different groups of social elites and two different regions of the country that were experiencing similar problems in both the environmental and eugenic arenas. Moreover, they knew of and admired each other's work and carried on a long-term correspondence. Goethe considered Grant a major influence on his work and because Goethe outlived Grant by some thirty years, felt he was able to extend his friend's work into a new generation.

In the next section I will provide a quick overview of Grant's extensive work in both eugenics and conservation as background for exploring his influence on Goethe.[6]

Madison Grant (1865–1937)

Background

Madison Grant is known primarily to historians of science as a rabid eugenicist, immigration restrictionist, author of the widely read racist tract, *The Passing of the Great Race* (1916), and somewhat eccentric member of the wealthy late nineteenth and early twentieth century New York elite. He was, indeed, all of these things. But there was

[5] I was rather surprised that relatively few women seem to have been equally involved in both movements, though two, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster and Mrs. Matthew T. Scott, both holding important offices in the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) may provide interesting examples, as discussed briefly in the final section of this paper (see also, Merchant, 1984). Numerous women were also involved in pursuing eugenics work as field workers of the Eugenics Record Office, doing research on eugenic families, or as organizers of local eugenics groups or programs (see, for example, Larson, 1995). What I have not been able to discover is individual women who were as *actively* involved in both eugenic and conservation movements in a fashion similar to the five males on whom my study will focus.

[6] Jonathan Spiro's extensive and admirable biography of Grant provides much additional information (see Spiro, 2009).

another side to Grant – his naturalist/conservationist side – that worked synergistically with his eugenics, each supporting the other, and both equally as important to him personally and politically. Born in New York of ancestry tracing back to colonial times, Grant grew up in patrician circumstances, spending summers at the family estate on Long Island, the "Outlands," where, he claims, he gained his long-standing love of nature and natural history. Educated by tutors in Europe (Dresden), he entered Yale in 1884, graduating (early) in 1887. He matriculated at Columbia University Law School that same year, graduating with an LLB in 1890. Although he set up a law office on Wall Street, across the street from the offices of his friend J.P. Morgan, Grant never practiced law as such, using his time, connections and independent income to pursue his special causes, eugenics in general, immigration restriction in particular, and conservation. He never married and had no children (Spiro, 2009, p. 240).[7]

Grant was highly connected to the most elite circles of ruling class New York. A close personal friend of Teddy Roosevelt, he was a member of Roosevelt's famed Boone and Crockett Club, admission to which required (for regular, full membership) the killing and mounting of at least three species of large North American mammal.[8] It was partly through Grant's effort after his election in 1893, that the Boone and Crockett Club became increasingly devoted to conservation efforts. Indeed, many members of the Boone & Crockett Club were also members, and often on the boards of, other natural history and conservation-minded organizations, including the American Museum of Natural History, American Bison Society, the Audubon Society, the American Society of Mammologists, the Save the Redwoods League, and the New York Zoological Society (Spiro, 2009, pp. 392–393). Many also joined Grant as members of the Galton Society, an elite, eugenically oriented group that met monthly at the American Museum of Natural History, to hear lectures on, and discuss, racially oriented

[7] Spiro points to the large number (well over 15) of active eugenicists who had no children, from Francis Galton to Adolf Hitler (Spiro, 2009, p. 240, 386).

[8] Other members included Gifford Pinchot (First Chief of the U.S. Forest Service), Albert Bierstadt (landscape painter), Henry Cabot Lodge (Senator from Massachusetts), C. Hart Merriam (zoologist, ethnographer and Director of the U.S. Biological Survey), Elihu Root (Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt), George Eastman (of Kodak fame), George Bird Grinnell (naturalist and founder of the Audubon Society), W.T. Hornaday (naturalist at the Smithsonian Institution and later Director of the New York Zoological Garden); Osborn was an associate member (a category created for those who did not meet the hunting criterion).

anthropological issues. Grant, who was on the Board of the Museum, and Osborn, its President, usually organized and hosted the meetings.[9]

Grant's Natural History Writings

Grant was a prolific writer on natural history, penning scores of articles, mostly of a popular sort, about different species of animals, their habitats, behaviors and ecology. He was recognized as a superb popularizer, though most of his work was derived from the basic research of others, including J.A. Allen and William Diller Matthew, both from the American Museum of Natural History (Spiro, 2000, p. 116). His first natural history article, "The Vanishing Moose" in 1894 already showed his deep concern for conservation, albeit connected as it was with saving large game animals for hunting. Elk once ranged, he noted, over much of the east, down as far south as Kentucky and Illinois. Now they were restricted to the mountains of the northwest (Grant, 1894, p. 345). "The Vanishing Moose" brought the young Grant a commendation from Henry Fairfield Osborn, and began what became a lifelong friendship and collaboration in a wide variety of activities, both eugenical and environmentalist. Grant's writings on bighorn sheep, coyotes and martens were cited by Ernest Thompson Seton in *Lives of the Game Animals* (4 Vols., 1909), and in 1902 a new species of caribou from Alaska was named after him: *Rangifer grantii* (Spiro, 2009, p. 25).

Grant began his career as a conservationist but evolved ultimately into a preservationist. Initially, he wanted to preserve herds of large game for hunting, protecting them from local inhabitants or market hunters either in the Adirondacks or in the far west. It was not individual hunters like the Boone and Crockett members, he argued, that were decimating the moose and other animal populations, but the *market hunters*, those who hunted for large companies for profit or locals who were used to hunting for their own subsistence: "The chief evildoer and enemy of all classes," he stated in 1908, "is the professional hunter, who kills for the market" (quoted in Spiro, 2009, p. 32). He was particularly incensed at the way Italian immigrants hunted songbirds and squirrels in local parks for food. He even tried to introduce a bill in the state legislature that would prohibit non-U.S. citizens from owning or carrying guns. The larger societal import of this effort was not lost on

[9] The Galton Society had been formed in 1918 by Grant, Osborn and Charles B. Davenport, Director of the Station for Experimental Evolution, and of the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, as an antidote to the culturally based and "Jewish anthropology" of Franz Boas (1858–1942) of Columbia University, which dominated the much larger American Anthropological Society.

Grant and his elite circle, for whom large numbers of inferior immigrants brandishing weapons was a major threat to social and political stability.

Grant became a major activist in both New York and on the national scene especially in the period before World War I. He lobbied extensively in Albany for controlling hunting practices in the New York state parks, in Washington for protection of Yellowstone from incursions by a major railroad project, for prohibiting hunting in the national parks, and for scientifically-informed game management. He also helped to negotiate several migratory bird treaties between the United State and Canada. Strongly opposed to plans by ranchers and soft-hearted animal protectionists to kill off the wolf and coyote predators in the west, Grant argued that predators were a necessary part of the ecosystem, culling herds of weak, sick and defective animals.[10] As successful as he became as a lobbyist, he also lost several important, battles: two major ones with Gifford Pinchot: (1) on prohibiting hunting in the national parks (Game Refuge Law, 1902) and (2) on damming the Hetch-Hetchy valley in Yosemite (Raker Act, 1913) to provide water for San Francisco, a battle in which he was joined by the aged John Muir. Pinchot had called the "mere preservation" of beauty "sentimental nonsense," and although they were both members of many of the same elite clubs, Grant and Pinchot never spoke to each other again. It was in large part from these sorts of experiences that Grant metamorphosed from conservationist into a preservationist (Spiro, 2009, p. 61).

In his preservationist role, Grant was directly involved in establishing Denali and Glacier National Parks, promoting the Everglades for park status (it did finally become a park in 1947, 10 years after Grant's death) and the joint effort to establish the Save the Redwoods League (SRL) in 1918 with Henry Fairfield Osborn and John C. Merriam, the paleontologist from Berkley (and later President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington).[11] Like the large animals of which he was such a devotee, the redwoods were for Grant symbols of a great and heroic past that were in danger of extinction unless dramatic measures were taken. The redwoods were particularly symbolic for their dramatic height and for the once-dominant forest community that the remnant stands

[10] His worst fears were realized in the Kaibab Plateau explosion of the mule deer populations in the 1920s, as a result of a campaign to eliminate their predators. For a detailed history of this case see Young (2002); also, Spiro (2009, p. 79).

[11] For establishment of the SRL, see Schrepfer (1983): It should be noted that under Merriam, the Carnegie Institution of Washington became one of the major financial supporters of the Eugenics Record Office, established originally in 1910 by the Harriman family. See Allen (1986, 2004).

represented. In 1904 Grant had told Roosevelt, "it would be little short of barbarous to allow… the destruction of these trees, the oldest living things on earth" (Spiro, 2009, p. 272). Roosevelt had agreed. Redwoods and Nordics were to be saved for their own inherent worth. Once they were lost, Grant argued, they could never be replaced.

Grant and Osborn were also collaborators in establishing the New York Zoological Society (mid-1890s) and its very ambitious Zoological Park (later referred to as the "Bronx Zoo," opened in 1899). Significant in bringing nature to the "vast urban wasteland" was its value for teaching important lessons about the relationship between animals and their environments, and by analogy, to the "natural" social order that human society had perverted by its uncontrolled development and its (to Grant) irrational commitment to egalitarianism. Grant thought that social order needed to be imposed (by the morally superior elites such as himself) on human society. "Nature teaches law and order and respect for property," Osborn trumpeted, and was echoed by W.T. Hornaday (1854–1937), the zoo's first director: "Order is Heaven's first law, and must be ours, also. The warfare against dirt and disorder must be constant" (Spiro, 2000, p. 76). The Zoological Park was probably Grant's most long-standing and tangible contribution to natural history: an urban monument to preservation and the moral values imparted by Nature.

