

Report on the Role of Eugenics in the History of UCL

September 2019

Dr Maria Kiladi

Sources for historical research in the role of Eugenics in the History of UCL.

The historical sources at UCL that provide information on the role of Eugenics in the history of the institution can be broadly divided in two categories: Those belonging to UCL Special Collections, and those which are part of the Records Office. The Records Office material is also part of Special Collections the last few years, though it is managed by a different team, headed by Mr Colin Penman. There are very significant differences between the two collections. The historical material for this inquiry (by this I mean papers and archives of the individuals involved in eugenics and UCL, such as Francis Galton and Karl Pearson) has been thoroughly catalogued and digitised, while the Records Office material (which includes more modern records of the College) has not received much attention in this respect and remains catalogued at a very basic level. Its catalogue is not online, and my understanding is that it exists only in lists. Naturally, this makes it very difficult to explore, though it should be stressed that staff at the Records Office is incredibly helpful and ready to assist with any queries regarding the material.

On the other hand, the more 'traditional' Special Collections material is not only online and catalogued down to the last detail, but also digitised online, both at our UCL catalogues, but also as part of the Codebreakers Project that took place a few years ago between UCL Special Collections and the Wellcome Trust. As a result, this part of the material used for this inquiry is easier to navigate and to request, particularly from historians who are more familiar with archival research. It is also the part of the archive that provided the bulk of the material for this research.

The main collections to focus for this inquiry are: the Galton Papers, (GALTON), with material from 1612 to 1926; the Karl Pearson papers (PEARSON), 1840 to 1972; the Galton Laboratory Records (GALTON LABORATORY), 1825 to 1998; the L S Penrose Papers (PENROSE), 1806 to 1974; the Haldane Papers (HALDANE), 1933-1964, Egon Sharpe Pearson Papers (E S PEARSON), 1584-1980. Other minor collections include MS ADD 233 (containing a single record of University College London, Galton Laboratory); Biometrika Trust (BIOMETRIKA TRUST), containing a single record of Biometrika Trust Records (1901-1935, one box of material).

Material selected from the Records Office is slightly more complicated. I have been provided by the Head of the Collection with a list of material that might be relevant for this research and have identified records from there. The Records Office material consists of records that in a way complement those of Special Collections listed above (for example, material related to Karl Pearson and buildings) but also to more modern material for the Galton Laboratory's history. Because of the nature of some of the material at the Records Office, it is probably best to keep some of it at least closed and inaccessible to the public, as it raises serious GDPR issues. There are, for example, records of bursaries and scholarships given under the Galton Laboratory in the 1990s, complete with the names of individuals who received the funding. I have been able to identify every single one of them, and I think these records should be handled with more confidentiality than the 'historical' records that go back to Pearson's time.

Having seen material from the list that the Records Office has provided me, I think it is quite clear that there is a wealth of information about the most recent years of the Galton Laboratory (and indeed on anything that has to do with eugenics and UCL as an institution) which unfortunately will remain inaccessible, unless the archivists have enough resources to work on it. Our Records Office contains the 'operational' files of the College, including information about buildings, departments and staff. Ideally, we would want this part of the archive sorted and catalogued (possibly even digitised) as soon as possible, to ensure the material is open and available to the public for research, especially when it comes to research in UCL's institutional history (and not just in relation to eugenics). It will provide a vital link to the past and will further clarify the institution's links to eugenics. This, however, can only be done with the provision of appropriate funds, that would allow the team to employ enough people/archivists to work on the collection, and ideally have it catalogued online, in the same manner that Special Collections has its material online (hopefully, digitised too).

Dividing the Archives in Themes.

It should be stressed that dividing the existing catalogued archives in themes, is not cataloguing them anew, nor should we seek to recommend a different way of cataloguing. As with any historical research, a historian will *have* to divide material in themes in order to be able to identify emerging themes and produce a historical study. It was a practice that I myself have used while a PhD student in Historical Musicology, working on socialist and communist choirs of the 1920s and 1930s, with archives ranging from political party archives, music archives and secret services files. In this sense, the study for this inquiry

was a bit less complicated, as the focus was at UCL's archives and records, though I have studied other archives that provided information about the institution's work (such as the University of London Archives). I would therefore advise against any suggestion that archives should be re-catalogued, as the themes that emerged reflect this study: Another historian could use the same archives but draw different themes. Similarly, it should also be pointed out that some of the archival material could easily fit in two or even three different themes. The division therefore should not be taken as a way of dividing the already catalogued archives, but as a guide in what kind of material each collection contains – and as a way of others finding easier their way into our collections.

