NOTES OF THE QUARTER

THE MAKING AND THE TAKING OF LIFE

The essence of "life" is the everlasting multiplication of its own specific kind within the confines of an alien environment. The growth of knowledge now transmutes the very success of this multiplication into a new hazard to the well-being of our own species. Two tremendous world wars killed between them perhaps as many as 50 million people, the equivalent of the total population of the British Isles. Yet that number is now replaced in less than 400 days by natural increase of world population.

Experience suggests that, as numbers in any community or population increase, the seeming importance of the individual diminishes. As reproduction becomes more deliberate, and as the necessity for global "limitation" becomes more widely understood, the need emerges for progressive appreciation of quality in the making of new lives. This is the essential prerequisite for eugenic advance, and entails further biological evolution in the sense of advantageous differentials in actual reproduction. The growing understanding of the importance and excitement of psycho-social evolution is additional to, and not a substitution for, deliberate eugenic bio-

logical advance. Sir Julian Huxley's recent Fawley lecture* should stand as a landmark in this subject.

The human dilemma is greater than this, however, since qualitative improvement must be sought without detriment to the conscious appreciation of the importance and worth of every individual. The population surge and excess is a recent addition to an age-old problem. We live in days of rapid transition, both biologically and in the evolution of propriety and ethics. We must cherish the individual whatever his quality, and yet what is an individual? On reductio ad absurdum a living tissue culture of human cells is not an individual which anyone would hesitate to destroy. Is the foetus, the product of rape of a still terrified girl, an individual who should appropriately be destroyed by therapeutic abortion? Opinions vary. The adult in misery may now voluntarily end his existence without commission of crime. But what of infants born grossly defective?

THALIDOMIDE

In these notes two years ago (April 1961) appeared these words:

Fourthly ... is the problem, set primarily to the medical profession, of the appropriate treatment of those infants born hopelessly deformed. At present this problem is quiescent in comparison with others in our series.

Contraception, sterilization, abortion, suicide and voluntary euthanasia were the other members of the series.

Since then enough thalidomide-damaged children have been born in Europe to be recognized

and to cause a furore in both the lay and the technical press. First, the lay papers followed the difficulties of the American mother who had taken thalidomide in the early days of pregnancy whilst in Europe, and later wished for a "therapeutic" abortion. This she finally obtained in Sweden, with the finding that the baby, if born, would have been deformed. And then came, in November 1962, the acquittals in Liège of parents, relatives and a doctor, charged with murdering a limbless child which had resulted from thalidomide ingestion.

For several years the knowledge that the mild virus infection of German measles, occurring in the early days after conception, can produce infantile deformity has occasionally raised the question of therapeutic abortion. More recently, it has also been realized that virus pneumonia may result in similar deformity, and it is probable, too, that an incorrect diet can, on occasion, affect the developing embryo. Thalidomide is the first widely used drug recognized to have direct deleterious effects on the embryo: undoubtedly there will be others. "Drug" deformity has now come to be a problem alike for the community, the medical profession, and the pharmaceutical industry.

The problem of the severely deformed infant, whether mentally or physically deficient, has facets which are emotional and ethical, rational and traditional. The suffering of a child with gross physical deformity, even after surgery or partial alleviation with gadgets, can be immense. Additionally there is the mental suffering of the parents, and often of the siblings, too, if the mother tries to compensate for the disability by so much devotion that the other children are given insufficient love and care. Dogmatic, but varied, assertions based on clear consciences have been many, but few seem to have recognized, at least in letters to the press, two fundamentals. The one is that this problem has both physical and temporal degrees, and the other is that there is an evolution of conscience with the passage of time, and from one generation to another, among even the most devout of people. The history of the introduction of anaesthetics provides an admirable example.

In the House of Lords, in 1936, Lord Dawson of Penn said:

This is a courageous age, but it has a different sense of values from the ages which have gone before. It looks upon life more from the point of view of quality than of quantity.