Eugenics

Because so much has been written about Grant's eugenics and his racism, especially surrounding the publication of his highly controversial book, *The Passing of the Great Race* (Grant, 1916) only a brief summary is needed here (Spiro, 2009, Chapters 7, 12; Paul, 1995, pp. 103–105; Chase, 1977, pp. 163–175; Ludmerer, 1972, pp. 22–30 and ff). From moose to man, Grant's eugenical views flowed directly from his natural history and preservationist ideology: For any society, like any animal species, to survive, it must preserve the best of its "germ plasm." Like any natural resource, the human germ plasm, Grant argued, belongs to society as a whole. As his friend and associate, Harry H. Laughlin (1880–1943), Superintendent of the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor put it, "We must look upon the germ plasm as belonging to society and not solely to the individual who carries it" (Laughlin, 1914, p. 16). Framed in these terms, managing the germ plasm by governmental legislation was as rational as managing any other natural resources.

The Passing of the Great Race (1916), with a new edition in 1918, and two more editions through 1921, was Grant's most explicit statement on

race. In writing and revising the original manuscript he was greatly aided by Osborn and Charles B. Davenport (1866–1944), Director of the Station for Experimental Evolution and the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor. Race, Grant argued, is the most important factor in determining the fate of populations. As an extreme hereditarian Grant claimed that racial traits were biologically determined and immutable: "The great lesson of the science of race is the immutability of somatological or bodily characters, with which is closely associated the immutability of psychical predispositions and impulses." Taking much of his racial taxonomy from William Z. Ripley's *The Races of Europe* (Ripley, 1899, pp. 37 *ff*),[12] Grant distinguished three major groups: the Nordic, the Alpine and the Mediterranean, each with their own innate physical and cultural characteristics. They were distinguishable physically by skull shape.[13] Nordics were superior because, like the elk and moose, they had evolved in harsh northern climates. Grant juxtaposed his hereditarian eugenics to the cultural anthropology of his great nemesis, Franz Boas (1858–1942) at Columbia, whom he claimed slavishly adopted the "dogma of the brotherhood of man" (Grant, 1916, pp. 24–25). Grant resented what he saw as the hegemony Boas and other Jews held among anthropologists in the United States, because they emphasized only cultural and environmental factors to the exclusion of biology.

As with animal populations, Grant claimed that human migrations and race-mixing (what he called "mongrelization") were almost always deleterious. When races encountered each other through the invasion of the territory of one by the other racial mixing occurred with disastrous results, since the characteristics of the lower group almost always prevailed. For example, Grant claimed that the superior Nordics lost their original racial purity when they migrated into the territory of the inferior Goths, with whom they then interbred. Because of race mixing, especially by the southern and eastern Europeans, New York was becoming a "cloaca gentium" – a "sewer of races." To counteract this

[12] Although something of a typologist, Ripley nonetheless recognized considerable variation within each of his head-form groups, as indicated by photographs showing a variety of brachycephalic Asiatics, and another of dolicocephalic Africans (between pp. 44 and 45).

[13] Continuing with Ripley's distinctions, Grant divided *Homo sapiens europaeus* into two major types: the long-headed *dolichocephalics* (Nordics and Mediterraneans) and the round-headed *brachycephalics* (Alpines). As Spiro has pointed out, Grant also used skull shape in his taxonomic divisions of the large mammals, an unorthodox criterion among systematists at the time (but likely reflecting the hunter's focus on mounted head specimen).

trend, he strongly supported immigration restriction by lobbying to have Harry H. Laughlin appointed Expert Eugenics Witness to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in 1921 (Spiro, 2009, p. 204; Hassencahl, 1970). This effort was successful: the Reed-Johnson Act (also known as the Immigration Restriction Act) was passed by Congress in 1924 and signed into law by President Calvin Coolidge. It restricted exactly those southern and eastern European populations Grant thought were genetically inferior. By a similar logic he also supported eugenical sterilization "of the lower fifth" – that is, the lowest 20% – of the population.[14]

Like most American eugenicists, Grant was keenly interested in the development of eugenics in Germany after the Nazi takeover in 1933. *The Passing of the Great Race* had been translated into German in 1925 and according to Hitler's personal physician, Dr. Karl Brandt (1904–1948), it had become the Führer's "Bible" (Spiro, 2009, p. xi). When the Nazi government introduced the "Law for the Prevention of Genetically Diseased Offspring" – the "sterilization law" – in 1933, Grant was enthusiastic and, according to Spiro, quickly translated the Reichstag speech for publication in *Eugenical News*.[15] While a number of American eugenicists (including Henry Fairfield Osborn and Charles Goethe), as we shall see, actually went to Germany to visit the eugenic courts and see how the law was implemented, by 1933 Grant was largely bedridden with arthritis, and unable to travel.[16]

In summary, what motivated Grant in both his preservationist and eugenics efforts was an integrated view: conserving "the best" in nature and in the human germ plasm through scientific management. The *New York Times* obituary caught this component clearly and succinctly:

> The preservation of the redwoods, of the bison, of the Alaskan caribou, of the bald eagle… of the spirit of the early American colonist,… and of the purity of the 'Nordic' type of humanity in this country, were all his personal concerns, all products of the same urge in him to save precious things. (June 2, 1937)

[14] Passage of compulsory sterilization laws in the U.S. between 1907 and the 1940s has been summarized in Largent (2008, Table 3.4, pp. 79–80).

[15] Spiro (2009) claims that Grant translated an address introducing the law to the Reichstag for *Eugenical News*, but the actual article as published in the journal is attributed to Hellmer (1934).

[16] Even more disappointing to Grant, he had to forego an invitation to Hermann Goering's spectacular International Hunting Exposition in Berlin in 1937 because of his health (he died in May of that year).

Charles M. Goethe (1876–1967)

Charles Matthias Goethe[17] was an ardent admirer of Madison Grant, sharing with the older New Yorker a passionate dislike for immigrants, a belief in the superiority of the Nordics, and a zealous compulsion for organization and propaganda, whether for eugenics or for natural history and environmental causes. Like Grant, he also wrote numerous tracts, lobbied with politicians and bureaucrats for national park and forest preservation projects while simultaneously directing a variety of eugenics projects from his office or home. Unlike Grant, however, Goethe was neither a hunter nor a blue-blood patrician. He once boasted that he had "never shot a thing," even a squirrel, though he realized that was not considered very "manly" at the time. He was wealthy by standards of the day, having inherited his father's banking and real estate business at the age of 52. He also augmented his own wealth by marrying Mary Glide, the daughter of one of the richest families in Sacramento. And finally, unlike Grant and most other eugenicists-environmentalists, Goethe was actively religious, not only as a long-standing member of a local Methodist congregation but also as a founder (with his wife) of the Sacramento Council of Churches and linking it with the national organization. Goethe's religious views, however, did not prevent him from (or perhaps contributed to) sharing with Grant a strong dislike for Catholics and Jews.

Background

Goethe was descended from a German Lutheran family that had immigrated to California in the 1860s via Australia. His father had become successful in banking and real estate, and after graduating from high school, young Charles had worked his way up in the family business, starting as a clerk, then as bookkeeper and manager. He studied law with a local judge and a state senator, and was admitted to the California Bar in 1900, though, like Grant, he never practiced. After his father's death in 1928, Charles took over the family business, augmenting the real estate holdings through a series of large land purchases that he divided into subdivisions. He was thought to be a very tight-fisted businessman, charging high interest on late rent payments and

[17] His name was pronounced "gay-tee" I was told by the archivist at Sacramento State University. The Anglicized pronunciation seems all the more strange because Goethe himself claimed to be fluent in German and to be related (in some way he never clearly specified) to the German poet, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. A brief and useful summary of Goethe's life and work is found in Schoenl and Peck (2010).

ready to foreclose on overdue mortgages. Since he held many of the mortgages for the properties himself, he accrued not only profit from the monthly interest payments, but also from repossessing those that were in default and re-selling them. After World War II he turned his attention more and more to investments on the stock market, from which he had profited heavily by buying up blue-ribbon stocks a low rates during the Great Depression. When he died, Goethe left an estate estimated at somewhere around twenty-four million dollars (Schauer, 1976, p. 100 and Appendix J).

In his autobiography, *Seeking to Serve* (1949), Goethe recalled that as a young man he had come to a crossroads in his life: as he put it, one direction led to "grabbing," the other to "giving" (Goethe, 1949, p. 1). Goethe chose the latter, throughout most of his life working toward a wide variety of local civic activities and projects, as well as larger national issues such as conservation and eugenics. Many of these were carried out in the context of Progressive Era ideology: concern for planning, social order, efficiency, and an almost worshipful reverence for science. He was the main force behind the development of the first supervised recreational playgrounds on the west coast. With his wife Mary, he opened a model playground at the Sacramento Orphanage Farm in September, 1909, and hired a young woman as supervisor, considered to be a novel arrangement for the time (*Sacramento Union*, September 2, 1908, p. 4). Two years later he led a public service commission to establish a similar supervised playground in the city of Sacramento itself (Schauer, 1976, p. 57). After having studied playgrounds in various countries around the world, Goethe concluded that organizing and planning supervised activities would provide not only physical but also moral education for young children. In a similar vein he was highly influential in the founding of the Boy Scouts of America, where outdoorsmanship was linked to building character and inculcating strong moral (Protestant) principles derived from experiencing the orderliness of nature. In addition, he developed an interest in city planning and in 1913 became Chairperson of an urban planning committee for Sacramento. Goethe and his wife also founded the Alta Sanatorium for tuberculosis patients in Sacramento, of which Charles became a Director. During World War I Goethe served on the California Military Welfare Commission, whose job was to make sure army recruits did not contract venereal disease; to this end Goethe and the Commission saw to the passage of the "Red Light Abatement Act," closing down hundreds of brothels in the San Francisco/Sacramento area (Schauer, 1976, p. 60).

