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It would be difficult to deny that during the early twentieth century the notion of 'Latin eugenics' as distinct from other forms of eugenics, particularly the North American and northern European varieties, was held by individuals and organizations in southern European and Latin and Central American countries. This notion of difference was consolidated in the 1930s in light of scientific and political developments of the period. The question is how stable and historiographically viable such a distinct tendency can be taken to be.

The most extensive examination of the contours of Latin eugenics to date has been undertaken by Marius Turda and Aaron Gillette. These authors note that 'Latin eugenics' was, at least to some degree, a cultural and social construction made by those that subscribed to the idea. In distinction to Nordic and Anglo-Saxon eugenics, these authors argue, 'Latin eugenics relied less on race and class and more on [the] individual and the national community' (Turda, Gillette, 2014, p.1). One of the central concerns of Turda and Gillette is a focus on Latin eugenicists' 'attempts to achieve the social and political goals of the modern welfare state' in their respective countries. In discussing the issue of the welfare state, they concentrate on the impact of eugenicists on 'countries' population and family policies, maternal and infant health, preventive medicine, and social hygienic and public health campaigns against tuberculosis, alcoholism, venereal diseases, and prostitution' (Turda, Gillette, 2014, p.3), all issues present in the Spanish and Portuguese movements.

The intentions of Turda and Gillette are taken as framing points for this paper. But they are taken with caution. Many of the vectors of Latin eugenics mentioned above, with their concentration on social hygiene and public health, certainly ring true for eugenics for Spain and Portugal in the 1930s and 1940s. But there were also concurrent attempts to articulate a form of eugenics that drew more closely on northern European or specifically Germanic inspirations. It is also important to note that in contrast to what Turda and Gillette have argued, both the Spanish and Portuguese dictatorships were reticent to create any type of 'welfare state'.

In order to explore these questions, this paper focuses on the late 1930s and 1940s when the ideological premises of the two dictatorships and the international circumstances surrounding them pushed eugenics in certain directions. The previous years, particularly up to 1936, would also cast light on Latin eugenics given the different ideological circumstances, particularly of the Primo de Rivera dictatorship and the Spanish Republic. But today, given time constraints, I have chosen to focus on four principal examples from circa 1936 onwards. In part, this decision also responds to the fact of the creation of the International Latin Eugenics Federation in Paris in August 1937. The examples studied are: first, the rise of technical and professional orientation as a means of guaranteeing productivity, including the usage of biotypology, itself a technique allied with the science of eugenics; second, a comparison between early Francoist anthropology in respect of notions of the Spanish 'race' and those current in Portugal during the 1940s; third, an analysis of the development of Latin eugenics primarily in Portugal in the 1930s and 1940s via the figure of Almerindo Lessa; fourth, the incidence of Germanic eugenics in Portugal via the figures of José Ayres de Azevedo and Leopoldina Paula. By giving these examples, I hope to provide a framework for continuing comparative work on the eugenics of the Iberian dictatorships and beyond, in the field of 'Latin eugenics'.

The Scientific Organization of Work, Professional Orientation and Biotypology

The scientific organization of work focused on increasing productivity through mechanization and effective organization of the worker and the workplace. So-called ‘Taylorism’ was malleable enough to be adopted by a variety of political regimes. As it connected with individualized investigations into ‘biotypology’ – the ‘science’ of individual biological and constitutional types – it became a tool for the matching up of workers with particular aptitudes to particular types of jobs supposedly best suited to them and best suited to the interests of the economy. It is in this interest in the scientific organization of work and productivity that the Iberian dictatorships coincided with other totalitarian regimes in the 1930s and 1940s.

There has been little work on the reception of such ideas in either country. Specifically, in Spain, the origins of professional orientation are rooted in the mid-1910s with the establishment of the Catalan Institut d’Orientació Professional in 1917, which published, under various changing forms, its journal – the Annals de l’Institut d’Orientació Professional (1920-30), the Revista de Psicología i Pedagogia (1933-37), and, under Francoism, the Anales del Instituto Psicotécnico (from 1945). In the words of one of the main proponents of professional orientation in Spain, José Marvá, the purpose and consequence of the scientific organization of work were summarized as follows: ‘...el resultado inmediato y más esencial de la organización científica del trabajo es aumentar en gran proporción el rendimiento del obrero...’

As part of the attempt to harmonize workers and the interests of their ‘natural’ overlords in the Iberian dictatorships, the insights provided by the scientific organization of work, professional orientation and individualized biotypology conspired to make a sleeker, more efficient and conflictless set of industrial relations. Although the question of industrialization sat uncomfortably, especially with the ruralist Salazar regime, the advantages in the Spanish case were seized upon notably by the Francoist elites. But even here, there were certain limitations on the uptake of this kind of theory. As Antonio Polo Blanco has pointed out, a careful path was negotiated between professional orientation as selection of the ‘best’ and most apt types at work and the actual scientific organization of work. The former was seen to be in tune with the medieval guild mentality of Francoism within the context of its obsession with ‘hispanidad’; the latter was seen as a new fangled, possibly even liberal take on workplace organization.