This was said in a discussion on euthanasia; since then public, as well as medical, opinion has considerably progressed. The Suicide Act of 1961 now allows an individual to choose a contrived death to end personal suffering, though the unfortunate is often unable to put the choice into practice. A medical practitioner cannot help without committing a criminal offence and jeopardizing his career.

The acquittals at Liège resulted in a remarkable correspondence in The Times, including one leader and forty-two letters. Some of the writers openly welcomed euthanasia for deformed infants, as well as, voluntarily, for older people in distress and suffering. One of the correspondents mentioned the Society's name on November 14th, 1962:

Let up hope, rather, that the time is not far distant when, on petition of a parent or a body like the Eugenic [sic] Society, a small panel of medical men will sign an order for its destruction. In fact, its Statement of Aims does not specifically include any consideration of the problem set by the birth of severely deformed infants; nor would the Eugenics Society in any way accept the role of arbiter. Yet the problem must be of interest to the Society. At present the appropriate treatment of deformed infants is a matter for the consciences of individuals, though it may well happen that members of the Eugenics Society would tend to be in one camp rather than another. The Society, as such, would only be directly concerned if deformed infants, for any one of a variety of possible reasons, were so nurtured that the possibility of reproduction were to arise and with it the possibility of transmission of heritable abnormalities or inadequacies. There is no evidence that a thalidomide deformity is likely to be transmissible.

In a conservatively-minded country like Great Britain the activities of a pressure group, zealous for reform, may do more harm than good to its cause if the group is brought into being prematurely. The growth of the Abortion Law Reform Association and the Voluntary Euthanasia Legislation Society are examples of pressure groups arising when the time is ripe. It is
difficult to see, however, how the problem of the deformed infant (including mental or physical deformity) can be dealt with except by special legislation, since "sound" and fashionable medical practice will never be able (except in the case of the occasional perceptive midwife or obstetrician) to deal with it without legislation. As with voluntary euthanasia and the now public condonation of suicide, a doctor cannot, yet, openly help without committing an offence.

The effect of thalidomide is now limited by its recognition and the withdrawal of the drug by the manufacturers. But this withdrawal only occurred after the additional births of a number estimated, in the United Kingdom alone, as between five and six hundred grossly deformed infants who are likely to require care over many years of impaired and often painful existence. Thalidomide is a complex product of a complex society, and it has added to the difficulties of mankind. Its effect has, however, probably accelerated the advance of public opinion on subjects allied to the interests of members of the Society.

POPULATION PERSIFLAGE IN THE PRESS

THE ANNOUNCEMENT BY the Minister of Health of new official projections of British population showing prospects of a larger growth and a younger age-distribution than hitherto expected has given rise to comments of very varying quality in the newspapers. At best, the Minister’s carefully chosen (if a little slanted) words have been repeated or suitably paraphrased. At worst, the leader-writers have used the change, to what they regard as a more cheerful prospect, as an excuse to shuffle off the world population problem in cheap and easy terms. As readers of the Review will know, from facts given in the January, 1962 and January, 1963 issues, Britain has not hitherto partaken in the world problem of excessive fertility in the present century but may now be showing some signs of a mild movement in this direction. It does not seem to be a cause for much rejoicing.

Needless to say, what has happened in Great Britain has virtually no effect on the world population prospects, which remain unchanged. Let us, therefore, leave this particular confusion on one side and deal with three other popular errors nearer home that are so often repeated and so rarely corrected. Let us state firmly that it is wrong to suppose:

1. that those who make population projections are forecasting what will happen in the future;
2. that a growing population must be a very good thing;
3. that Great Britain’s population is (or was until recently) going to become materially older in its age-distribution.

Let us hope that it will be generally realized one day, not too far ahead, that the truth is quite different, namely that:

1. population projections are, somewhat reluctantly, made annually in response to popular demand for illustrations of the effects that must follow if present trends in fertility, mortality and migration continue; when the trends vary between projections, then the projections themselves will follow suit;
2. a moderate rate of growth can be economically stimulating in the short run, but its long-term effects may be harmful; a rapid growth is a disaster for all countries and most of all for under-developed areas;
3. Great Britain’s population has “aged” enormously already over the last thirty or forty years and is unlikely now to age much further; (what has happened is largely a reflection of the fertility trends in the early part of the twentieth century).