Goethe lived a highly-controlled and rigid lifestyle that would have made even a Madison Grant seem like a profligate. He neither smoked nor drank, started a rigorous daily routine by 6 AM, and graded himself with points for accomplishing his routines in due fashion each day (such as a morning walk, mastering two new vocabulary words daily, arriving at his office an hour before his employees, etc.). He also prided himself on setting aside a "Madison Grant Hour" each month in which he would retire to his library and read through portions of *The Passing of the Great Race* (Spiro, 2009, pp. 349–350). He considered Grant's influence on his philosophy of life "profound."

Goethe, like Grant, was an avid traveler, he and his wife spending months at a time traversing North and South America, Europe, the Middle East and Asia. Both Charles and Mary were enthusiastic hikers and campers, though the frequency with which they pursued these activities declined as Mary's health became increasingly precarious from her mid-forties on. Everywhere they went Goethe made notes on the natural history of the region and on the ethnic and racial combinations that he encountered. While he showed some level of appreciation for other cultures and their variety of habits and experiences, on the whole his travels only reinforced his nativist view that it was the Nordics who had created the highest forms of "civilization."

Goethe as a Naturalist

Goethe's interest in nature derived, he claimed, from the influence of his mother, who taught him about animals, plants and rocks even before he learned the alphabet (Schauer, 1976, pp. 17, 61). His interest in nature and nature study followed him throughout his life. Every year he chose some taxonomic group (algae, lichens, fungi, mosses, spiders, beetles) and studied them intensively. Birds were his specialty, however, and early on he became an active member of the national Audubon Society. His diaries are filled with notations and comments about birds that he encountered on his various trips at home and abroad. Goethe thoroughly enjoyed being out in the wilderness observing nature first-hand. Although he had no formal training in biology or ecology, he was not an armchair naturalist. His interest in conservation and preservation was kindled in part by a brief encounter with John Muir on a hike in the Sierras, and by direct confrontation with the haphazard land and forest management practices he saw on a visit to the Grand Canyon during his honeymoon in 1903. Goethe remained friends with Muir until the latter's death in 1914, and became a strong

proponent of scientific forest preservation, especially in relation to the coastal redwoods.

Although an activist on behalf of natural history and preservation of the natural environment, Goethe operated less through legislative channels, than through various educational activities that he promoted.[18] For example, after traveling through Europe just before World War I, Goethe and his wife had attended a naturalist lecture given on a hike in Switzerland. Goethe found that the idea of a talk given by an expert *in a natural environment* provided a unique opportunity to learn by direct experience with professional guidance. Shortly afterwards, in 1918, on a visit to Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge near Lake Tahoe in the Sierras, the Goethes happened on another lecture, this time being given by a biologist from the University of California, Berkeley, in the lodge auditorium. What particularly attracted Goethe's attention were the amazingly realistic bird calls the speaker was mimicking.

Thinking that such lectures in wilderness areas would further visitors' understanding and appreciation of the natural sites they were experiencing, Goethe initiated at his own expense a series of such talks in 1919 at Fallen Leaf Lake. It so happened that Stephen Mather (1867–1930), at the time the head of the newly-created (1916) National Park Service, was in Tahoe, so Goethe invited him to the Lodge to hear one of the talks. Goethe proposed that it would be an important addition to the parks' educational program to institute natural history talks by rangers or imported biologists and naturalists, who could take visitors on hikes and provide background information and ecological context for the area (*Eugenics Pamphlet* # 68, n.d., pp. 7, 9, 13, 17). Thus was born the tradition of ranger nature talks, known as the National Parks Interpretative Program, now a staple in all the national parks. A sound understanding of biology was essential, in Goethe's view, not only for the appreciation and preservation of nature, but, as Grant and Osborn also had argued, for inculcating proper moral values. In addition to initiating the Parks Interpretative Program, Goethe wrote pamphlets for schools and other organizations extolling the value of nature study, urging schoolchildren to make their own natural history collections and display them systematically at home. It was through these varieties of educational venues that Goethe focused much of his efforts to promote natural history. His motto for nature study was to "learn to read the

[18] Goethe did help to push a recreational enabling act through the California legislature and served on the "Recreational Inquiry Committee" for California in the years just before World War I, at the request of Governor Hiram Johnson, whom he knew also as a native of Sacramento. See Sterling Winans to C.M. Goethe, February 2, 1954. Goethe Papers, California State University at Sacramento, Box 7, Folder 13.

trailside as one does a book.'' (*Eugenics Pamphlet* # 68, p. 13) For his role in establishing the National Park Interpretive Program Goethe was made an Honorary Chief Naturalist by the U.S. Park Service.

Goethe as a Conservationist/Preservationist

Goethe's predilection for natural history led quite naturally to a concern for conservation, and even more, after his contact with John Muir, for preservation. As he wrote in 1963: ''Is there anything more important than this work of preserving not only the wilderness but especially the wildlife that can exist only under wilderness conditions?'' (Goethe Papers, Box 9, Folder 2)[19] During his lifetime Goethe was involved in dozens of conservation and preservation activities and organizations. He was a founding member of the American Bison Society, an early member of the Audubon and the Kenya Wildlife Societies, the Isaak Walton League, the Wilderness Society, a staunch supporter of the Save the Redwoods League, Regional Head of the Sierra Club and a sponsor, through grants to California State University at Sacramento (CSUS), of the Sports Fish Survey and general faculty research in ecology. Of the larger conservation/preservation enterprises in which Goethe engaged, the campaign to establish the Everglades as a National Park was one of the most enduring. Partly through his ornithological interests, his attention was called early on to the decimation of the heron and egret populations for their feathers. Goethe recognized that the Everglades was a major habitat for these birds and, like Grant, saw the market hunters as a threat to its continued viability. Indeed, the last trip that Goethe and his wife took together, in 1946, was to a meeting of the Audubon Society in the Florida Everglades, aimed at pushing the federal government to designate the area as a national park. Goethe was able to report to his wife just before her death that the campaign had been successful (Schauer, 1976, p. 63).

Like Grant, Goethe was an indefatigable proselytizer and pamphleteer. To spread his conservationist/preservationist gospel, he sent subscriptions for a variety of environment-oriented magazines (such as *The Wilderness*) to dozens of colleges and universities for, as he put it, ''there seems no better way of spreading the conservation gospel…'' than to get this sort of information into the hands of the next generation (Goethe to

[19] Goethe to ''The Librarian'', February 23, 1963. Goethe Papers, CSUS Special Collections, Box 9, Folder 2. There are many letters addressed to ''The Librarian'' accompanying gift subscriptions that Goethe sent to college and university libraries. Most of these letters also include comments and anecdotes about conservation, preservation, ecology or eugenics.

"The Librarian," Goethe Papers, Box 9, Folder 2). Goethe was convinced that for the public to adopt a conservationist/preservationist ideology it had to be "biologically literate," and his campaign for "biological literacy" was a major thread running throughout all his natural history and environmental efforts.

While he shared most Progressives' concern for planning, scientific management and control, Goethe's own experience as a naturalist and rancher, coupled with his philosophy of "biological literacy" also dictated that there were times when nature should be left alone to take care of itself. Probably more than Grant, Goethe had an overall ecological approach to the natural world that reflected his experience as a hiker and camper rather than a hunter. For example, he recounted several cases in the Sacramento area in which considerable harm had been caused by uninformed programs of predator control. In the early twentieth century farmers had organized an owl and hawk eradication effort to reduce the attacks on their chicken flocks. This resulted in an enormous increase in the ground squirrel population, some of which burrowed into irrigation levies causing breaks and flooding (Goethe to "The Librarian," August 11, 1958, Goethe Papers, CSUS, Box 4, Folder 1). In another case, he found on inspection of his own sheep farms (in 1963, at age 87) that the sheepherders had been killing coyotes. According to his own account the herders told Goethe that they killed coyotes because sometimes coyotes kill lambs. Goethe's response was ecologically as well as economically shrewd: "'Yes, but I am willing to spare them [coyotes] because of what they save in rodent control. That is ten times the value of the said lamb.' Thus even 'mountain lions' also coyotes, for which bounties are paid, are truly an asset." (Goethe to "The Librarian," February 23, 1963, Goethe Papers Box 9, Folder 2) Like Madison Grant, Goethe was particularly horrified by large-scale cases of the mismanagement game populations as occurred with the predator-elimination programs on the Kaibab Plateau in the 1920s (Young, 2002). Lack of scientific understanding of the ecology of prey-predator relationships had led to a disastrous management policy that could have been avoided, in Goethe's view, if the planners had been more "biologically literate."

For Goethe as for Grant, the giant coastal redwoods provided the most profound examples of a "noble race" fighting for its very survival in an increasingly hostile environment. He imbued the redwoods with racial qualities similar to the Nordics, needing the same kind of government intervention as that taken by the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924. Not only through his work with the Save the Redwoods

League, but also through personal donations of sections of redwood stands, Goethe sought to give this "superior race" a much-needed helping hand. In the late 1940s he provided funds for the Jedediah Smith Grove in Mill Creek State Redwoods Park, commemorating the "Bible-toting" pioneer and nature aficionado who trekked through the west and northern regions of California in the 1820s (Stern, 2005, p. 143). In 1948 he contributed to the establishment of the Madison Grant Forest and Elk Refuge, and in 1952 he commissioned the Mary Glide Goethe Grove, a 160-acre plot in the Prairie Creek Redwoods area.