In order to explore the reception of such ideas in Spain, some remarks on the Francoist work ethic are required. What was for the Nationalists the return of normality after the aberration of the Republic allowed for ‘natural’ harmony to reign whereby each man and woman knew his or her place within the organized social hierarchy. This state of affairs was enshrined in the Fuero del Trabajo (1940). In the words of regime acolyte Dr. Antonio Vallejo Nágera in his Política racial del Nuevo Estado, ‘Como la Nueva España no admite vagos, se pueden recluir en colonias de trabajo para mendigos y vagabundos, donde permanecerán hasta que reediquen su capacidad de trabajo’. Work was a way of becoming productive and of expiating one’s sins.

Shortly after the end of the war, the precursor to the 1945 Instituto Psicotécnico, the Instituto Nacional de Psicotecnia, was described as aiming for ‘un rendimiento social mayor y más acorde con las necesidades nacionales’, the overall objective being ‘formar una España grande, según los deseos del Caudillo’1. In a blend of physiological, psychological and constitutional rationales, derived from a mixture of principles drawn from biotypologists Viola and Kretschmer, one of the main advocates of professional orientation, Dr. Dantín Gallego, argued in the first number of the new review, Psicotecnia, that any propensity to hernias in workers was down to a combination of workplace fatigue and failures of constitutional type2. A similar approach was embarked upon by the same
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author when considering workplace accidents. In a set of studies by Workplace Inspector Eusebio Martí based on 100 workers in the Madrid area who had suffered workplace accidents, indexes of robustness, height, muscular strength and sensorial perception were individually tested and there was an attempt to match up constitutional defects (taras) with the propensity for accidents\(^3\). Later studies debated between the need to select the most apt types for particular tasks rather than diffusing the least apt throughout a particular school or workplace\(^4\). One means of finessing this process was through the design of a ficha escolar para la colocación en las empresas, introduced by the Bilbao laboratory run by other prominent figures in the field\(^5\).

Most of the authors writing in Psicotecnia from 1939 to 1945 came, not surprisingly, from the field of psycho-technics, medicine, engineering and pedagogy\(^6\). Of the 49 authors writing in the Institute’s journal, nine were from abroad. Dantín, for his part, followed the work of the geneticalist Von Verschuer in his work on the constitutional traits of those involved in workplace accidents\(^7\). Mallart was in favour of introducing programmes along the lines of the Kraft durch Freude (Joy at Work) initiative introduced by the Nazis in Germany\(^8\).

Similar patterns were followed in Portugal. Portuguese specialists followed the work of Kretschmer and the biotypologists and notions of ‘robustness’ percolated diverse fields ranging from the military academy through to models of workplace efficiency. In the early 1940s in Portugal there was a certain convergence of ideas stemming from concerns over the health of the nation, eugenic notions of fitness, the usefulness of sports and gymnastics as energizing activities and the utilization of biotypological assessments in the workplace. Shortly after the establishment of the INEF (National Institute of Physical Education) in January 1940, the University of Oporto eugenecist, Luís de Pina, commented in a debate in the National Assembly that ‘O problema do desporto, no fundo, é um mero problema eugenico’\(^9\).

Although Mallart had argued in favour of a similar organization to the German ‘Joy at Work’ initiative in Spain, it would appear that the Portuguese Estado Novo took this to heart and created in June 1935 the FNAT (National Foundation for Joy at Work). The FNAT, based directly on the German model and on the Italian fascist Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro\(^10\) was established as part of the incipient ‘welfare state’ of Salazarism. The FNAT was not precisely a eugenic endeavour; however, it did promote holiday colonies for workers and sports and gymnastics to be supported by the employers’ guilds in true corporatist manner.

From Racial Anthropology to Eugenics of the Spirit

George Stocking Jr. has argued that nineteenth-century European anthropology followed two principal lines of conceptualization and research: one was involved primarily in the construction of the nation and the other was imbricated in the construction of the empire. In the case of Spain and especially Portugal, it would appear that, instead of separation, the two were mutually intertwined at
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least from the 1930s. The concept of the nation was dependent on what was understood as the ‘overseas’ (the ‘colonial’)\textsuperscript{11}. Within each of these two strands the demon that haunted European anthropology was the possibility and fear of racial mixing and how to control it; this was an issue that came to be at the heart of eugenics movements too\textsuperscript{12}.

