

finds that the group composed of exceptionally intelligent children "is made up almost entirely of children whose parents belong to the professional or very successful business classes. The child of a skilled labourer belongs here occasionally; the child of a common labourer very rarely indeed." (*Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. iii.) Dr. Tredgold says: "I do not think there is any doubt that, taken in the mass, the children of the professional classes show a relatively higher degree of educability than do those of the lower labouring classes." (Report of Second International Congress of Eugenics.) The reason of this apparently indisputable fact appears to be that the lowest social class includes not only its own unskilled workers but also the improvident, the incapable and the cast-offs from other grades of society, and that it loses gradually its own most capable members, who rise in the social scale. It is doomed therefore to remain the lowest class in the sense that it contains a large proportion of those who are inferior in vigour and in many of the desirable physical, mental and moral qualities. During the last century hopes have been entertained of improving this class by education and other changes in Environment, but slowly the preponderating influence of Heredity and the comparative futility of environmental changes are being recognised, and consequently the importance of actually reversing the present ratio of fertility. Karl Pearson and other biometricians prove from a vast number of observations on measurable physical and mental characteristics that "the influence of Environment is not one-fifth that of Heredity and quite possibly not one-tenth of it." (*Nature and Nurture*—Pearson.) This lowest class as a result largely of its average incapacity does not support its own members, and the fertility of the upper middle and skilled working class is handicapped in order to provide money by taxation for the support of the children of the less desirable! The high rate of birth in the lowest social class is therefore dysgenic.

Many social workers expected the problem would be solved by the introduction of artificial methods of conception control, assuming that those least able to support a family would most

readily avail themselves of the methods, but this hope has proved vain, for the poorest and most ignorant of the population have not shown the necessary intelligence and prudence to use the methods effectively, whereas they are increasingly used by people whose children would be a national asset. What the nation needs is limitation of the family in the case of its inferior stocks and greater productiveness among those of superior quality.

II. *Conception Control either voluntary or compulsory should eradicate certain heritable defects, probably dependent on a single Mendelian trait.*

The relative infertility of the upper classes, although perhaps the most serious, is not the only matter of anxiety from a eugenic point of view, for the propagation of the unfit is not confined to the lowest social class. So far conception control has been exercised as a matter of convenience rather than as a means of weeding out disease and defect, and the ideal of the production only of perfect children has not yet been accepted by society. The usual aim is still to provide a good environment in the vain hope that it will counteract the overpowering effect of heredity. Yet conception control properly applied either voluntarily or compulsorily could, in the opinion of many, cleanse the race in a few generations of many of the most terrible diseases and relieve it of a great financial burden. The study of heredity is still in its infancy, an immense amount of investigation is necessary before we can boast of much definite knowledge of the subject, yet we know a little and the ascertained facts may be summed up as follows:—Mental superiority and general capability are due to a complex heredity, but there are certain defects which appear to depend on the presence or absence of a single Mendelian trait.

Some are due to a dominant trait, e.g. Brachydactyly, and in these cases the defect is only transmitted by those manifesting it themselves. Other defects are sex-linked, the male alone manifesting the disease, the female alone transmitting it. Again the defect may be inherited as a Mendelian recessive trait, and in these cases it may be transmitted by those who do not themselves manifest it. If two people, both showing the defect, mate, the