Goethe's Eugenical Interests

In the period immediately after World War I Goethe became increasingly involved with eugenics, which he defined as "the conservation of human assets" (Goethe, 1955, p. 126). Like Madison Grant, his deepest concerns focused on Nordic supremacy, the deleterious effects of race-mixing, and immigration control. He was a member of the Eugenics Research Association and served as its last President in 1936 before the organization disbanded. He was an active member of the American Eugenics Society, and sat on its Board along with Mary Harriman and east coast bankers Frank Babbott and Robert Garrett (Mehler, 1987, pp. 135–136). Goethe was also on the Advisory Board of the American Genetics Association, publishers of *Journal of Heredity,* which routinely carried articles on chicken and corn breeding alongside articles on eugenics. He also founded and directed the Eugenics Society of Northern California from his home in Sacramento. As a member of the prestigious Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, which if not quite as influential as the Boone and Crockett, was, in Goethe's words, "the most powerful club of its type on the coast" (Goethe to ERA, July 2, 1926, Laughlin Papers, ERA File), he pushed for creation of a Eugenics Committee to tackle problems of immigration in California. And finally, in the mid- and late-1930s he became an outspoken advocate of Nazi eugenic legislation, especially the sterilization laws. He saw in the Nazi's racial and social legislation the first modern state based on what he considered rational, scientific principles – in this case *Rassenhygiene* or "racial hygiene."

Goethe published with his own funds almost one-hundred eugenics pamphlets that combined travel commentary, natural history, ethnography, and out-and-out eugenics. He wrote articles for journals such as *Eugenical News* and *Eugenics*, and for various west coast newspapers (especially numerous editorials for the *Sacramento Bee*), and a number

of books, including an autobiography, *Seeking to Serve* and a small book, *War Profits and Better Babies*, describing a eugenics ''garden city'' established in France in the 1920s by a wealthy industrialist who had made a fortune in the sugar business during World War I (Goethe, 1946). Among his more eccentric publications, Goethe issued a series of rather bizarre ''eugenics cards'' (about postcard size) containing anecdotes often of events or topics seemingly unconnected to eugenics. One discussed early attempts at flight and then segued to the low birth-rate of intellectuals, suggesting that without a large supply of superior and inventive people, humans would never have been able to conquer the air. Goethe's eugenical writings, unlike Grant's, made little or no pretense at scholarship. They are eccentric, disjointed, and like the eugenic cards are often peppered with examples whose relationship to eugenics is unclear.

An article Goethe penned for *Eugenical News* in 1936, titled ''Patriotism and Racial Standards,'' provides a general overview of his eugenical interests and how he related them to ecology and environmental issues in a broader sense (Goethe, 1936). The article begins with one of Goethe's somewhat oblique parables describing a group of schoolchildren witnessing the operation of an electric-powered streetcar. Goethe says this phenomenon illustrates the rapid rate of progress humans have made recently ''compared to all ages of human history since Java Man'' (Goethe, 1936, p. 65). While advances in physics and chemistry are indeed ''dazzling,'' Goethe noted, they may well not modify our future progress nearly as much as current research in genetics and eugenics. In his particularly brazen racist language, he went on to reassure the reader that ''We *are* moving toward the elimination of humanity's undesirables like Sambo, the husband to Mandy the 'washerlady'… We are beginning to eliminate the 'n-good-on-earth' type, whose unfitness to propagate is most glaring'' (Goethe, 1936, p. 65). Goethe had his own special terms for fit and unfit people: the ''high-powers'' and ''low-powers,'' respectively. Like most eugenicists he saw the high-powers, specifically the old ''Nordic type,'' losing ground to the low-powers, particularly the ''hyphenates'' as he deridingly termed them (that is, Mexican–Americans, Japanese-Americans, or Jewish-Americans). Mexicans, he claimed, ''breed like rabbits'' while Nordics are not even replacing themselves, a development that he saw paralleling the attrition rate of patrician families in Rome from the time of Caesar to that of Hadrian, that is, roughly 33 BCE to 138 CE (Goethe, 1936, p. 67).

To Goethe, non-Nordics were incapable of true civilization, and brought with them degeneration and deterioration wherever they went.

The Mexicans were the worst. In 1929 he wrote in an article that the Mexican is ''eugenically as low-powered as the Negro… He not only does not understand health rules: being a superstitious savage, he resists them'' (Goethe, 1929, quoted in Schrag, 2010, p. 134). In a postcard to Harry Laughlin at Cold Spring Harbor in 1927, he wrote: ''Am down here on the border studying the eugenic aspects of the Mexican immigration problem. One's reactions to their slums surrounding the Nordic quarters of border towns is that the latter are competing with a rabbit-type of birth rate. The more one studies the peon the more one wonders: Did the Conqustidores eliminate the thinkers when they destroyed the Aztec priests and soldiers?'' (Goethe to Laughlin, February 8, 1927. Laughlin Papers, Goethe Files) As a sign of the Mexicans' degenerate condition, Goethe claimed they were responsible for the spread of ''reefer madness'' (marijuana) in California and the southwest (Schrag, 2010, p. 134). Like many of his contemporaries, Goethe thought that marijuana had particularly ''crazed'' effects on the ''degenerate races'' (Schrag, 2010, p. 135). In the manner of nativists on the east coast who associated immigrants with all sorts of disease, he even blamed an early 1930s outbreak of Bubonic plague in Los Angeles on the Mexican-American community there (Goethe, 1936, p. 68).[20]

From his west coast California perspective, however, the influx of Mexicans, other nationalities from Latin America and from Asia (particularly Japan and the Philippines) were left untouched by the 1924 Immigration Restriction Act. In a letter to the *New York Times* in 1935, he asked why the same sorts of quotas applied to European nationalities could not be applied to Mexicans as well? (Schrag, 2010, p. 134) In the early 1920s Goethe formed the Immigration Study Commission to lobby the state and federal governments to limit immigration from Mexico, whose ''low powers'' he claimed scored at the same level on intelligence tests as the negro and Italian (Platt and Stern, 2007, p. E3).[21] It was the lack of success of the Immigration Study Commission that led Goethe to convince the Commonwealth Club that it should form a Eugenics Section and to lobby for immigration restriction and sterilization (Platt and Stern, 2007, p. E3). Even into the early 1950s, Goethe was writing various members of Congress strongly supporting the McCarran-Walter Act and urging that its quotas by

[20] Goethe cites the authority of Berkeley zoologist and ardent eugenicist. Samuel J. Holmes for the claim that Mexicans are responsible for bringing disease to the United States.

[21] The I.Q. test claim comes from Goethe to Ethel Richardson of Los Angeles, February 19, 1926; Laughlin Papers.

national origin be retained (Stern, 2005, p. 142).[22] Despite this, he died still fearing that in the long-run no pure Nordics were going to be left and that national stamina was being diluted by the influx of ''low-powers'' and the ''coming of heterogeneity'' (Platt and O'Leary, 2006, p. 68).

While Goethe felt that some progress was being made, the pace of eugenic legislation in the United States was ''snail-like'' largely because, he claimed, the opposition was so much better funded than the eugenicists (he likely had the Catholic Church in mind here). Much of the opposition came from theologians (presumably on quasi-moral or ethical grounds, though Goethe does not cite any reasons), in response to which he offered two biblical parables that convey a clear eugenic message: ''Do men gather grapes of thorns, figs of thistles?'' and ''Every tree that bringeth forth not good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.'' (Goethe, 1936: p. 68) Through his religious connections, particularly the network emanating from the Sacramento Council of Churches and its national affiliates, Goethe constantly tried to show that there was a clear religious rationale for promoting eugenics. One of the eugenic cards that Goethe printed and distributed related eugenics to religion by noting that two good Christian women were killed on their way to church in Oakland by a 16-year old driver who might have been either drunk or of ''low intelligence'' (or both). The point was that ''low-powers'' are behind a large number of criminal and other asocial behaviors, while the victims were the ''high-powers'' and ''good Christians'' in the traditional sense.

Race consciousness was another major theme in Goethe's panoply of eugenic concerns. Claiming, like Grant, that the desire to preserve racial homogeneity was a biologically-based instinct, Goethe bewailed the fact that especially in the United States there appeared to be tacit censorship of discussions about race and race-purity, at least in the mainstream media. ''Does there exist in America,'' he asks, ''an adroit censorship to bar any advocacy of the desirability of conserving Nordic homoegenity? Are we forbidden even to use certain words [referring to the term ''Nordic'']?'' (Goethe, 1936, p. 67) Like Grant, Goethe thought that race mixing brought out the worst in both groups, and it had already done nearly irreparable harm to the old-time Nordic strains in Europe and the United States. The decline of Athens, he claimed, was due to the admitting to citizenship of the ''immigrant mongrels of Asia Minor or

[22] The McCarran-Walter Act, passed in 1952 by Congress over President Harry Truman's veto, consolidated various earlier immigration acts, including the Reed-Johnson Act of 1924, and retained, as Goethe hoped, the national origins quota system. While it expanded some categories of admission, it was opposed by many as selectively favoring northern European groups.

Africa,'' a fate certain to overtake the United States at the present rate of immigration of ''low powers'' from Asia and Latin America. Miscegenation due to immigration led to a loss of race consciousness and thus to degeneration.