For Spain, Joshua Goode has argued that there predominated a notion of the ‘racial alloy’, the idea that there was no racial purity in Spain as those inhabiting the geographical area derived from Moors, Visigoths, Jews and assorted others\textsuperscript{13}. Any Spanish race was, then, a hybrid cluster of cultural and physical attributes rather than anything ‘pure’. For Franco, racial strength ‘emanated from bringing races together, not the domination of one pure race over all mixed ones’\textsuperscript{14}. Such an idea was perhaps inherited from, on the one hand, falangistas-to-be such as Ernesto Giménez Caballero who argued that the ‘genius’ of the Spanish race came not from purity but from fusion\textsuperscript{15}. On the other hand, the second ideological side of the Franco regime, Catholicism, argued that precisely what had enabled this fusion and exalted it was the unifying principle provided by the Church in the fifteenth century.

What united further the two Iberian countries was the role given to the colonies. Although Spain remained a colonial power longer than Portugal and continued to minimize mixing between the European and the colonial races, viewing this as undesirable, some sectors of Portuguese anthropology began to be more open to such a possibility from the 1930s onwards. Even though there were still evidently voices that opposed ‘miscegenation’ up to the 1960s and beyond, by this time, at least on paper, fusion between the ‘European Portuguese’ and ‘African Portuguese’ was viewed as less of a problem. Indeed, despite early objections, the Salazar regime sought to utilize notions of supposed age-old Portuguese openness to hybridity and fusion under the guise of Gilberto Freyre’s idea of ‘Luso-Tropicalism’ in order to justify its past role in the colonial venture and the post-war continuation of the empire. Importantly, however, such fusion between races was viewed more favourably when it took place away from the metropole and stayed in its ‘proper place’ outside of Europe.

I will now compare the Portuguese and Spanish cases in respect of the understanding of ‘race’ and the acceptance or otherwise of positive and negative eugenics. Such an interpretation will be cast through an examination of the book by Antonio Vallejo Nágera, *Eugenesia de la Hispanidad y regeneración de la raza* (1937)\textsuperscript{16}. While this author and this particular volume have been the focus of many studies to date\textsuperscript{17}, less emphasis has been placed on an international comparative focus and attention has not generally been paid to what is an interesting aspect of early Francoist racial hygiene: the notion that the Spanish race was a hybrid formation and the consequences of this idea for a particular construction of eugenics.

\textsuperscript{11} For the debate, see Stocking, George W. Jr. *Afterword: A view from the centre*. Ethnos. 1982; 57: 172-186.
\textsuperscript{14} Goode, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{17} Cayuela, p. 129-142.
Vallejo Nágera was born into a military family, absorbed German organic psychiatry and became the director of Franco’s military psychiatric services in 1936\(^{18}\). He is famous for his studies of republican prisoners of war in 1938 on the ‘psychopathology’ of Marxism and was made professor of psychiatry at Madrid University in 1942. Juárez González has noted that Vallejo Nágera’s thought represents a cross-over between the ‘pensamiento tradicionalista español, una defensa del pasado histórico y un alegato en defensa del catolicismo como fundamento social’\(^{19}\). He advocated racial hygiene, the primacy of natural sexual reproduction, considered the sterilization of psychopaths\(^{20}\) and argued for the optimization of conditions for the best *crianza* of new-borns within an ideological and religious environment that was founded on the negation of progressive liberal thought.

Vallejo Nágera’s thought was a careful positioning within eugenic constructs mooted nationally and internationally during the period. Although, for example, he advocated the removal of children from leftist families in order to supposedly improve the phenotype (the qualities of the individual as a mix of heredity and environment)\(^{21}\), he did not, on paper at least, advocate the exterminatory eugenics of Nazi Germany, a procedure that was held to be incompatible with Catholicism\(^{22}\). On the other hand, there can be no doubt that his thought provided justification for the ideological and physical destruction of the ‘enemies of Spain’ in the 1930s and 1940s\(^{23}\). However, while the ‘anthropologist and Nazi sympathizer’ Misael Bañuelos frequently cited Hitler and the National Socialist race theorist H.F.K. Günther in his work\(^{24}\), noting that ‘el racismo es la concepción biológica más fructífera y más revolucionaria de los últimos tiempos’\(^{25}\), Vallejo Nágera, despite citing the race scientists Von Verschuer and Fischer, was critical of some aspects of Nazi thought.