I have worked very closely with the archivist, Ms Katy Makin, in finding the best possible way to work on dividing the archives in themes, and given my Digital Humanities background, I was very interested in finding a way to use digital means for that – such as work from XML files, work with Python programming language as a way of 'mining' themes out of the archives. This was not so much as a way of reducing the amount of time required for this task, but also to reduce the possibility of an error through copying material from our Special Collections website. Both me and Ms Makin agreed early on that unfortunately our public catalogue is a bit difficult to use, particularly when a historian is working on identifying themes. Ms Makin had tried to generate XML and HTML reports from our cataloguing software (CALM), which however did not work according to plan. The extent of our collections caused the software to crash while generating the reports we needed, and after a few attempts, I decided I had to find alternative ways of working.

A further problem was the complexity of material which made it not ideal for text mining. It became clear that it is best to be able to see the description of each record and decide whether it signifies something for eugenics or biometry. Further attempts to use other means of dividing the archives (NVivo) also failed. This was mainly because we could not produce a file that could work with NVivo well (mainly because CALM was crashing) and all other options would mean additional work that could delay everything (for example, working with a text editor to 'clean' the data before importing it to NVivo). In the end, it became clear that it was probably better to work from our public catalogue, simply copying and pasting information to Excel spreadsheets, even though this was probably the most time-consuming way of working.

Though originally I had envisaged the archives to be divided in set themes (Eugenics, Biometry, Anthropometry etc) it became clear as I was going through each collection that there are other interesting themes that need to be highlighted, at least at this stage. The Haldane collection for example has material on his communist affiliations which I

thought was quite important to highlight. This of course is not a theme in any other collection I used for this study. At the same time, and having done historical research on eugenics the last few months, I became convinced that the part of the archive that gives us information about the scientist is also important (for example, the section of the archive that is normally catalogued as 'Family papers'), as it gives us vital clues about who the scientist behind the science was. I felt this was an important part of this eugenics inquiry, in the sense that separating 'the man from his science' creates more Galtons and Pearsons. Pearson's personality for example explains a lot about the laboratory's 'success' – this was someone who did not accept any criticism, who did not speak to those friends who dared question him about his biometric methods, who did not allow students to voice concerns about scientific research in the lab, who published only in his own journals that he controlled heavily. Is this not an important part of his science, I wondered? Does this not say a lot about the kind of science he was doing, of the lengths to which he was willing to go to have his science published? Does this not say something about his scientific methods – completely cut off from any criticism that could have challenged him and his methods, or even discredit them?

For these reasons, I have decided to divide the entire archival collections as they appear online, and not exclude or ignore parts of it as irrelevant. Given the extent of our collections but also the very limited time I had at my disposal to complete this study for the inquiry, it was impossible to go down to as much detail as I would have liked when it comes to how I am listing records. For instance, it would have been much better if I could have also indicated the extent of each record (i.e. how many boxes each record represents) or a full description of what it is rather than just the record's title. I have worked from the tree structure of the catalogue, which looks like this:

Record hierarchy

« Collapse	GALTON LABORATORY	Title Galton Laboratory Records Date1 1825-1998 Level Collection RefNo GALTON LABORATORY
Expand »	1	Title Galton Laboratory Business Papers Date1 1906-1979 Level Series RefNo GALTON LABORATORY/1
Expand »	2	Title Galton Laboratory Research Working Papers Date1 Late 19th Century Level Series RefNo GALTON LABORATORY/2
« Collapse	3	Title Galton Laboratory Publications Date1 1825-1933 Level Series RefNo GALTON LABORATORY/3
Expand »	1	Title 'Annals of Human Genetics' Date1 1922-1971 Level SubSeries RefNo GALTON LABORATORY/3/1
No records below this level	2	Title 'Treasury of Human Inheritance' Date1 1908-1911 Level File RefNo GALTON LABORATORY/3/2
No records below this level	3	Title Other Galton Laboratory Publications Date1 1906-1927 Level File RefNo GALTON LABORATORY/3/3
No records below this level	4	Title Printing Blocks and Copper Plates Date1 c1825-1832 Level File

The descriptions I took for the finding aid are from this webpage and include the details from the records as seen here: Title, Date, Level and Reference number. There is quite a lot of difference between listing a record from the tree structure, than listing it from its Full View. Taking as an example the GALTON LABORATORY/3/3 record in the screenshot above. It is at the lowest level of the record hierarchy (item) with no other records below this level. Clicking on the number next to it (3) opens a different webpage that gives more details (Full View) about the items of this record:

Full view of record

Click on the RefNo link to view the record's hierarchy.