What was clear was that Goethe, like Grant, believed strongly in Nordic superiority, based on a genetic constitution selected rigorously in the harsh climates of Northern Europe. That rigorous constitution displayed itself well in the westward expansion of the North American pioneers, which Goethe saw as led by the Nordics and their ''pioneer spirit.'' In Grant's later book, *Conquest of A Continent*, Goethe saw the unveiling of that spirit of the Nordic adventurer, and he was overflowing with admiration over this sequel to the *Passing of the Great Race*. Goethe wrote Scribner's that he was so ''profoundly stirred'' by the book that he stayed up all night reading it (Goethe to Scribners, February 2, 1934; Goethe Papers Box 7, Folder 10, Vol. 1, No 2). He told Grant it was ''epoch-making'' and proceeded to have it recommended through his Federated Churches network to thousands of Protestant groups (Goethe to Grant, January 10, 1934; C.M. Goethe Papers, Box 7, Folder 10, Vol. 1, No 2; Spiro, 2009, p. 344). The plethora of highly negative reviews of Grant's later book in the scholarly as well as popular press were attributed by Grant, Goethe and others to a ''Jewish conspiracy'' especially linked to the ''Boas crowd,'' including Ruth Benedict (1887–1948) and Ashley Montagu (1905–1999) (Spiro, 2009, pp. 345–347).[23]

Nazi Eugenics and Sterilization

Although in his pamphlets and other literature from the Eugenics Society of Northern California, Goethe claimed that the organization emphasized primarily positive eugenics (increasing the birth-rate of the ''high-powers''), he also thought sterilization of the mentally deficient, insane and socially inadequate had to be applied as well. He was proud of California's record as a leader in sterilizations in the U.S. by the 1930s. For this reason, and his fixation on Nordic supremacy, he found the Nazi regime that took power in Germany in January 1933 a model

[23] Spiro describes well the growing frustration and annoyance Scribners was experiencing with Grant over the reception of *Conquest of a Continent*. Although assuring Grant that the attacks of the ''Boasians'' was due to their ''Jewishness'' and not something he should take personally, Grant's editor, Maxwell Perkins (also the Scribners editor for F. Scott Fitzgerald and Ernest Hemingway) became increasingly ''contemptuous'' (Spiro's term) of Grant's constant pestering about sales results, and his request for a new edition of *Conquest* so the term ''Scotch'' cold be replaced by ''Scottish'' in fifteen places in the text (Spiro, 2009, pp 346–347).

for putting eugenic theory into practice. When the Nazis passed the 1933 Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Defective Offspring, or the ''Sterilization Law,'' Goethe was both excited and envious. As he wrote in 1934: ''The sterilization statutes, electrified into action by the Hitlerian signature, are a force to be reckoned with'' (Spiro, 2009, pp. 345–347). And in his presidential address to the Eugenics Research Association (ERA) in 1936, he noted that up until now, ''California had led all the world in sterilization operations. Today, even California's quarter century record has, in two years, been outdistanced by Germany'' (Goethe, 1936, pp. 65–66). According to historian and sociologist Tony Platt, who has inspected Goethe's travel diaries, on his trip to Germany in 1934 Goethe found the mood exuberant. In Berlin he noted ''an atmosphere of idealism'' which was also mirrored, he thought, on the faces of the population, in particular of the ''Brown Shirts'' singing the old fatherland songs. ''Hitlerism was a surging forward of idealism. It is amazing that a vegetarian should have consolidated behind him the public opinion of what were overweight, corpulent Germans of a [quarter] century ago.''[24] Although he disliked the militarism and the philosophy of ''Pan-Germanism,'' he saw Germany being transformed. He was particularly impressed by the kind of eugenic legislation and program the Nazis put into practice, especially the legal procedures involved in compulsory sterilization (*Eugenics Pamphlet* No. 12 (n.d.), p. 6; Goethe, 1936, p. 66).

Along with Clarence Campbell (1862–1938), his predecessor as President of the Eugenics Research Association, Goethe traveled to Germany in 1934 to observe the Eugenics Courts in action. The courts were set up to examine cases brought forward for sterilization, and to hear appeals from those (or their families) judged to be genetically inadequate. He wrote in Eugenics Pamphlet # 12 (n.d.):

> Germany, since Hitler had become Fuehrer, has made eugenics an applied science. In negative eugenics Germany has set up hundreds of eugenics courts. These try social inadequates as to their fitness for parenthood. Please do not think these trials are based on race hatred [sic]. Whatever else may happen in the Reich, the eugenics trials proceed with fully as much caution as if they were held in the United States…. [Germany's] plan is: Eliminate all low-powers to make room for high-powers. And thereby ALSO SAVE TAXES! [Emphasis in original] (Goethe, 1936, p. 66)

[24] From Goethe's diary, June, 1934, as reported in Platt (2006, p. 67).

Economic efficiency, as with most calls for sterilization by Progressive-minded eugenicists, was invoked in the wake of the Great Depression as a major rationale for what otherwise might be seen as "cruel and unusual punishment." Like other American eugenicists who had traveled to Germany to observe the operation of the Nazi eugenics laws, including the eugenic courts, (Kühl, 1994, p. 56), Goethe was personally impressed with "the sane and cautious manner in the German sterilization program is proceeding."[25]

More than simply admiring Hitler's establishment of the racial state, Goethe thought the United States should emulate Hitler's methods as well, or else Germany would outstrip the U.S. in producing "high-powers" and great leaders for future generations. As he wrote in 1935, "However much one abhors dictatorship, one is also impressed that Germany, by sterilization, and by stimulating birth rates among the eugenically high-powered, is gaining an advantage over us as to future leadership." (Quoted in Platt, 2006, p. 68) The Nazis appeared to Goethe as eminently practical in their approach to eugenics in general and sterilization in particular. Their sterilization and later marriage ("Nüremberg") laws were passed by fiat and simply needed to be rubber-stamped by the Reichstag. Goethe bemoaned the slow and clumsy way in which sterilization laws were debated and acted on state-by-state in the United States. By the time he attended the annual meeting of the International Federation of Eugenics Organizations in the Netherlands in 1936 (as one of only three U.S. delegates, compared to fifteen from Germany), Goethe found the German work inspiring. A year later, in a letter to Freiherr Othmar von Verschuer (1896–1969),[26] then Director of the Institute for Hereditary Biology and Racial Hygiene at the University of Frankfurt, Goethe wrote: "I feel passionately that you are leading all mankind herein."[27] And again, a few months later he praised Verschuer on "the marvelous progress you and your German associates are making."[28] Goethe had hoped to visit Verschuer and his Institute in

[25] Goethe to Ellsworth Huntington, September 26, 1935, quoted in Platt (2006, p. 69).

[26] Vereschuer succeeded Eugen Fischer (1874–1967) as Director of the Kaiser–Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics (KWIA) in 1942. He was the doctoral mentor of and collaborator with Josef Mengele (1911–1984), whose infamous twin studies at Auschwitz resulted in dozens of murders to obtain body parts for genetic analysis back at the KWIA. See Adams et al. (2005) and Weiss (2010a). Verschuer's remarkable post-war career, as the first professor of human genetics (at Münster), has been discussed in detail in Weiss (2010b).

[27] Goethe to von Verschuer, December 23, 1937; quoted in Platt and O'Leary (2006, p. 69).

[28] Goethe to Verschuer, February 26, 1938; quoted in Platt and O'Leary (2006, p. 70).

Frankfort in 1939 but was unable to do so. He wanted to bring back his personal observations to the United States to counteract what he saw as the rampant prejudice with which the news media was blinding the American public about German eugenics. Like Grant and others, Goethe attributed this prejudice to the control of the media by the Jews.[29]

Unlike Madison Grant, Henry Fairfield Osborn and other eugenicists and conservationists of their generation, Goethe lived well beyond the end of World War II and the revelations of the Holocaust. Interestingly, nowhere (that I have found, in either primary or secondary sources) has any indication surfaced regarding Goethe's reaction to the whole Nazi experience. Along with Alexandra Stern and Tony Platt, I was told that a large chunk of Goethe's letters, originally being used by CSUS Education Professor Roger Bishton for a biography, had been left in a backyard shed to deteriorate and have now been lost. Bishton never wrote the biography and it has been speculated that the letters and documents he had collected were too distasteful and revealing of Goethe's deep racist feelings.[30] However, what exists at CSUS or in other collections and in Goethe's published works, is often revealing enough.

It is clear that for Goethe, as for Grant, eugenics and conservation were intertwined by both vision and methodology. The vision was preservation of the "best" and elimination of the "worst" (however both were defined). The methodology involved selection of certain genotypes over others through direct manipulation of reproduction by sterilization, or indirectly by immigration restriction. Goethe himself made the point explicitly about how nature study and eugenics were related: In one of his eugenic tracts, he posed a rhetorical question: "Why all this nature material in a Eugenics Pamphlet?" His answer was that "Because it spells accelerated progress in human betterment, in building a better race, in removing some causes of poverty." (Goethe, Eugenics Pamphlet # 68, n.d., p. 13) As Alexandra Stern has put it, for Goethe "strict immigration quotas, involuntary sterilization, population planning, Nordic domination, and nature conservation were one and the same…" (Stern, 2005, p. 148) Goethe himself saw it clearly: "Perhaps the greatest national gains from a really completed National Park system, interlocks [*sic*] with State Parks' chains, can be expected in the accelerated building of a eugenically-better nation." (Stern, 2005,

[29] Goethe to Verschuer, December 23, 1937; quoted from Platt and O'Leary (2006, pp. 69–70).

[30] Tony Platt, personal communication; Platt, quoted in the *Sacramento Bee*, February 8, 2007, p. A18.

pp. 148–149) It embodied, as Stern notes, a connection between ''outbreeding of bad genes'' with ''wilderness management.''

Goethe's Later Years and Legacy

After the death of his wife in 1946, Goethe became more reclusive, his eccentricities increased and he apparently became more irascible as a businessman. He continued his eugenic and anti-immigration work, but his travels slowed down considerably and it is apparent that he felt the impending decline of the eugenics movement and its goal of Nordic homogeneity. All his old cohorts in that endeavor – Grant, H.F. Osborn, Laughlin, Lothrop Stoddard and of course his wife Mary – were gone. And as its last President, he had presided over the dissolution of the Eugenics Research Association in 1936. He absorbed these losses by devoting increasing amounts of time to his real estate business and the operation of his various ranches. His money, and the attention it brought, must have been one of his major consolations. To this end, his philanthropy became increasingly directed to the local Sacramento area, especially to CSUS, which began to court him seriously after the death of his wife.