In order to understand Vallejo Nágera’s concept of eugenics, it is important to follow his distinction between, on the one hand, two expressions of eugenics and, on the other, the differentiation made between eugenics and racial hygiene. The psychiatrist argued that any individual and any racial group possessed two sets of influences on their body and psyche: the genetic and the behavioural\(^{26}\). This, in turn, had produced two sets of eugenic theories and practice, one form that was ‘geneticista’ and the other was ‘conductista’. The first, prevalent among ‘materialist’ eugenicists had, according to Vallejo Nágera, achieved little beyond the limitation of births of the ‘undesirable’ sectors of the population and the segregation and sterilization of certain groups\(^{27}\). But because the actual mechanics of inheritance were unclear and there was no automatic passing on of negative traits between families, such measures were destined to remain uncertain in their effectiveness or could even be counter-productive. The hereditary link could not be relied upon for the purposes of racial hygiene\(^{28}\). Given these doubts, Vallejo tended towards a second kind of eugenics, the behaviourist variety, which emphasized the phenotype as the principal locus of eugenic intervention rather than the genotype (the basic genetic core of the individual).
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The second major point to note is Vallejo Nágera’s differentiation between eugenics and racial hygiene. Eugenics, for Vallejo, had become contaminated with the first of the versions of eugenics he rejected - materialist or geneticist eugenics. Such a derivation was typical of liberal approaches to the science and it failed to take into account the ‘spiritual’ aspects of racial improvement. Racial hygiene, in contrast, would be a broader undertaking and would focus on the spirit and the psychological inheritance of values. It would reject a mere concentration on geneticist negative eugenics, thus promoting a programme of positive eugenics akin to some forms of Latin eugenics. Consider these words: ‘La higiene racial exaltaría las cualidades excelsas de la raza actuando conjuntamente sobre el individuo y sobre el medio’. The phenotype was thus the point of action for racial hygiene. In light of these conclusions, the principal strategy that the racial hygienist should adopt, Vallejo Nágera argued, was ‘seleccionar y mejorar los genetipos, e impedir que degeneren los fenotipos, evitando o neutralizando los agentes morbosos que puedan actuar sobre aquéllos’.

The key concept in Vallejo’s suggested programme of racial hygiene was the relationship between race, history, patriotism and spirituality. Like the anthropologists that Joshua Goode studied for the early twentieth century, Vallejo signalled that the ‘raza hispana’, the ‘genotipo ibérico’ was one that ‘ha experimentado las más variadas mezclas a causa del contacto y relación con otros pueblos’. More interesting for him than this mix was what this situation had permitted the Hispanic race to achieve: ‘civilizar tierras inmensas e influir intelectualmente sobre el mundo’. This aspect of Vallejo’s thought coincided once again with that of Portuguese right-wing nationalist eugenacists such as António Augusto Mendes Correia who foregrounded the differences between population, nation and race.

Inferior and superior ‘castes’ within the Hispanic race had been and could be mixed but what was at stake was ‘una supervacía hispana, éticamente mejorada, robusta moralmente, vigorosa en su espíritu. Para ello hemos de estimular la fecundidad de los selectos...’. Pro-natalism, the regeneration of the family, religion and the guidance of the family doctor to foster ideal marriages between the ‘select’ were all key elements of this programme of racial hygiene. As Richards has observed, all these components could sit very comfortably with National Catholicism and it was within these parameters that any form of eugenics could be fostered in Spain in the 1940s.

Unfortunately, I do not have the time to explore such ideas in the Portuguese case, although an interesting scenario for further exploration would be the rejection of eugenics, perhaps in the same terms as Vallejo, by the Portuguese fascist Rolão Preto. Instead of eugenics of a racial or blood type, what was important was human dignity based on the family, specific roles for men and women, and the elevation of a national community through the ‘just organization of work’.
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An Exponent of ‘Latin Eugenics’ in Portugal: Almerindo Lessa

The insistence on family policies, social hygiene and public health campaigns (Turda, Gillette, 2014, p. 3) characterised a broad swathe of eugenic initiatives in Portugal, especially from the 1930s onwards. These coexisted with other projects that were more hereditarian and race hygiene oriented. Almerindo Lessa was a disciple of Dr. Abel Salazar and was steeped in the hygienic tradition of this socially active medical figure. Lessa articulated his thought on sexual hygiene, eugenics and, later on, racial questions through the prism of this progressive and environmentally-oriented foundation. In addition to writing some accessible texts on sexual education in his early twenties, such as *A Educação Sexual da Mocidade* (Lessa, 1934a), Lessa became increasingly interested in eugenics and marriage hygiene in the 1930s and he attended the Latin eugenics federation conference in August 1937.

Lessa began to study blood diseases and was by 1945 head of the blood transfusion service at the Hospital de São José, Lisbon, and in 1950 he went to Mozambique to establish blood therapy programmes and consolidated a long relationship with Portugal’s colonies. He carried out further research on blood groups as a series of anthropological missions from 1950-1981 to countries as varied as Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, Goa and Macau (Pacheco, 2012, p.97). Finally, he published on the question of ‘racial mixing’, intervening in this debate extensively.