First Prev **Record: 1 of 1** Next Last

Print

RefNo GALTON LABORATORY/3/3
Title Other Galton Laboratory Publications
Date1 1906-1927
StorageSite UCL Special Collections
Level File
Extent 1 box
Description Consists of offprints from the Eugenics Laboratory Lecture Series, issued by the Galton Laboratory. Contains numbers 1-6, 8, and 12-14, and report of the City of Edinburgh Charity Organisation Society on physical condition of school children. Publication details of the lecture series are listed below in number order:

- 'The Scope and Importance to the State of the Science of National Eugenics' by Karl Pearson, 3rd edition, (London: Dulau and Co., 1911), lecture originally delivered as the fourteenth Robert Boyle Lecture before the Oxford University Junior Science Club, 17 May 1907. Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 1;
- 'The Groundwork of Eugenics' by Karl Pearson, 2nd edition, (London: Dulau and Co., 1912), derived from two lectures delivered as an introduction to a course on the Science of National Eugenics at the Galton Laboratory, 23 February and 2 March 1909. Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 2;
- 'The Relative Strength of Nurture and Nature' by Ethel M Elderton and Karl Pearson, 2nd edition, (London: Dulau and Co., 1915), based on statistical material in Galton Laboratory Memoirs 5 and 8. Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 3;
- 'On the Marriage of First Cousins' by Ethel M Elderton, (London: Dulau and Co., 1911). Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 4;
- 'The Problem of Practical Eugenics' by Karl Pearson, 2nd edition, (London: Dulau and Co., 1912), derived from the final lecture of a course on the Science of National Eugenics delivered at the Galton Laboratory, 25 May 1909. Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 5;
- 'Nature and Nurture: The Problem of the Future' by Karl Pearson, 2nd edition, (London: Dulau and Co., 1913). Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 6;
- 'Tuberculosis, Heredity and Environment' by Karl Pearson, (London: Dulau and Co., 1912). Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 8;
- 'The Function of Science in a Modern State' by Karl Pearson, 2nd edition, (London: Dulau and Co., 1919), paper first published in 1902 as a prefatory essay to volume 32 of the tenth edition of 'Encyclopaedia Britannica'. Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 12;
- 'Side Lights on the Evolution of Man, being a lecture delivered at The Royal Institution, Friday, May 14, 1920' by Karl Pearson, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1921). Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 13;
- 'The Right of the Unborn Child, being a lecture delivered on November 13 1926 to teachers from the London County Council Schools' by Karl Pearson, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1927). Eugenics Laboratory Lecture number 14.

Also contains a copy of the City of Edinburgh Charity Organisation Society 'Report on the Physical Condition of Fourteen Hundred School Children in the City', (London: P S King & Son, 1906), annotated 'Francis Galton Laboratory' on inside of front cover

Repository GB 0103
AccessStatus Open
AccessConditions The papers are available subject to the usual conditions of access to Archives and Manuscripts material, after the completion of a Reader's Undertaking
ReproductionConditions Photocopies/photographs/microfilm are supplied for private research only at the Archivist's discretion. Please note that material may be unsuitable for copying on conservation grounds, and that photographs cannot be photocopied in any circumstances. Researchers who wish to publish material must seek copyright permission from the copyright owner.
CatalogueStatus Catalogued

Ideally, I would have liked to include the details from the Full View record, particularly the 'Description' part of it. This however was incredibly time-consuming, especially when one collection can easily have as many as 6,000 records. For this reason I listed records from the 'Record Hierarchy' view, where details are still given, but the user/researcher will have to click on the record for its full view.

I have listed the records at the lowest level possible (item) in the majority of themes, at least those that are very relevant to this inquiry (eugenics, biometry, anthropometry etc) but used a higher hierarchy level (SubSeries or File) particularly with family papers. In cases where one record had 200 items listed individually on our catalogue, I indicated that on the guide, essentially not to copy 200 different records on the spreadsheet. In any case, I consider this guide only as a starting point for a research in eugenics and UCL; it is not designed as a replacement of our catalogue, but as an aid to find records in our catalogue and collections. As a result I did not think it was appropriate to give that level of detail. Much of the work for a research in eugenics, anthropometry or biometry, will have to be done by the researcher, and this was the point of this finding aid. For this reason I also included a detailed account of how to use our online catalogue, complete with screenshots, to enable researchers to use my finding aid along with our online catalogue.