Yet there is no doubt that to many of his elite contemporaries, Goethe was seen as a remarkably productive and influential figure. He had a park and middle school in Sacramento named after him, and both the campus arboretum and a projected science building at CSUS (to which he contributed funds) also bore his name. He was appointed to the University Advisory Board in the 1950s, and in 1965 the university organized a ''national recognition day'' to honor his ninetieth birthday. At that event he received letters of commendation from around the country, including from President Lyndon B. Johnson, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall, and Governor Edmund Brown of California, who declared that Goethe was the state's ''number one citizen'' (Platt and O'Leary, 2006, p. 64). The letters describe Goethe as ''an American whose life has been so richly dedicated to the service of humanity,'' (Johnson), as having had ''a remarkable career of public service'' (Warren) and having made ''considerable contributions to conservation and particularly to the interpretation of America's natural, historic and scenic wonders'' (Udall). A decade later (1976) the Save-the-Redwoods League honored Goethe by naming a forty-acre grove after him in the Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park (Platt and O'Leary, 2006, p. 64). Plaques in these various locations extol Goethe's humanitarian contributions. There is no direct

mention anywhere of his eugenic activities or of his unflinching support of German race hygiene under the Nazis. His eugenical ideas appear nowhere in any of his conservation efforts such as the Save the Redwoods League literature or the National Parks Interpretative Program.[31] Such is the way public history is written (or rewritten) to eliminate an unsavory past.[32]

As a follow-up, it should be pointed out that when Goethe's eugenic and Nazi sympathies became public in the political activist era of the mid-1960s, there was an increasing outcry in Sacramento to eliminate his name from various memorial places on the CSUS campus (the Goethe Arboretum, the science building, and the mansion he donated to the school), and in the city, the Goethe Middle School and Goethe Park.[33] Exposure of Goethe's past by students and faculty resulted in removal of his name from all of these locations. This was an important gesture but, as pointed out by Tony Platt, this had the negative effect of eliminating an important (and revealing) part of the area's history (Platt, 2007). Sacramento is now "Goethe-free," but as a result modern residents and readers will not know the extent to which the local politicians, civic leaders and educators once celebrated one of the major eugenicists and Nazi supporters of a past era.

Conclusion

Despite the fact that eugenics and environmental conservation might seem to represent opposite political philosophies, the two movements were intimately connected in the minds of many during the first half of the twentieth century. Madison Grant and Charles M. Goethe represent two of a number of eugenicists who were also active conservationists.

[31] See Schrepfer (1983, pp. 44–45). The eugenicist that the Redwoods League quoted in their literature was not Goethe but John C. Merriam, President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington and long-time supporter of Charles B. Davenport's eugenics operations at Cold Spring Harbor. Merriam differed from Goethe and Grant in favoring a more genetically based rather than racially based eugenic philosophy.

[32] Tony Platt has written a suggestive essay on the use of historical markers in California as means of establishing particular historical and cultural visions, and to eliminate distasteful components of the past. Platt argues that commemorative plaques in the state parks and redwood groves, in particular, provide clear examples of the erasure of eugenics and racial science from environmental history. See Platt (2004), unpublished ms, "Saving the Redwoods".

[33] See "Sacramento's Own Doctor Strangelove," Pamphlet produced by the May Second Committee at CSUS, (ca. 1965); Goethe Papers, CSUS Archives and Special Collections, Box 13, Folder 5.

The connection underscores the importance of Progressive Era values in the convictions of both men: social control, scientific management under the guidance of highly trained experts, formulation of state regulated social policy and the cult of efficiency. For the subset of Progressives who embraced both eugenics and conservation, such as Grant and Goethe, there was a strong sense of society as a hierarchy of ethnic and racial groups with elite and "superior" groups at the top and degenerate, "inferior" groups at the bottom. Both Grant and Goethe, like other Progressives, believed in active intervention to control and regulate everything from business and commerce to the wilderness and the human germ plasm. For both Grant and Goethe, the ideological connections between the two movements were remarkably compatible.

That compatibility involved not only the general methods and ideology of Progressivism, but also a variety of specific cultural fears and common goals. Among the fears were the specter of deterioration and degeneration of the human species – race suicide on the cultural level and an environmental wasteland on the other. Social degeneration resulted not only from high birth-rates among what were considered to be the least fit families and racial groups from each generation, but also from interbreeding and race-mixing, where the offspring always seemed to show the worst characters of each parental type. Similarly, deterioration and degeneration of nature, whether of valuable commercial resources or aesthetically beautiful landscapes, came from uncontrolled exploitation with no thought or long-range plans for the future. For both eugenical and environmental planning, the important common thread was preservation of the *best* – whether the biggest moose, the tallest redwoods, or the most sturdy Nordic – and cultivating them for the future. The key to Grant's and Goethe's eugenic and conservationist plans was that they should be based on sound biological knowledge: ecological concepts for game and forest management and Mendelian genetics for human reproductive management. A wide understanding of biology, on the part of the general public (Goethe's "biological literacy") as well as the trained professional expert, was crucial to the long-range success of both eugenics and environmental conservation.

Of the various themes suggested at the beginning of this paper I would like to focus on four in concluding this analysis: (1) The role of metaphor in discussions of both environmental and eugenic concerns, (2) The pervasive idea of primeval nature or wilderness set apart from human activity, especially among the preservationists within the environmental movement, (3) Nature as an exemplar and model for moral behavior, and (4) The problem of place or boundaries – spheres

of jurisdiction – in controlling natural resources as well as reproductive rights.

(1) The use of metaphors to relate environmental and eugenic concerns was widespread during the early twentieth century. The particular metaphors that Grant and Goethe invoked provide an important insight into the ways in which the ideologies of eugenics and conservation were intertwined. Among the most prevalent and frequently invoked metaphors was that of the redwoods as symbols of natural and Nordic superiority, what John Muir had once called "the noblest of a noble race." Like Grant's east coast elites and Goethe's west-coast "high powers," the redwoods were struggling to survive a rapidly changing environment and the onslaughts of modernity. Others invoked more spiritual metaphors, describing the redwood groves as "cathedrals," "sanctuaries," pervaded by "divine light." They were also symbols of success in the struggle for existence, and demonstrated to Grant and Goethe what writer Herman Keyserling claimed: that the creative power of nature had not died out; the most recently colonized continents still contained "primordial power" and by analogy suggested that the ancient Nordic lineage retained its regenerative power as well (Keyserling, 1925, pp. 287–290; cited in Schrepfer, 1983, p. 44). For Grant and Goethe, the redwoods were the botanical equivalent of the Nordics.

Moreover, the trees' ancient lineage, captured in concentric growth rings, also told stories of epic proportions, like the sagas of Norse mythology, the Prose and Poetic Eddas, or the *Nibelungenlied*, all treasured icons of Nordic culture.[34] The redwoods told of both human and natural history, and could be read as a linear, historical book in the same way as the trailside could be read as a horizontal, ecological book. Without intervention and conservation – indeed preservation – both redwood and Nordic would pass into extinction and be lost forever. Grant and Goethe were not alone in their metaphorical invocations uniting race and conservation. In 1911 at the Second National Conservation Congress the President of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), Mrs. Matthew T. Scott, in an explicitly nativist tone, claimed that "We must conserve the sources of our race in the Anglo-Saxon line…We, the mothers of this generation… have a right to insist upon the conserving not only of soil, forest, bird, minerals, fishes, waterways in the interest of our future home-makers, but also upon the conservation of the supremacy of the Caucasian race in our land."[35] As

[34] Grant periodically peppered his popular natural history writings with references to the *Nibelungenlied* for inspiration. See Spiro (2009, p. 117).

historian Laura Lovett has summed it up, the effect of Scott's argument was to place the future of the Anglo-Saxon race on the same level of importance to future wives as the conservation of any other natural resource (Conference *Proceedings*, 1911, pp. 275–276; quoted from Lovett, 2007, p. 124). Sensing the pervasiveness of the intertwined conservation-eugenic metaphors of the time, Lovett titled her own chapter (5) on this subject, ''Men As Trees Walking.''

More important, the redwoods symbolized the commonality of the threat to both nature and the Nordic elite: the uncontrolled, rapacious forces of industrial expansion. While the Nordics were being threatened by the high birth and immigration rates of inferior foreigners seeking work, the redwoods were being threatened by humans themselves – the commercial giants (of which lumber companies were among the worst) who had no interest higher than that of their own profit. But both were signs of the times. Both were the symbolic victims of modern industrialization and commercialism (perjoratively referred to by some as ''modernism'').

(2) Both Grant and Goethe adhered to a pervasive view in the early twentieth century of a dichotomy between ''natural'' and ''human.'' The ''natural,'' embodied in unexploited Nature in all its pristine purity, what Alexandra Stern refers to as ''the sacred quality of nature free from people'' (Stern, 2005, p. 137), stood in stark contrast to the unnatural conditions of man-made cities, dirty and teeming with degenerates and the unfit. Behind the ''nature free from people'' image was what environmental historian William Cronon has termed the concept of ''wilderness,'' an imagined and romanticized world unsullied by human presence that replaced the disappearing frontier in the American imagination (Cronon, 1996, pp. 78–80). Not only was this vision of wilderness an ahistorical fiction, since indigenous Amerindians had inhabited these regions for millennia, but it was in itself a contradiction. As Cronon notes: it was an Eden from which humans were expelled, and hence was a place that, by definition, we could not logically inhabit. Environmental historians have debated since the mid-1980s the nature and influence of this concept of ''wilderness'' on both environmentalists and historians alike.[36] While it is clear from these debates that much of the ''wilderness'' concept was a romanticized

[35] Conference *Proceedings*, 1911, pp. 275–276; quoted from Lovett (2007, p. 124).