Given this varied scientific background, it was logical that the ‘curiosa ciência, a Eugénia […] a arte de criar bons homens’ (Lessa, 1936, p.213) should become one of Lessa’s interests. He called for Mothers’ Schools or Institutes of Puerculture to be established to create the ideal hygienic conditions for the reproduction of the Portuguese (Lessa, 1934b, p.87). He argued that the undertaking to have children should be limited to those who were capable of such a step and to those who were able to conceive of the greater national good: ‘Fazer um filho é um dom que só devia caber aos pais honestos, respeitadores da sua inteligência, do seu sangue e da riqueza nacional’ (Lessa, 1943, p.179). This focus on the individual, through to the nation, rather than on race, clearly placed Lessa within the framework of Latin eugenics as identified by Turda and Gillette and contrasts his ideas with those of the more Germanic professor of anthropology, Eusébio Tamagnini. It was a tendency that would be further illustrated by Lessa’s engagement with the Latin eugenics federation itself.

Before attending the 1937 Paris meeting, Lessa had written his *Exortações Eugénicas*, published by the medical students’ association at the University of Oporto in 1933. This was his clearest statement on eugenics and it proved to be something of a scandal when published, entailing rejection from university colleagues, opposition from the Church and censorship with many of the copies of the publication being seized. *Exortações Eugénicas* outlined four interrelated strands of eugenics. These were the constructive, restrictive, destructive and creative (also called curative by the author) versions (Lessa, 1933). These different tendencies combined, to a greater or lesser degree, hereditarian and environmental understandings and strategies for improvement. Constructive eugenics focused on those already married and advised couples on how to procreate with maximum care and foresight. The issuing of marriage certificates would guarantee the best results and prizes would be awarded for large families (Lessa, 1933, p.7).

Lessa viewed restrictive eugenics as the most promising as it taught certain types of parents not to procreate by means of birth control and *coitus interruptus* (Lessa, 1933, p.13-19). The third tendency, the destructive form of eugenics, allowed for sterilization, preventing the ‘incapazes’ and ‘inferiores’ from reproducing and therefore, Lessa argued with no reference to any justifying theory of heredity, eliminating them from the population within three generations (Lessa, 1933, p.19-21). The fourth strategy, curative eugenics, was clearly based on hygienic measures and child-centred puerculture (Lessa, 1933, p.21-23). His endorsement of restrictive eugenics confirms his initial proximity to Latin forms of eugenics.
Four years later, Lessa attended the Latin eugenics congress and published a two-part discussion of the proceedings in the *Arquivo de Anatomia e Antropologia* (Lessa, 1938a; Lessa, 1938b), one of the principal sites for discussions on eugenics in Portugal. After a brief description of the theory of eugenics, Lessa noted that the Latin federation had grown out of the Italian concern about the influences exerted by Germany, England and North America within the international eugenics movement. Lessa also noted that the federation stressed the common heritage of the Latin countries on issues such as population politics and a more open or positive attitude towards miscegenation (an attitude, in fact, not quite so clear-cut in Latin eugenics organizations). He also emphasized the opposition to sterilization within the federation (Lessa, 1938a, p.175).

Returning to the strong environmental leaning of his 1933 *Exortações Eugênicas*, Lessa argued that the improvement of the environment represented the fastest means of dignifying and perfecting the population. In addition, a process of parental selection would be the most effective means of correcting the environment in which people lived and brought up children: eugenics, as was the case for many Latin eugenicists, had its complement in ‘ euthenics’ (Lessa, 1938a, p.177). This dual approach provided Lessa with a platform to critique the application of Mendel’s theories as overly mechanistic, thus reaffirming his commitment to environmental improvements in tune with Latin eugenics. It should be pointed out, nevertheless, that Lamarckian theories, often used to justify such a position among Latin eugenicists, were not mentioned by Lessa at this stage.

Lessa’s focus on the population and nation rather than ideas of racial purity was exemplified by his general openness to the possibility of racial mixing. Some twenty years after his initial 1938 report, in sections of his published diary, he noted that it was during the ‘I Reunião Latina de Eugenia’ that he first came across the idea of miscegenation as potentially beneficial for the population at large and admitted to being enthused at the time by the ideas of three figures at that congress: Corrado Gini, Raymond Turpin and René Martial (Lessa, 1958, p.187). This was perhaps a selectively positive reading of these three authors’ ideas on racial mixing. Nevertheless, such an engagement served Lessa to embark on the discussion of a process that would interest him for the next decades: the formation of racial mixes of all kinds for the Portuguese – ‘mestiços luso-africanos, luso-ameríndios, luso-indianos, luso-qualquer raça ou luso-qualquer cor, que são os homens novos desta comunidade tropical’ (Lessa, 1958, p.187).