Sources outside UCL for the historical research in eugenics.

As well as UCL Special Collections and our Records Office material, there are other archives in London and abroad that can potentially provide a wealth of information about the role of eugenics in the history of UCL. The University of London Central Files is one of them. The University's archive catalogue can be found online at <https://archives.libraries.london.ac.uk/Details/archive/110015694> . The Archive is divided in various categories, divided in PDF documents that can be downloaded and explored. Essentially my work with this archive was more exploratory – in the sense that I requested material just hoping I will find information about the Galton Laboratory or UCL.

Of much interest are the archives from the Central File (CF 1/5) which appear to have information on the Galton Laboratory (1659), but also on UCL (275). The PDF documents are searchable, and the material can be requested for viewing. There is hardly any doubt that the University of London also has material on financial information about UCL (and possibly the workings of the Galton Laboratory) but I have been unable to identify it due to the lack of time. I have requested material from the University's financial committee files (FG 1) but inexplicably only one item was found (FG 1/1/4) which contained material from the university's Finance and General purposes committee minutes for years 1904 and 1905.

In it, an instalment to Karl Pearson (of £250.0.0) was recorded for the year 1904, described as 'the last instalment of grant', implying that there were more of them in the year(s) before 1904. I was advised by the archives team of the University of London (Senate House) to request the items again and this time follow through with enquiries as to what happened to the items I requested – something that I am planning to do later in October, particularly as I will still be working on eugenics.

Other archives in UK and abroad relevant to this study.

A number of other archives and collections could provide information about the Galton Laboratory history. The ones I have identified as having (or potentially having) material are:

- The Royal Society: <https://royalsociety.org/collections/catalogue-search/> I have visited them and have talked to members of staff from their Library, who subsequently have provided me with reports from their cataloguing software on the individuals involved in the Galton Laboratory. The Royal Society also has material on grants given to scientists, which also included Karl Pearson. More research is needed in their collection.
- The Drapers' Company Archive: <https://www.thedrapers.co.uk/Company/History-And-Heritage.aspx> The Archive is not online, so any requests have to go through the archivist. I have not identified material in this archive, but given that the Company has been giving funding to Pearson, it is very likely that they have records of this.
- University of Adelaide, Fisher Papers: <https://www.adelaide.edu.au/library/special/mss/fisher/> The collection appears to be digitised.
- University of Pennsylvania, Harry Harris Papers: <https://archives.upenn.edu/collections/finding-aid/upt50h313>. Harry Harris essentially succeeded Penrose as Galton Professor and Galton Laboratory director, a position where he remained until 1976 when he joined the University of Pennsylvania.
- Royal Geographical Society: https://rgs.koha-ptfs.co.uk/cgi-bin/koha/opac-search.pl?idx=kw&q=galton&sort_by=pubdate_dsc&limit=au:Galton,%20Francis. Material related to Galton.

Other collections that might include material on UCL and eugenics include:

- The Royal Institution: <https://www.rigb.org/>

I was notified about a collection on eugenics journals, but was also told that it is uncatalogued.

- Lotherton Hall: <https://museumsandgalleries.leeds.gov.uk/lotherton/>

I was told about a collection of letters recently received that might include letters by Galton. The collection is unsorted, and unlikely to include scientific material.

During the course of this study, it became clear that Galton's anthropometric laboratory was not the only one set up in the country. Instead, three other laboratories were set up, in Trinity Dublin, Eton College and University of Cambridge. I have been unable to identify anything in their collections (and did not have much time to expand on collections outside UCL) but it is quite likely that they have something in their collections on that.

Of interest would also be the Wellcome Trust Codebreakers project (<https://wellcomelibrary.org/collections/digital-collections/makers-of-modern-genetics/>) which also includes digitised material from UCL Special Collections (Galton, Penrose and Haldane Collections) as well as material on the Eugenics Education Society.

UCL and its connection to Eugenics.