The Minister may well not be sorry to observe that there will be more young people to stimulate economic demand in the near future and replenish the labour force later on. But the consequence of a continuation of the higher fertility level of to-day, as compared with that of seven years ago, is a total population for Great Britain of nearly 65 million in the year 2000 instead of one of about 50 million (the present level). Which total is going to be the easier to live with in these islands—even if the larger one is somewhat the younger of the two?

TOO MANY PEOPLE?
The Fabian Society has recently published a broadsheet by Mr. A. Carter in which the truths mentioned above are much better recognized.* The author argues that we should prefer

a stable to a rising population on both social and economic grounds. Socially, he is concerned chiefly with the use of land and with traffic congestion on the roads, and makes arguments generally similar to those used in a debate held by the Eugenics Society some years ago. From the economic point of view, his line of approach is perhaps unorthodox, but he is able to make some interesting points concerning the relationship between population size and productivity and between population growth and the increase of wealth. He is also able to refer for support to the Report of the Economics Committee of the Royal Commission on Population, if not to the Report of the Commission itself. In a final chapter, Mr. Carter maintains that control of numbers is both practicable and a permanent necessity. He supports the idea of a greater amount of emigration from Britain and points to the disadvantages of large-scale immigration into this country of mainly unskilled labour. Encouraging emigration and restricting immigration are aims that might well be capable of achievement in some degree in the long run, but it is a pity that he gives no figures to illustrate the demographic consequences that could reasonably be expected; if he had, it might have appeared that no practicable development of migration policies is likely by itself to be capable of solving the problem of eliminating Britain's population growth.

The author does recognize, however, that "the fundamental problem is the excess of births above replacement level," "which is likely to persist unless steps are taken to counteract it." In this connection the only measures he suggests are smaller Family Allowances for larger families, and a higher minimum age for marriage—say seventeen or eighteen. Here his case is not strong, for such measures would appear able to command little political support at the present time, and even if they were applied their direct effect (as he himself recognizes) would necessarily be small. The fact is that a larger vision and a much longer-term policy (such as family planning and eugenics provide) are needed in order to tackle effectively the problem of major demographic trends in any country.

**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE; A BANNED EXPRESSION**

A BATTLE HAS been going on at the United Nations over the phrase "technical assistance." It began in 1961, when thirteen countries—including Ceylon, Ghana, Greece, Nepal, Sweden, Thailand and the United Arab Republic—put forward a long draft resolution in which, *inter alia*, the view of the Population Commission was endorsed that the United Nations should "give technical assistance, as requested by Governments, for national projects and programmes dealing with the problems of population." This was not discussed until September 1962, when amendments were proposed by France, Liberia and Spain, one of which was the deletion of this passage. The sponsoring countries carried their resolution, amended but still including the foregoing passage, in committee, against the opposition mainly of Roman Catholic countries; but they failed to obtain a majority for it in the General Assembly; the voting on the passage was thirty-four for, thirty-four against and thirty-two abstentions. This rejected, the remainder of the resolution was then passed.

Why this argument over an apparently harmless phrase? It would appear, as some of the other amendments also seem to indicate, that it is held to imply, or include, the dissemination of contraceptive appliances and knowledge of methods of birth control that are in disfavour in some countries. It was in this sense that the debates in New York were reported in the *Guardian*, which recorded the French delegate as saying that the General Assembly had no right to impose a collective view on the question of birth control, "which risked violating certain consciences and disregarding certain laws."

Fortunately, help for the areas needing technical assistance can still be provided, even if it cannot be given by the United Nations.

**SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

THE CURRENT CALENDAR of meetings of Biological Societies, 1963, compiled by the Biological Council, lists the names of sixty-six societies in the United Kingdom. It is both informative and salutary to scan the list and mentally to place the Eugenics Society among the hetero-
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geneous company. Almost all the societies listed publish their own journals and the few which do not are offset by those which publish more than one. Membership varies from the highest honour of election to the limited Fellowship of the Royal Society to the thousands who join the Royal Horticultural Society.