Instead of a biological notion of race, Lessa favoured that employed by Martial: race would be a collection of psychological traits whose anthropological traces ‘constituem no tempo, isto é, na História, uma unidade distinta’ (Lessa, 1938a, p.185). On this basis, a ‘bon mestiço, eugenicamente, é aquele cuja psicologia cabe, duma maneira harmonica, na psicologia do meu onde foi gerado’ (Lessa, 1938a, p.185). Here, Lessa was probably voicing support for Martial’s idea of ‘racial grafting’ (on the ‘greffe inter-raciale’ from 1931) and selection of the ‘best’ immigrants (Schneider, 1990, p.240-248). To this understanding, Lessa added the dimension of blood types, just as Martial had as part of his idea of a ‘frontière des sangs’ in Europe (Schneider, 1990, p.249), and warned once more against an over-Mendelian interpretation of heredity (Lessa, 1938a, p.185).

Lessa also added to this mix the theories of the Brazilian F.J. de Oliveira Viana ‘que defende a superioridade ondulatoria e relativa de cada uma [das raças]’ (Lessa, 1938a, p.186). Relying on biotypological theories, Viana had argued that race or ethnic type determined the type of constitution of a group, which in turn determined the type of temperament and intelligence of each group (Lessa, 1938a, p.186). This somewhat circular argument was perhaps less disapproving of racial mixtures within the ‘appropriate’ psychological and blood groups.

Such a position came to form the core of Lessa’s ideas. His ideas were made up by an ‘exerto’ or grafting of their own: a mixture of ideas derived from Latin eugenics and others from sociology, most notably from the work of Gilberto Freyre. From the mid-1930s onwards, Lessa argued in favour of miscegenation and justified it within a positive reading of the history of racial
groupings that Martial had referred to, with a particular emphasis on crossings between different types of blood (as the biological mechanism) and culture (as the environmental mechanism). What was required was 'uma mistura de sangues, como aquela que os Portugueses vêm executando desde o século XV' (Lessa, 1958, p.188). In addition, miscegenation was justified by Lessa by recourse to what Freyre had called the 'Albuquerque method' whereby the captains-general in India married off their soldiers to the 'flor biológica' of Indian women (Lessa, 1958, p.188). White people gained from this mixture in the Tropics through better disease resistance (Lessa, 1958, p.189). The Portuguese were eugenizers par excellence (Bastos, 2005, p.24).

The advances of genetics confirmed the advantages of such a project by allowing observers to see the biological value of mestiços in a new way (Lessa, 1958, p.191). This programme of creating new human strains – 'enxertos de homem', as Lessa called them – was a biosocial project of population building and settlement ('povoamento'). It would literally result in a new kind of race, or even non-race, universal in its cultural aspirations, championed by the Portuguese whereby ethnic and blood characters would blend: 'Os Portugueses não são uma raça: somam raças – formando um conjunto humano com diversos grupos e subgrupos bioquímicos e etno-linguísticos unidos por laços genéticos, jurídicos e religiosos comuns' (Lessa, 1969, p.33-34). Such an appreciation coincided with and helped to consolidate the increasingly positive reception of Freyre's Lusotropicalism under Salazar, especially from the late 1940s and early 1950s onwards (Bethencourt, 2012, p.10; Castelo, 1998).

**Germanic strains of eugenics in Portugal**

As stated above, there was a strong Germanic tendency in the eugenics movement in Portugal. But as we can see from Almerindo Lessa's work, this tendency was far from the only 'legitimate' or 'available' discourse (Bourdieu, 1991) on eugenics at the time. Lessa denounced the Nazi 'experiments' as 'um dos documentos mais espantosos da história da Humanidade' in 1949 (Lessa, 1958, p.21) but others within the movement were much more clearly pro-German, pro-Nazi or both. The founder of the Sociedade Portuguesa de Estudos Eugénicos (SPEE), Eusébio Tamagnini, professor of anthropology at the University of Coimbra, was certainly one of the more enthusiastic proponents of Germanic eugenics.

There are two aspects of Tamagnini's thought that need to be discussed briefly. First, his remarks on the question of 'family' and 'racial' eugenics (Tamagnini, 1938). Second, his renowned opposition to miscegenation (Tamagnini, 1934). Tamagnini dismissed family-based eugenics as inadequate for two main reasons. Families could hide undesirable biological traits for the sake of convenience or because of their shameful consequences. Also, any eugenic policies would, by default, only reach the family unit and not the whole racial pool. This evidenced certain understandings of genetics and its socio-political dimensions at the time; Tamagnini believed that particular races had certain qualities in common and these could only be purified by means of national and racial intervention organized by the state.