As part of my work with the committee I have submitted two different research reports, detailing the beginnings of what became the Galton Laboratory at UCL. One of my reports detailed the anthropometric laboratory which Galton set up in 1884 as part of the Health Exhibition that took place that year and questioned its success. Evidently, the success of the laboratory in that exhibition was not so much Galton's success (i.e. of the popularity that anthropometry had) but more the result of Galton's connection to the Exhibition's set up: His cousin, the successful engineer Douglas Galton was part of the Exhibition's organising committee. Galton's laboratory was set up right at the entrance of the exhibition, facing the dining rooms that no doubt millions of people would have used. I also highlighted in that report the significance of the laboratory's structure – the lattice wall that allowed outsiders to peek through and questioned how Galton's space differ from other exhibitors. Certainly more research is needed, but it proved the point that the context of a successful laboratory can actually say a lot about the laboratory's success and as a result should not be ignored.

In a similar manner I questioned the Galton laboratory's success. My research report on the early years of the laboratory proved that there was a wider network of support on eugenics, and eugenics at UCL was not something that happened in isolation. I highlighted the significance of the Eugenics Education Society and its contribution to the Mental

Deficiency Act of 1913, but above all the debates that Pearson's scientific work generated, particularly with William Bateson, and how these were handled by Pearson. Having seen primary and secondary sources on the Galton Laboratory, I don't feel that the scientific objections to the Laboratory's work (and publications) has been taken into account, and this is an aspect of the laboratory's context that needs to be explored further. Equally, having studied the available sources, it becomes clear that eugenics (and by this I mean also eugenics outside UCL, in the form of the Eugenics Education Society) became the main scientific argument for discrimination that survives to this day. I feel that it is only through re-examining the validity of those scientific arguments, that we can start deconstructing inequalities, and for this reason more research is needed in the work that the laboratory was doing and its scientific context.

From the sources I have seen so far, UCL as an institution does not appear to have an active involvement in Eugenics. It is clear that the Galton Laboratory was the brainchild of Karl Pearson, who appears to almost have created a 'cult' around Francis Galton. The relationship between the two men I think is very important. Galton could not have had his name in a university at the point when qualifications were important for a scientist; Pearson could not have had enough resources (money) to have a laboratory that would enable him to avoid the much-hated teaching. It is almost as if the two of them took advantage of each other: Galton took advantage of Pearson's status at UCL to get his name in an institution, while Pearson took advantage of Galton's money to create the Laboratory. I highlighted in one of my research reports the significance of Pearson suggesting the Francis Galton Laboratory for the Study of National Eugenics. It was almost like ensuring that Galton would fund a project that connects his name to national activity in eugenics. In this case, as was in the case of the laboratory's predecessor, the Eugenics Records Office, UCL's involvement was restricted to providing rooms.

In fact, I have pointed out in my research report that the initial suggestion for the Eugenics Records Office was at the University of London which found rooms at UCL. Galton made the first donation in 1904 to form the Eugenics Records Office, and the money was accepted. Soon after, in 1906, with Edgar Schuster's departure, a second donation was made by Galton this time to fund the Francis Galton Laboratory. With his death in 1911, a significant sum was left for the laboratory to continue its work. At the same time, the Worshipful Company of Drapers was funding Karl Pearson's Biometric Laboratory already from 1903. All these might answer the question of 'why did UCL support eugenics'. Pearson's eugenics and biometric laboratories were supported by money coming in (from Galton, from the Drapers Company) and was seen as successful because of the number of people Pearson managed to employ. I have pointed out in my research reports the

significance of employing women who were paid significantly less than male members of staff, and how this helped Pearson in projecting the image of a successful laboratory. In this sense, at least in the early years of the Galton laboratory's existence, UCL appears to have been completely passive: It was more a laboratory left to Pearson to develop, though this in no way excuse the institution's passivity – which supported in this way the development of the science of discrimination.

It is quite unfortunate that due to the very limited amount of time for this study, I have been unable to focus much more on the years after Pearson. In any case, from what I've seen so far in primary and secondary sources, after Pearson the Galton Laboratory appears to be in decline, which probably support my theory that the Galton Laboratory was essentially Pearson's 'pet project' and was there to serve him and his ideas. At the same time, developments in genetics should be taken into account as they too could explain how some of the ideas of the laboratory could have become outdated (and no doubt more research is needed in this respect). Fisher takes over, but he does not appear to have shared the same passion that Pearson had for his laboratory. By the time Penrose took over (1944) the laboratory begins to disassociate itself from the term 'eugenics'. From a historian's point of view, it would be interesting to see the type of research produced under the laboratory at that point, but also the kind of objections this research raised.