Most of the listed biological societies are composed of learned enthusiasts within a fairly clearly defined scientific discipline. Their objectives are the increase of knowledge in a limited field by means of publication and mutual stimulation. As examples of the purest of such societies may be instanced the British Bryological Society and the Malacological Society of London. Others such as the Mammal Society, the Nutrition Society and the Marine Biological Association advance knowledge and may provide the platform from which individuals may seek to modify or channel public policy in the realms of conservation or rational fishery. Other societies seek deliberately to educate the public in addition to furthering a particular discipline: the Zoological Society of London is the primary example, and it is notable, too, for the possession of its own laboratories.

Many of the listed societies contain individuals who possess a sharp social conscience. But few of the societies themselves deliberately seek to modify public opinion and action on account of strength of conviction in matters of social responsibility. The Eugenics Society is among the few. The admirable Universities Federation for Animal Welfare goes further and is in fact a learned pressure group within a particular field. It flourishes for three reasons: the enthusiasm of its directorate, the convenient alliance of things of the head and of the heart, and the relative simplicity of its appeal to individuals.

By contrast the Eugenics Society stands alone among all the listed societies. Its aim is the appreciation of social responsibility in matters connected with human biological inheritance; that is to say, human genetics ennobled by responsibility. The Eugenics Society must build on a foundation of increasing detailed genetic knowledge. It must disseminate information and spread the appreciation of responsibility: that is to say, it is inevitably concerned with education. Its role is too difficult and its material too intractable for advancement other than by the use of the intellect. Additionally, the complexity of the Society's field of interest and its very long-term nature make advance by pressure group tactics inappropriate, not to say inexpedient. The Eugenics Society can, however and does, advance by the subsidization of pressure groups which have aims sufficiently simplified to move the hearts of the many as well as the heads of the more discerning. The long-term subsidization of the Family Planning Association and the I.P.P.F. fall into this pattern.

In one further and important particular is the Eugenics Society in isolation. It alone is subject to active antagonism based on emotion and ignorance of reality. No one will condemn the British Lichen Society or the British Society of Protozoologists for their enthusiasm and increasing knowledge. But, just because the Eugenics Society has consciousness of responsibility for the good or ill of our own species, emotional reactions and antagonisms are all too prone to flourish. These are regrettable facts of life with which we must contend. Yet, looking back, the advance in understanding over the decades has in fact been remarkable, more especially, of course, in the provision and the acceptability of the contraceptive means for attaining those favourable differential fertilities which are the core of eugenics.

The Eugenics Society is up against the fact that the mere increase of knowledge is a simple matter in comparison with the deliberate improvement of the condition of men by the sensible use of new knowledge. Valid comparisons may be made with the increase of knowledge in the nuclear field.

A NEW PUBLICATION PROJECT

An earlier definition of almost any concept is likely to seem archaic with the passage of the years. Thus with eugenics—Galton's "study of the agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations" now seems oddly outmoded despite its truth. A more sophisticated modern definition might read "eugenics is the ennoblement of human genetics by an assumption of social responsibility." Yet the complexity of the eugenic concept remains an impediment to its
much wider appreciation by those many who already have an inkling of reality in this difficult field. To help such people the Society is planning a volume under a title which shall encompass much of our range of responsibility towards future generations.

The scheme is to produce a volume bringing together between a dozen and a score of personal contributions from authorities on their own topics. The contributions will, so far as possible, be set in a logical order, but editorial work will be used extensively to unify the whole. Thus, it is hoped, it will be possible both to display the wide area, and to clarify the inevitable complexity, of eugenic interest, where so many factors are interrelated.

Such a volume should present eugenic thought not only in relation to genuine realism but also in relation to proper concepts of personal freedom and responsibility. This last is an area of concern in which the ignorant too freely tend to criticize those who possess ideals which extend beyond mere environmental factors.