In respect of the second matter, alongside Mendes Correia, Tamagnini was staunchly opposed to miscegenation. At the National Congress of Colonial Anthropology in 1934 in a paper on the 'problems entailed by miscegenation' he spoke of antagonism between different racial characters, the risk of infertility and the 'disastrous' results that occurred when racial crossings took place (Tamagnini, 1934). Such evaluations relied on a Mendelian framework which showed how negative traits were passed on from one generation to the next. His stance on miscegenation was significantly more critical than that of even Mendes Correia (Mendes Correia, 1934).
A figure who took Tamagnini’s racial style of eugenics further, supporting Nazi policies on sterilization, marriage regulation and the prevention of the reproduction of the ‘unfit’, was José Ayres de Azevedo Novais Basto. Ayres de Azevedo had coincided with Tamagnini in the important national congress of population science where he elaborated upon the role of population management and empire (Ayres de Azevedo, 1940a) and on the ‘bio-chemical purity’ of the Portuguese (Ayres de Azevedo, 1940b). He was to follow in Tamagnini’s footsteps by working at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute (KWI) in the early 1940s as a visiting researcher. Working under Oumar Von Verschuer at the KWI section on race biology and hygiene, he praised Nazi initiatives on racial policy and on the family (Ayres de Azevedo, 1943a, 1943b), went on to conduct blood analyses and worked with Verschuer on ‘human material’ derived from twins. Despite his enthusiasm for this work and the supposed advances that it represented, his reception in Oporto when he returned from war-ravaged Germany was cool and his doctoral thesis (Ayres de Azevedo, 1944) was not received favourably. It is likely that the prevailing tendency in the Oporto SPEE grouping in favour of eugenic social sanitation meant that eugenicists there frowned upon his pro-Nazi sentiments.

In addition to these two figures, some work that provided a bridge between the physical anthropology of the 1930s and some of the methods, especially those of anthropometry, utilized by Nazi supporters such as Verschuer, is that of University of Oporto anthropologist Leopoldina Ferreira Paulo. Working as a research assistant at the Institute of Anthropology in Oporto, Paulo is worth our attention for a number of reasons. Following our initial comments on the meanings of eugenics, however, we cannot simply argue that Ferreira Paulo was a ‘eugenicist’. Her work was located in the field of physical anthropology. However, given the strong links between physical anthropology and eugenics in Portugal, it can be said that her work grew out of a field – institutional and scientific – that made up part of the intellectual foundations enjoyed by eugenics.

Paulo continued the intellectual trajectory of Portuguese researchers such as Tamagnini and Ayres de Azevedo in visiting prominent German research institutes such as the KWI. In the 1950s, she arranged for a research visit to the Institute of Human Genetics at Münster University. The director of the Institute was no-one less than Oumar Von Verschuer. Verschuer was never sanctioned for his previous activities at the KWI under the Nazi regime despite his work with Josef Mengele, among others (Weiss, 2010).

Before going to Münster, Ferreira Paulo had worked on an anthropometric comparison between different indigenous women brought to Oporto for the First National Congress of Colonial Anthropology (Ferreira Paulo, Duarte de Oliveira, 1934). She performed research on the skin pigmentation of the Portuguese (Ferreira Paulo, 1940), discussed craniometrics in 1942 (Ferreira Paulo, 1945) and went on to write about constitutional types (Ferreira Paulo, 1945). She published her material in the review of the newly formed Centro de Estudos Demográficos (established by decree in March 1944), an organism that offered an academic home for many of the most influential eugenicists of the day, including Tamagnini and Mendes Correia. The Centre provided an environment that was short of strong interventionist eugenics and promoted work on demography and hygiene (Cleminson, 2014, p.199-202). In this sense, now that the outcome of the war was clear, the Centre constituted the curtailment of Germanic eugenics and an unstated acceptance by the Salazar regime of eugenics and one-time eugenicists restricted to social hygiene measures and demographic planning. The work on constitutional types by Paulo, supported by Mendes Correia and funded externally by the National Institute of Statistics, of which the Centre was a part, developed population categories according to the system derived by Sigaud (Mendes Corrêa, 1944). This kind of anthropological work was continued by Paulo in the 1950s with an emphasis on comparative studies, corporal measurements and data collection (Ferreira Paulo, 1954; 1959; 1962).

Paulo’s collaboration with Verschuer in the 1950s permitted a return to priorities that were at the heart of Germanic forms of eugenics and racial hygiene in the 1930s and 1940s. Her work enables
us to see how the kind of science that informed Portuguese eugenics in previous decades set the stage for work after the war, thus showing continuities between ‘old’ and ‘new’ forms of eugenics, particularly of the German variety. In addition to the photographs and various tables on ‘untermenschen’ worked on by Ferreira Paulo in Münster dating from the late 1950s, she also undertook an extensive study on twins during the same period. This work under the direction of Verschuer consisted of some 196 profiles of monozygotic (identical) and dizygotic (fraternal) twins. Their characteristics and measurements were recorded in tabular form. Most of the observations and data derived from 1958 but some were taken from 1952. It is possible that the first set of studies in the file were undertaken by Paulo under Verschuer’s supervision but from number 134 onwards, with the results displayed in an almost identical printed table, Paulo appears to conduct these observations alone as each report bears the title ‘Zwillingsuntersuchungen Münster. (Arbeit Dr. Ferreira PAULO)’. Some of the studies are accompanied by close up photographs of eyes, lips and mouths and others with photographs of the feet, finger and hand prints of the individuals concerned.