The Galton Laboratory appears to have survived until the 1990s. After Penrose retired in 1965, Harry Harris takes over as Head of the Department of Human Genetics and Biometry, Galton Professor and Galton Laboratory Director, a position he holds until 1976 when he resigned. Elizabeth (Bette) Robson takes over in 1978 until 1994 when her directorship ends. The Galton Professor of Genetics becomes a position unfilled for 15 years and re-appears again in 2009 with Nicholas Wood.

Funds

Tracing the funds for the Galton laboratory was a quite elaborate process, and in most cases not very successful. Ledgers of the Eugenics Records Office are available from the Records Office, while on the Galton Laboratory some of the ledgers survive at Special Collections. The accounts/ledgers I've seen so far did not contain anything questionable, as they detailed mainly salaries for staff, furniture, books etc. Other financial information is probably included in the records of the University of London, which I will be following up in the next few weeks. Probably the most interesting financial files when it comes to the laboratory are two files that I found at the Records Office, described as Galton Laboratory Bursaries (WD 34577, 116/6/5/1) and Galton Laboratory Research Studentships (WD

34577, 116/6/5). Both files documented scholarships and bursaries given from the Galton Laboratory for the period between 1990 and 1995. Both are very detailed – the students who received the money are easily identifiable.

Though in neither of them are there any indications as to what kind of research was conducted with the money given, it seems unlikely that it was in eugenics. In fact the majority of Research Studentships were given as a 'Joint Galton Laboratory and Quest Cancer Test Studentship', implying a completely different type of research. The most interesting perhaps part of the files are the funding codes, which to me imply that can be followed through with Finance: These are FH 69 8 W2 and FH 69 8 W1. At this stage (during the 1990s) it is probably clear that the Galton Laboratory survives more like a funding code, as a budget item for the University, though of course research was still taking place in the room where it was housed. It would be interesting to follow these through and check for how many years they have been given, as the files I found at the Records Office are unique (there are no files before or after these years, and to me this implies that they were listed by the Records Office for the committee as a way of demonstrating the kind of material that the Records Office has on eugenics and UCL). Equally interesting would be to liaise more with Records Office and identify more files on funds if possible.

Another file from the Records Office that gave some insight into the funding of the Galton Laboratory was a file on anonymous donations (GO 464, 29977). The file contained information from the late 1950s and early 1960s, and detailed funding coming from organisations such as the Rockefeller Foundation (donating \$43,500 for 5 years from January 1961 for Eugenics, Biometry and Genetics, for Research in Human Genetics). A string of anonymous donations (of £250 each year) was provided on a yearly basis from 1955 to 1961 by the Charities Aid Fund, specifically given for 'purchase of apparatus or books, travelling expenses of research workers, remuneration for technical assistance'. In this file the University of London's significance for UCL also becomes clear, as UCL is cited as 'not allowed to accept the donation(s) unless they are approved by the University of London'. It is probably safe to conclude that this, again, is not an one-off file, but there are several files regarding anonymous donations to the Galton Laboratory.

Regarding the actually teaching of eugenics at UCL: Unfortunately there was not much time to investigate into more depth, but I have identified the possible sources. For the early records, our UCL Calendars record the activity of each department and this would definitely be the starting point. For the most recent records, I would suspect working with Moodle and conducting keyword searches might be the way to identify courses.

To conclude, the historical study in the role of eugenics in the history of UCL is a complex one. Certainly focusing only on UCL archives and records gives a lot of information, but other archives could equally provide a very interesting angle into the 'UCL and Eugenics' story. In a way, by focusing exclusively on UCL archives and records we are presenting the story as 'something that just happened at UCL', when it clearly wasn't the case. The University of London Archive provide a very interesting insight, not least because it contains letters by Pearson, and information about the Galton Bequest. In any case it has been noted above on the anonymous donations that they have to be approved by the University of London – this implies a significant level of approval by the University of London, at least for the 1950s and 1960s. Other scientific archives (such as those of the Royal Society) will provide information on how Pearson's work was viewed by other scientists, what the scientific objections were, and how Pearson responded. Material on the Eugenics Education Society would demonstrate the wider support on eugenics around 1910 and will reveal the most serious impact of eugenics (that of legislating).