[36] For a discussion of these issues see Cronon (1996), ''The Trouble with Wilderness,'' Dann and Mitman (1997), and Dann (2000, especially pp. 1–15). Dann's book presents a particularly salient case study of the turn-of-the-20th century ''back to nature'' movement in the creation of Harriman Park and Palisades Interstate Park on the Hudson River.

creation, it is also true that Grant, Goethe and many of their generation believed such a wilderness once existed and shaped their plans for conservation, and especially preservation, accordingly. That it was necessary to remove the indigenous people out of preserved areas to make them fit the wilderness vision was just one of the contradictory, and tragic consequences of the Edenic myth.

For Grant and Goethe as eugenicists, the ''wilderness'' myth had its counterpart in the vision of a pristine early Nordic race, a group that never existed as they imagined, but which served as the guide for their racial preservationist efforts. Grant's and Goethe's Nordic prototype found its expression in mythic heroes such as Sigurd from the Völsung Saga (in the later *Nibelungenlied* Sigurd became Siegfried), the most renowned hero of Germanic legends. That such pure races ever existed is as much a product of nineteenth and early twentieth-century imagination as was pristine wilderness, but preservation of both remained a strongly motivating force for both environmentalists and eugenicists. Grant actually chronicled the descendants of these Nordics as they swept across and colonized North America in *The Conquest of A Continent* (1933). The early European colonists and westward pioneers were characterized as conquering heroes (with a little acknowledged ruthlessness thrown in) bringing civilization to a rich and untamed country. Only the Nordics were able to accomplish so much because of their adventurous spirit. Goethe, too, played into this fantasy, characterizing his family as ''pioneers'' on their way to California (however, not overland in Conestoga wagons but by ship from Australia!).

(3) For both Grant and Goethe, Nature (with a capital ''N'') had moral lessons to teach. As we have seen, Nature represented order, the rule of law (''natural laws'') survival of the superior and elimination of the inferior. If one listened to the sequoias, or read the trailside as a book, it was an orderly universe. Exposure to nature in whatever form – the relative wildness of a national or state park, or the managed Nature of the Bronx Zoo – provided first-hand contact with the natural world and thus the chance to learn these moral lessons. Of primary importance was the lesson of ''law and order.'' Among more long-range outcomes, understanding the lessons of nature would make the average citizen more amenable to conservation efforts in general and thus they would support the ideology that long-term planning and conservation were both economically profitable and environmentally sound.

The lessons of an ordered nature emerged directly from the ecological concept of niche, an idea that Goethe in particular championed, where all organisms existed in and were adapted to their specific

''place.'' Grant's zoo made this explicit with animals placed in enclosures that resembled their natural habitats, and thus put them, literally, ''in their place.'' For Goethe, ''learning to read the trailside as one would a book'' emphasized the close observation of ordered assemblages of organisms and their interrelations. The implications of this ordered view of nature for conservationists was that as humans encroached upon and modified natural environments, the organisms living there became increasingly threatened, many times to the point of extermination. The same metaphor of order and adaptation extended also to human society. Blacks in Africa, peasants in Mexico and Jews in the ghettos of Eastern Europe might be well-adapted to those particular ''niches,'' but when they migrated to new areas, their inability to adapt led them to become ''social inadequates.'' Worse, by race-crossing, they brought deterioration to themselves and especially the indigenous populations with whom they mixed. Grant had invoked this principle to explain the falling birth-rate of the Nordic elite: Having evolved their superior pioneer spirit in the harsh, open environment of northern European forests and mountains, they were unable and/or unwilling to compete in the changed environment of large industrial cities filled with ghettos and immigrant invaders. Grant's and Goethe's idealization of the wilderness and nature seems clearly to be an expression of their subconscious wish to restore that set of conditions in which they imagined the heroic early Nordics had evolved.

(4) A final vision (also a metaphor in its own right) that lay at the heart of both eugenicists' and environmentalists' concerns was the haunting fear of ''invasion'' – physically and socially. It was central to debates about wildlife protection in the state and national parks and forests (who could ''invade'' and hunt and who could not) and of course was the up-front issue about immigration at the national level. The natural world that Grant and Goethe wanted to preserve was being invaded by every sort of poacher, from local residents and market hunters, to large-scale commercial enterprises (lumbering, mining, cattle ranching, developers) just as surely as the cities of the east and west coasts were being invaded from such alien lands as eastern and central Europe, Russia, Asia and Mexico. It is not difficult to see that Grant's biological theory that animal migrations were generally deleterious to *both* the migrating and the endemic species applied directly to his views on human immigration. He saw it daily in New York, just as Goethe saw it in the Mexican communities of Los Angeles and the border towns along the Rio Grande. It would be difficult to know which side of the equation – the human invasions or those in nature – informed the other

the most, but it is certainly clear that they were mutually reinforcing. Growing up in the fast-developing Sacramento valley, Goethe saw first-hand (and even to some extent as a younger man in his father's business dealings, participated in) the conversion of fertile, open territory into sprawling subdivisions. With an often idealized view of a former, pristine nature and a pure Nordic race, Grant and Goethe could only see invasions as "unnatural" and therefore deleterious.

Ironically, there is a converse side to the image of invasion. Conservationist/eugenicists such as Grant and Goethe, so worried about immigrant invasion into their own territory, were themselves seen as invaders by local constituents in areas hey had targeted for preservation. Environmental historians such as Louis Warren, Adam Rome and Benjamin Herbert Johnson have argued that the divide between local inhabitants and conservationists formed a major arena of class conflict in the early twentieth century (Warren, 1997; Johnson, 2003; Rome, 2008). Residents in and around national parks and forests saw *their* regions and traditional practices being invaded, and their livelihood threatened by outsiders from the federal and state governments or the likes of Boone and Crockett elites. Many of these local communities were composed of immigrants who had originally settled in various "wilderness" regions to eke out subsistence farming, or to work in local extractive or lumbering industries. According to their accounts, whether in the Adirondacks, Minnesota's Superior National Forest, or Yellowstone National Park, there was considerable resistance from local populations to restrictions imposed by conservation efforts. Locals saw the conservationists as foreigners, elitists, and bureaucrats insensitive to local practices and needs. The warfare was sometimes open, as game wardens and rangers were threatened or killed for attempting to stop poaching or logging (Rome, 2008, p. 435; Johnson, 2003, p. 192.) A great deal of the resistance to conservation reforms, and one that Gifford Pinchot repeatedly ran up against as Director of the National Forest Service, was the popular outcry of locals whose hunting and other activities on federal lands was to be curtailed.

A story of similar concerns about immigrant plant invasions in the early twentieth century was recounted a few years ago by Phil Pauly. In 1909 Japan presented to the United States 2,000 ornamental cherry trees as part of a "gentlemen's agreement" that Japan should cut off emigration to the United States (Pauly, 1996, p. 51). The trees were to replace a grove of American elms recently planted near the Washington Monument. Soon after the trees arrived in January, 1910, Charles L. Marlatt, then Acting Director of the Bureau of Entomology of the

USDA, found they were infested with crown and root gall, two kinds of scale insect and potentially new species of borer and six other dangerous insect species. Marlatt recommended that the entire shipment be burned, and despite the diplomatic awkwardness, President William Howard Taft acceded. As Pauly notes, the cherry trees were seen metaphorically as ''diseased organisms,'' ''foreign invaders'' coming to the United States from abroad, and thus fell victim to an ongoing debate about whether or not to quarantine all imported crops. By 1910 the parallel association of ''new immigrants'' with human disease was widespread.[37] Adding to the negative image, the Japanese cherry trees were described as ''effete and twisted,'' dwarfs unsuited to the open grandeur of the New World. To make matters worse, people noted that these new ''immigrant'' trees were slated to replace the stately, ''native'' American elms lining the Washington mall (Pauly, 1996, p. 54).[38] The comparison had a dramatic and chilling effect. As Pauly portrays it, the debates about ''restriction'' or ''open admission'' in immigration circles was parallel to the debate about quarantine or open importation of plant species within the USDA. Indeed, in both cases by the post World War I period, the restrictionist argument had prevailed.

What can we learn about current environmental initiatives from a detailed examination of the early twentieth-century association of the eugenics and conservation movements? First, both movements were actively pursued by elites and nativists based on a variety of fears about the changing world in which they lived: from the loss of big game animals and songbirds to the swamping of pioneer Nordic homogeneity by inferior immigrant germ plasm. As historian Louis S. Warren has commented: ''For all its accomplishments, conservation generally benefited the urban middle classes and rural elites at the expense of the rural poor.'' (Warren, 1997, p. 181) This elitism has carried over in muted form to later aspects of the environmental movement, into the 1970s and 1980s (and some might argue even into the twenty-first century). Face-offs after Earth Day between proponents of the spotted owl and lumber interests in the northwest, for example, however valid the eco-

[37] It was also in the early decades of the twentieth century that horticultural pests began to be designated by foreign names: Oriental Chestnut Blight, Gypsy Moth, Russian Thistle (tumbleweed), Mexican scale insect, and the ever-present Japanese Beetle.

[38] The current Japanese cherry trees around the Basin in Washington, are the descendants of a second shipment that was found by USDA agents to be pest-free, and were planted in 1912. This was also the same year that Congress passed the Plant Quarantine Act, giving the Federal Horticultural Board authority to exclude any plants thought to be potentially injurious to U.S. agriculture and horticulture.

logical message about the consequences of habitat destruction, retained remnants of that old dichotomy between the livelihood of local inhabitants and distant or elite conservationists. Current environmental advocates should be aware of this dynamic and develop an interactive approach in which local communities can be partners in, and not opponents of, conservation programs.