In a sense, there is little sinister about this work. Twin studies, of course, continue today. But given the context, this work with Verschuer perhaps takes on another aspect. Would Paulo have been aware of the activities of Verschuer during the war? Would Verschuer have talked to her about Tamagnini’s visit to the KWI and Ayres de Azevedo’s work there on twins and inheritance? It is likely not. Rather than speculate along these lines, however, what the collaboration between Verschuer and Paulo illustrates is how malleable thought on human genetics had become in the period when eugenics was no longer an acceptable scientific and social practice either in Portugal or elsewhere. It also illustrates how anything close to Germanic eugenics in Portugal was, certainly by the 1950s, only possible for Portuguese researchers outside of Portugal, in this case within Germany itself. The highly constrained political and scientific environment under the Estado Novo (Do Mar Gago, 2014), where knowledge exchange was severely limited, had effectively curtailed not only eugenics but a scientific research programme based on ‘risky’ genetic models.

Conclusion
The examples provided above prove that a variety of eugenic ideas existed in Spain and Portugal in the 1930s and 1940s. They also suggest that these were not automatically the province of any particular ideological tendency. The form of eugenics envisaged by Vallejo Nágera, ‘legitimized by religion and anti-communist nationalism’38, was censorious of attempts to introduce programmes of negative eugenics and was highly sceptical of the efficacy of such programmes. In the case of Tamagnini and Ayres de Azevedo, Catholic constraints did not play a part and their eugenics was highly indebted to German models.

Where do the two countries’ eugenics stand in respect of ‘Latin eugenics’? While Portuguese involvement in the Latin eugenics federation was minimal, the kind of eugenics that eventually came to the fore in this country in the 1940s was decidedly environmentalist, less focused on ‘racial hygiene’ and more on pro-natalist family hygiene. But this does not mean that German or northern eugenics was absent in the country. Strong hereditarism eugenics was visible in Portugal from the late 1920s onwards into the 1930s and it clearly drew on Germanic and even Nazi frameworks in the 1930s and 1940s, following a German ‘style of science’ (Harwood, 1993). After the defeat of the Axis powers, the condemnation of Nazi eugenics and the establishment of the Centre for Demographic Studies, Germanic eugenics within Portugal became a closed chapter. Work such as Almerindo Lessa’s with his favourable stance on racial mixing came to the fore.

38 Turdas, Gillette, p. 111.
In this sense, the form of eugenics that triumphed in Portugal was Latin eugenics. When Lessa remarked three years before the Latin federation meeting, in 1934, that the Portuguese playwright Fialho de Almeida, who he described as the ‘prose-maker’ of eugenics, provided a ‘conjunto equilibrado onde cabem o lamarquismo e o darvinismo, Weissman [sic] e Gregório Mendel, e em toda a extensão das teorias de Francisco Galton’ (Lessa, 1995, p.61), he perhaps summarized not only Latin eugenics but the strongest variety of eugenics present in Portugal. Latin eugenics embraced an eclectic combination of theories of inheritance, with environmental factors predominating and with no ‘clear distinction’ drawn between congenital and genetic conditions (Stepan, 1991, p.64).

In the Spanish case, while the early 1930s may have reflected such heterogeneity in eugenic models – we only need to look at the 1933 ‘jornadas eugenécias’ to see this – the climate prevalent in the Franco regime spelled an end for any such variety. But what prevailed was also a mixture of styles of eugenics. The theoretical work of Vallejo Nágera drew on German and Italian models and was critical of ‘liberal eugenics’. It was pro-natalist, was opposed to sterilization but promoted ‘racial hygiene’ and the promotion of the ‘best types’. What ensued on the ground, at a practical level in Spain, however, was similar to the eugenics practised in Portugal: pronatalism, puerculture and the control of women’s bodies.

While neither the Portuguese nor the Spanish case allows for the rejection of the usefulness of the interpretive category of ‘Latin eugenics’, we must caution against two temptations. On the one hand, the danger of over-homogenising Latin eugenics; it, like ‘northern’ or even ‘German’ eugenics was different according to country. On the other hand, we need to be vigilant when effacing the continuities between the methods of northern European eugenics and some more hereditarian or racially-oriented strains present in particular national expressions of Latin eugenics. Indeed, comparisons may be useful, but in the final analysis each country’s eugenics movement needs to be considered for its own diversity and disparities and continuities with broader international currents.