**OBITUARY**

**SIR CHARLES DARWIN, K.B.E., M.C., F.R.S.**

Sir Charles Darwin had a long association with the Eugenics Society: he became a Life Fellow in 1930 and in 1939 he delivered the Galton Lecture on Positive Eugenic Policy.* In the same year he was elected a Vice-President, which office he held until 1946. He was a member of the Council from 1951 until 1961 during which period he served as the President of the Society from 1953 to 1959.

Sir Charles was unfailingly helpful in contributing Notes of the Quarter and book reviews to the Review, besides the original papers which we were fortunate in being allowed to print from time to time. These included Eugenics: Galton and After (1952); Energy in the Future (1955) and The Ascertainment of Promising Families, also in 1955. The last named was the text of a lecture given on behalf of the Eugenics Society at the Thirty-eighth Conference of Educational Associations. This was during the period when he was Chairman of the Society's Promising Families Sub-Committee, whose surveys were an important part of the Eugenics Society's activities at that time.

Formal obituary notices and appreciations appeared in the national press following his death on the last day of 1962. We print below two personal tributes.

*Dr. G. C. L. Bertram writes:* Sir Charles Darwin was the Eugenics Society's eighth President, serving in that capacity from 1953 to 1959. Obituary notices elsewhere have told of his many distinctions and achievements: here is the place for a more personal tribute.

The personality of a President is large in the mind of a new General Secretary taking office during the great man's tenure. Sir Charles could scarcely be excelled in this regard: his good sense and kindness were available at all times. The mutual dwelling in Cambridge added immensely to the convenience and the happiness of the relationship. To use the modern idiom, a eugenic "working tea" at Newnham Grange was always a pleasure and most instructive too.

Sir Charles's *The Next Million Years* appeared in 1952, and its essence later formed his Rede lecture. Both received wide attention, though it was characteristic of him to remark—with a happy sense of family pride—that really it was his sister's, Gwen Raverat's, *Period Piece* which caught the public fancy. That of course was true in the sense that there are always more who read for pleasure than for enlightenment.

During the earlier part of his presidency Sir Charles had taken a leading part in helping forward the Society's Survey of Promising Families organized by Dr. C. O. Carter, and in furthering the concept of "promising" as opposed to "problem" families. The reality of the new concept was well vindicated in that research, which has perhaps not yet received the fuller recognition which it most certainly deserves.

Even after the six years as President were over—that being the maximum allowable under the Eugenics Society's Articles—the Darwin presence was frequent and so very welcome at Council meetings. It is a happy custom of the Society that past presidents are always invited to all subsequent Council meetings. In that way the Society has, so very fortunately in recent

---

*The Eugenics Review, 1939. 31, 13.*
years, continued to profit from the wisdom of Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, Sir Charles Darwin and Sir Julian Huxley. Long may this custom survive.

It was during Sir Charles’s tenure of office that the Society celebrated its jubilee, the fiftieth anniversary of its founding in 1907. The dinner on December 4th, 1957, to mark the occasion was presided over by Sir Charles. The occasion was notable both for the presentation to Dr. Blacker of the Society’s second Galton medal and, sadly, for the thickest fog for many years which caused both the Lewisham train disaster and the absence of many who desired to be present.

Sir Charles was the Society’s first President to spring from the physical sciences. As a physicist he was especially well qualified to recognize the numerical aspects of biological problems, more especially of course the fundamental world demographic problem. On this matter he took what some may have regarded as too gloomy a view, doubting whether any sufficiently important substitute for under-nourishment would arise in time to afford a significant brake upon excessive population increase.

As President, and perhaps because he was a physicist and viewing from that perspective, he had a clear perception. He perceived, perhaps more than some to-day, that eugenics does truly go beyond human genetics by the addition, to that pure study, of personal and group responsibility and therefore need for action. Sir Charles was also remarkably perceptive in his recognition—and he published on this subject—that the modern increased expectation of life postponed the average age of leadership. Thereby, people being what they are, the introduction of novel ideas and ideals is regrettably postponed and delayed beyond what is truly desirable.

Sir Charles Darwin was a great man, a kindly man and a wise one. The Society was fortunate indeed to have his leadership, and many of us to be blessed with his friendship.

