

January 3, 1986

To the Editor:

With reference to the article by Lynton Caldwell in the February 1985 issue of *PLS*, and the commentary on it written jointly by myself and Marian Van Court and published in the August 1985 issue, I have to report that the "neo-eugenics movement," to whose reappearance in this country Dr. Caldwell makes reference, is now dead. As former co-editor of *The Eugenics Bulletin*, as the person largely responsible for its financing during the last one-and-one-half years of its existence, and as Executive Officer of its sponsoring group, the Eugenics Special Interest Group, I must notify you that the publication is now defunct, and that the organization, a Special Interest Group of Mensa, passed out of existence in March 1986, will have no connection with Mensa as of that date, and therefore no right to use the ESIG name nor to copyright material in that name.

With regard to the prospects for a revival of the eugenics movement in the U.S. and the so-called "Free World," it is my well-considered conclusion that the Zeitgeist prevailing in that world renders such a development more improbable with each passing day. Where, however, I do see definite signs of a revival of eugenics, are in some of the so-called "Iron Curtain" countries, particularly in "East" (Central) Germany, Poland, and the Soviet Union, as well as in mainland China. Having finally abandoned Lysenkoism, a modified form of which now prevails in the West (so far as humans are concerned), and being much more pragmatic in these matters—rather than drowning in a pernicious flood of egalitarianism and environmental determinism which will irrevocably determine Spengler's Decline of the West—these nations can be expected to utilize to the fullest the most potent weapon in their hands for the genetic improvement of their peoples, i.e., eugenics. In 1984, for example, a collection of essays on eugenics written from the classic Galtonian perspective, with contributions from "East" German and Soviet scientists, was published in "East" Germany. Such a book could never even find a major publisher in the "Free" World. Many other examples could be provided to illustrate my point. Eugenics has been a pariah cause since 1945 in the Western

world, largely for reasons pointed out in my article "Eugenics and the Third Reich" in the final (Winter 1985) issue of *The Eugenics Bulletin*.

— Stephen B. Saetz

To the Editor:

I should like to explain how and why a biopolitical interpretation of many of the findings of my two-volume field study (reviewed elsewhere in this issue of *Politics and the Life Sciences*) of the impact of political subcultures on elite decision-making got there. Only in Switzerland was it possible to make a direct observational study of the making of decisions by judges in public courtrooms; and no doubt that aspect of the research will be of special interest to readers of this Journal (and see Schubert, 1983).

Both volumes freely acknowledge that my biopolitical insight at the time the research was designed was confined to an understanding that direct observational research on most of Swiss court panels of judges should be possible (Morrison, 1969) and ought to be attempted using Bales' (1950, 1970) theory of small group interaction. Once that research was initiated in the form of field pilot observations of a few panels, I realized the importance of including an ethological-theory-based concept and variable of physiological arousal, premised on direct observations of postural variations in judicial bodily behavior during the discussion and decision of cases. Hence my use of the method of direct field observation of small political group decision-making was part of the design, and the extension of the use of it to include the study of judicial arousal was added during the early period of testing the method prior to the collection of the substantive observational data reported in *Volume II*. Many years later, while composing the revised drafts that appear now as *Volumes I* and *II*, I did not hesitate to employ the biopolitical perspective and theory that I had acquired during the 70s and 80s, subsequent to the field research underlying both books; but such interpretations—as exemplified by my discussion of human development in relation to political socialization (I:224-6) or

of the implications of brain lateralization for social communication among judges arrayed linearly in their seating at a bench (//:157-60)—are postdictional interpretations of data convenient for their elucidation.

Although I and II attempt the most complete report drawn from the underlying research project, it is still only a partial one. This work should therefore be viewed in the context of the other nine publications that precede (Schubert, 1977a, 1977b, 1977c, 1980, 1981, 1982) or follow it (Schubert, in press; forthcoming; under consideration), as additional and alternative interpretations of its subject.

_____ (forthcoming). "The Political and Social Role of Judges: South Africa and Switzerland." In J. Schmidhauser (ed.), *Comparative Legal and Judicial Elites*.

_____ (under consideration). "Judicial Attributes/Roles/Attitudes and Political Subcultures: A Cross-Cultural and Causal Analysis." (Submitted to a political science journal.)

— Glendon Schubert

References

Bales, R. F. (1950). *Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

_____ (1970). *Personality and Interpersonal Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Morrison, F. (1969). "The Swiss Federal Court: Judicial Decision Making and Recruitment." In J. B. Grossman and J. Tanenhaus (eds.), *Frontiers of Judicial Research*. New York: John Wiley, pp. 133-162.

Schubert, G. (1977a). *Comparative Judicial Study: Switzerland and South Africa*. ICPSR 7365, Class II Data-Archive Study; Ann Arbor, Mich.: Box 1248. Revised 1981.

_____ (1977b). "Political Culture and Judicial Ideology: Some Cross and Sub-Cultural Comparisons." *Comparative Political Studies* 10:363-408.

_____ (1977c). *Political Attitudes and Ideologies: A Cross-Cultural Interdisciplinary Approach*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: SAGE.

_____ (1980). "Subcultural Effects on Judicial Behavior: A Comparative Analysis." *Journal of Politics* 42:951-992.

_____ (1981). *Comparative Judicial Study: Switzerland and South Africa*. Codebook for Data-Archive Study 7365. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research. Revised edition.

_____ (1982). "Nonverbal Communication as Political Behavior." In M. R. Key (ed.), *Nonverbal Communication Today: Current Research*. Berlin: Mouton, pp. 69-85.

_____ (in press). "Subcultures and Judicial Background: A Cross-Cultural Analysis." In J. Schmidhauser (ed.), *Comparative Judicial Studies*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: IPSA/SAGE.