very eugenicists who raved and ranted against the Nazi race theories and their "eugenic" practices are the very ones who belong to the same school of confusion. To the Nazis, the desirable characteristic to perpetuate was "Aryan-Nordic blood" (whatever that is) and to the eugenicists, it is "human values" (whatever *that* is).

We DO live in a class society. Social bias enters the picture. Huxley must recognize that it is the operation of social bias that determines what constitutes desirable traits. Capitalism thinks in terms of "adjustment" and of offspring *well-born* and adjustible to the status-quo. Essentially, eugenics is a capitalist concept. Instead of the horse breeder, agrobiologist, dairy expert, it is the ruling class that decides what type of offspring they desire. The very illustration Huxley uses is a powerful demonstration of eugenics "in practice," were it possible, which it isn't. He asserts that Russia has great need for breeding "the rare qualities of born leaders." What he is really saying is that there is a great need for the Russian bureaucratic dictatorship to impose their will upon the Russian masses and they must have persuasive propagandists to try to convince the Russian population of the superiority of the USSR.

The acid test of "superiority" is success. The eugenicists proposal seeks to assure the predominance of successful people. But, success is a SOCIAL relationship and not a biological one. In a capitalist world, the ingredients of success are callousness, craftiness, and similar virtues. Maybe, these are not the virtues some eugenicists desire, so what can they do about it? It is but another indication of the shallowness and fallacy of eugenics.

UNSCIENTIFIC

On its own merits, eugenics is unscientific and invalid.

Biologically, evolution, is relatively slow. Man's evolution, as distinct from lower animals and plants, does not take place in his inherited physical equipment but in his tools and mode of production. At most, under favorable conditions, there are but four generations per century, altogether too small a period for conspicuous genetic changes. But to make bad matters worse, we have never been informed what is the quality which is to be transmitted or if there are genes for that desired quality. After all, man is quite a complexity of characteristics. Man is not just an egg-layer, nor just a milch cow, nor just a wool bearer. Observe well, eugenicists have not the audacity to state *what* is the character that should be bred.

True as it is that the variations in genetic structure are quite noticeable in similar environments, it is far more predominant that variations in the environment conceal or minimize the differences in genetic structure. Of special importance is the study of identical twins.** In spite of having the *same* genetic inheritances, the differences in behavior, character, ideas, etc. were traceable to the childrens' environment. Man has an "abnormal range of genetic variability," Huxley shows. It runs the entire gamut of every conceivable type of physical, chemical, glandular, etc. differences. This vast variability is NOT distributed among humans according to social or ethnic groups. The number of possible genetic combinations at the moment of fertilization are so astronomical, that there are no guarantees for the prediction of the exact genetic structure of the offspring. Thus, the eugenicist is stymied. Huxley must recognize that "it is no longer legitimate to attribute the observed differences in physique and intelligence between social classes to genetic factors." He shows that vitamins and other accessory food factors have physical and mental effects far transcending inherited differences.

No wonder, Huxley exposes the "overbelievers" in eugenics. In spite of his endorsement of Dean Inge's avowal that eugenics should be "the most sacred ideal of the human race," he admits that the social environment is by far more important and is outside the control of the eugenicist (see page 32) and that the present social behavior is the resultant of property and class society. Huxley has shown the inadequacy of eugenics.

Huxley is not a socialist (i. e., a social scientist) but he is scientific enough to be aware that changes in the social environment are needed for the realization of "eugenic progress." He has abandoned the advocacy of eugenics, in essence. He is saying that what is needed is a new society.

When man solves the problem of capitalism, the need for the theory of eugenics will have vanished; then, at long last, a healthy, happy, useful community of human beings will become a reality and not an ideal.

REBEL

**The reader is urged to visit the Public Library for the Rockefeller Foundation studies on identical twins conducted by Yale University.

From Our Mail-Box

[Continued from page 2]

British Honduras; another member has gone to England; the Governor, too, has left to interview the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Yet the report has not been released. Meanwhile we learn that the Secretary of State has appointed a two man Commission to investigate the whole sugar industry. They have not yet left England.

"Although they have gone back to work, one can see the grim determination in the faces of the workers on the sugar plantations. I am of the opinion that as soon as the time is ripe, they will walk out again.

"The 'class warfare' campaign is dormant for the time being, since hardly any public meetings are held. They were held every night in Georgetown, the capital city, during the sugar estates strike, much to the disgust of the governor and his henchmen. On one occasion he stepped down from his pedestal to inform the public that what was said at one of the meetings — that he was siding with the sugar lords — was not true.

"The Legislative Council, comprising of 25 members (14 elected by the people, 7 nominated by the Governor and three ex-officio, with the Governor as president) recently rejected a motion for universal adult sufferage and self government. The motion was lost 9-7. Two members (Africans) of the Br. Guiana Labour Party, a committee of self-styled leaders, voted against the motion although it was introduced by the leader of the Party. The Party has six members in the Council. The reason for the loss of this motion is that the Negro section is afraid of Indian domination and the Indians, too, being afraid of African domination are being spurred on by their Indian leaders to vote race. I believe that Great Britain is very glad of this setup which is almost certain to lead to serious war between the two major groups. It gives it a longer chance to hold the people in slavery."

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DEBATING SOCIETY — Cambridge, Mass. — **"The M.I.T. Debating Society would be pleased to debate representatives of the World Socialist Party on some topics concerning Socialism versus Capitalism ..." The tentative subject: "Has Capitalism Outlived Its Social Usefulness." (The debate will take place at M.I.T. on Wednesday, Dec. 15th, at 5 P.M.)**

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DEBATING COUNCIL — Cambridge, Mass. — **"The Harvard Debating Council accepts the challenge of the WSP to debate. Subject: 'Can Capitalism Provide Economic Security.' The debate will take place at Harvard Univ. on Sunday, Nov. 28th at 8 P.M."**

TUFTS COLLEGE FORENSIC COUNCIL — TUFTS COLLEGE, Medford, Mass. — **"The Tufts College Debating Society and Forensic Council would be very pleased to stage a debate with you on the topic of Socialism versus Capitalism. We have some debaters who are very much interested in the question and I am sure that it would be a stimulating evening. We would prefer to hold the debate at the Old South Meeting House, and then, if you wish, have a return bout here at Tufts on Dec. 10th."**

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD
OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN
12 Issues $1.00 **6 Issues $0.50**
Sample copy free on request. — Literature Agent, 27 Dock Square, Boston 8, Mass.