Second, the powerful metaphors in which both eugenic and conservationist language were cast can tell us something about the ways in which cultural conditions fashion our scientific interests and epistemologies. Images of uncontrolled immigrants as invading species bringing about destruction of the existing cultural environment (through interbreeding and spreading inferior mentality, disease, propensity for crime) easily translated into images of similarly uncontrolled industries, market hunters, and local poachers invading pristine wilderness. The interconnection between these metaphors and the formulation of ecological and conservationist concepts deserves more examination. It is curious to note, for example, that in current ecological literature one of the most central issues is that of ''invasive species'' – at just the time when we (in the United States) are immersed in the most extensive and vitriolic immigration debates since the 1920s. Whatever the exact connection, I suspect it is not mere coincidence, and as such might well deserve closer scrutiny.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Ron Rainger and Mark Largent for the invitation to present an early version of this paper at the Forum for the History of Science in America session at the History of Science Society meeting in Pittsburgh in 2008. I would like to thank the Humanities Center at Washington University for a Fellowship to begin the research on this project. Thanks also to Gregg Mitman for initial encouragement and some critical references, and to Tony Platt, who shared a number of very helpful ideas and sources as well as some of his published as well as unpublished writings on Charles M. Goethe. My Sacramento friends Dr. Jonathan Hake and Lianna Edwards, have been a source of continual encouragement on this project, shipping me the occasional articles that still appear about Goethe in the *Sacramento Bee*; Ben Hake, was a great help in my initial survey of the Goethe Papers at California State University, Sacramento. I am indebted to them all.

References

Adams, Mark B, Allen, Garland E, Weiss, Sheila F. 2005. "Human Heredity and Politics: A Comparative Institutional Study of the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor (United States), the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics (Germany), and the Maxim Gorky Medical Genetics Institute (USSR)." *Osiris (2nd Series)* 20: 232–262.

Allen, Garland E. 1986. "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910–1940. An Essay in Institutional History." *Osiris (2nd Series)* 2: 225–264.

—— 2004. "Heredity, Development, and Evolution at the Carnegie Institution of Washington." Jane Maienschein, Marie Glitz, and Garland E. Allen (eds.), *Centennial History of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Volume V: The Department of Embryology. Chapter 6*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Balogh, Brian. 2002. "Scientific Forestry and the Roots of the Modern American State." *Environmental History* 7(2): 198–225.

Brechin, Gray. 1996. "Conserving the Race: Natural Aristocracies, Eugenics and the U.S. Conservation Movement." *Antipode* 28: 229–245.

Brush, Stephen G. 1967. "Thermodynamics and History." *The Graduate Journal* 7(2, Spring): 477–565.

Chase, Allan. 1977. *The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Cronon, William (ed.). 1996. "The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature." W Cronon (ed.), *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton, pp. 69–90.

Dann, Kevin T. 2000. *Across the Great Border Fault: The Naturalist Myth in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Dann, Kevin T. and Mitman, Gregg. 1997. "Essay Review: Exploring the Borders of Environmental History and the History of Ecology." *Journal of the History of Biology* 30: 291–302.

Davenport, Charles B. 1910. *Eugenics*. New York:Henry Holt.

Galton, Francis. 1883. *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*. London, UK: Macmillan.

Goethe, Charles M. n.d. *Eugenics Pamphlets* (Eugenics Society of Northern California). Selected Numbers are Contained in the Goethe Archives at California State University, Sacramento, Box 20, Folder 1.

—— 1929. "The Influx of Mexican Amerinds." *Eugenics* 2(1, January): 6–9.

—— 1936. "Patriotism and Racial Standards." *Eugenical News* 21(4): 65–69.

—— 1946. *War Profits and Better Babies*. Sacramento: Keystone Press.

—— 1949. *Seeking to Serve*. Sacramento, CA: Keystone Press.

—— 1955. *Garden Philosopher*. Sacramento: Keystone Press.

Grant, Madison. 1894. "The Vanishing Moose and Their Extermination in the Adirondacks." *Century* 47: 345–356.

—— 1904. "The Origin and Relationship of the Large Mammals of North America." *Eighth Annual Report of the New York Zoological Society*: 182–207.

—— 1916. *The Passing of the Great Race, or the Racial Basis of European History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

—— 1920. "Saving the Redwoods." *National Geographic Magazine* 37(June): 519–536.

—— 1933. *The Conquest of a Continent, or the Expansion of Races in America*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Hassencahl, Frances. 1970. *Harry Hamilton Laughlin, Expert Eugenics Agent for the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 1921–1931*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University.

Hays, Samuel P. 1999 [1959]. *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency. The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890–1920*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Hellmer, A. 1934. "German Population and Race Politics." *Eugenical News* 19(2 March–April): 33–38.

Huntington, Ellsworth. 1935. *Tomorrow's Children: The Goal of Eugenics*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Johnson, Benjamin Heber. 2003. "Conservation, Subsistence, and Class at the Birth of Superior National Forest." Louis S Warren (ed.), *American Environmental History*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 181–199.

Keyserling, Hermann A. 1925. *The Travel Diary of a Philosopher*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Kühl, Stefan. 1994. *The Nazi Connection. Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Largent, Mark. 2008. *Breeding Contempt: The History of Coerced Sterilization in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Larson, Edward J. 1995. *Sex, Race, and Science: Eugenics in the Deep South*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Laughlin, Harry H. 1914. *Report of the Committee to Study and Report on the Best Practical Means of Cutting Off the Defective Germ Plasm in the American Population*. Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Eugenics Record Office Bulletin No. 10A.

Lovett, Laura L. 2007. *Conceiving the Future: Pronatalism, Reproduction, and the Family in the United States, 1890–1938*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Ludmerer, Kenneth. 1972. *Genetics and American Society*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mehler, Barry A. 1987. *A History of the American Eugenics Society, 1921–1940*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois.

Merchant, Carolyn. 1984. "Women of the Progressive Conservation Movement, 1900–1916." *Environmental Review, ER* 8(1): 57–85.

Paul, Diane B. 1995. *Controlling Human Heredity, 1865 to the Present*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Pauly, Philip J. 1996. "The Beauty and Menace of the Japanese Cherry Trees." *Isis* 87: 51–73.

Platt, Anthony M. 2004. "Saving the Redwoods: The Eugenic Connection." Unpublished Conference Paper.

—— 2007. "Ugly Side of Philanthropist Divides CSUS." *Sacramento Bee*. February 28, p. A1.

—— 2006. *Bloodlines: Recovering Hitler's Nuremberg Laws*, from *Patton's Trophy to Public Memorial*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Platt, Anthony M. and Stern, Alexandra Minna. 2007. "Shared Riches Bring Wealth of Baggage," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Sunday, June 10: E-3.

Rainger, Ronald. 1991. *Agenda for Antiquity: Henry Fairfield Osborn and Vertebrate Paleontology at the American Museum of Natural History, 1890–1935*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Regal, Brian. 2002. *Henry Fairfield Osborn: Race and the Search for the Origins of Man*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishers.

Reiger, John F. 1975. *American Sportsmen and the Origins of Conservation*. New York, NY: Winchester Press.
Ripley, William Z. 1899. *The Races of Europe, A Sociological Study*. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Co.
Rome, Adam. 2008. "Nature Wars, Culture Wars: Immigration and Environmental Reform in the Progressive Era." *Environmental History* 13: 432–453.
Roosevelt, Theodore, Grinnell, George Bird. 1893. *American Big-Game Hunting*. New York: Forest and Stream Publishing Co.
Roosevelt, Nicholas. 1970. *Conservation: Now or Never*. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead & Co.
Schauer, Andrew. 1976. "Charles Matthias Goethe, 1976–1967," Unpublished paper, Goethe Collection, California State University, Sacramento, Box 3, Folder 3.
Schoenl, William and Peck, Danielle. 2010. "Advertising Eugenics: Charles M. Goethe's Campaign to Improve the Race." *Endeavour* 34(2): 75–80.
Schrag, Peter. 2010. *Not Fit for Our Society: Nativism and Immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Schrepfer, Susan R. 1983. *The Fight to Save the Redwoods: A History of Environmental Reform, 1917–1978*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
Spiro, Jonathan. 2000. *Patrician Racist: The Evolution of Madison Grant*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
Spiro, Jonathan. 2009. *Defending the Master Race: Conservation, Eugenics, and the Legacy of Madison Grant*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press.
Stern, Alexandra. 2005. *Eugenic Nation: Faults & Frontiers of Better Breeding in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Warren, Louis S. 1997. *The Hunters' Game: Poachers and Conservationists in Twentieth Century America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Weiss, Sheila F. 2010a. *The Nazi Symbiosis: Human Genetics and Politics in the Third Reich*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
—— 2010b. "After the Fall: Political Whiteashing, Professional Posturing, and Personal Refashioning in the Postwar Career of Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer." *Isis* 101: 722–758.
Wiebe, Robert H. 1968. *The Search for Order 1877–1920*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
Young, Christian C. 2002. *In the Absence of Predators: Conservation and Controversy on the Kaibab Plateau*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
Zenderland, Leila. 1998. *Measuring Minds: H.H. Goddard and the Origins of American Intelligence Testing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Archival Sources

Charles M. Goethe Papers. MSS 1966/01 Department of Special Collections and University Archives, The Library, California State University, Sacramento (CSUS).
Harry Hamilton Laughlin Papers. Pickler Memorial Library, Truman State University, Kirksville, MO.