_Dr. C. O. Carter writes:_ Sir Charles Darwin’s ideas on eugenics were embodied in _The Next Million Years_ published in 1952. He was not wholly optimistic. He foresaw that a fifth revolution would follow the fourth or scientific revolution, when the stored energy in coal, oil, and uranium would be exhausted. There would be a world-wide shortage of power. Attempts to get energy economically from heavy hydrogen and hydrogen fusion would, he thought, fail. Full exploitation of natural sources, water, wind and sunshine would allow a population and civilization rather less complex than existed at present.

Further he thought that any attempt to limit population on a world-wide scale would fail. Man was a wild animal and any race which successfully practised family limitation would be replaced by more prolific groups. Population would always press hard on food supplies with many people undernourished and under the threat of periodic famine:

There is no need for the procreative instinct to become even as remotely as strong as the sexual for it to defeat any opposing creed that favours limitation of population, and so to perpetuate the over-population of the world.

Nevertheless, Sir Charles thought that civilization based on the scientific revolution would probably be retained, with golden ages alternating with times of hardship and a return in many areas to barbarism. All civilizations tend to be dysgenic, but the first civilized race which could keep its civilization and, as a result of the practice of family planning with the self-elimination of the psychologically sterile, develop a strong procreative instinct would have an advantage over all others—an advantage both over civilized races without such an instinct, and barbarian races who have not needed it for their survival. This process would be helped, and might be much accelerated, if creeds should arise working in the same direction:

Is it possible that there should arise a eugenic creed, which—perhaps working through what I have called the method of unconscious selection—should concern itself with the improvement of the inherited nature of man, instead of resting content with merely giving him good but impermanent acquired characters? Without such a creed man’s nature will only be changed through the blind operation of natural selection; with it he might aspire to do something towards really changing his destiny. . . . Attempts at improving the lot of mankind have all hitherto been directed towards improving his conditions, but not his nature, and as soon as the conditions lapse all is lost. The only hope is to use our knowledge of biology in such a way that all would not be lost
with the lapse of the conditions. The principles of heredity offer an anchor which will permanently fix any gains that there may be in the quality of mankind.

Many eugenists will not agree with Sir Charles on all points. In the ten years since he wrote there are clearer indications that an ample and permanent supply of nuclear energy will be available before stored fuels are exhausted. The dysgenic influence of civilization may well be arrested sooner than he thought probable. There are perhaps already signs in Western civilization of an increase in procreative instinct in the more gifted groups, who were the first to practise family limitation. The discovery of a simple artificial method of photosynthesis giving sugar from carbon dioxide and water may give a sudden rise in food supply, which together with the discovery of a simple reliable method of oral contraceptive, may for a substantial time lift the pressure of populations on food supply. In this time a more intelligent future population with a developed eugenic creed might well take steps to limit the expression of their procreative instinct.

But those who, perhaps mainly for reasons of temperament, take a more optimistic view of the future are in debt to Sir Charles for his thorough-going evolutionary approach to man's future, and the stress he laid on the instability of advances due purely to cultural inheritance.

He was a courageous as well as a kindly man and was glad that his own descendants would be taking part in the vicissitudes of the future, hard though these might often be.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

E. G. Knox, M.D., M.R.C.P.

Dr. E. G. Knox graduated at Newcastle in 1949 and worked in paediatrics there, at first in the health service but later with the University. He spent six years as a whole-time member of a team studying illness in relation to its environment in a representative sample of children in Newcastle upon Tyne (the Thousand Families Survey). Later he worked in the Department of Social Medicine at Birmingham and at present is back at Newcastle as a Lecturer in Paediatrics. He has also spent some time in Nigeria and in the Gambia.

Published and current work includes the results of the child morbidity study already mentioned, a series of studies on rhesus haemolytic disease of the newborn and ABO incompatibilities, work on congenital malformations, studies of twinning and birth weights in Nigeria, post-neonatal infant mortality in Birmingham, inguinal hernia in Newcastle, a series of studies on the aetiology of intussusception, and investigations of the epidemiology of congenital oesophageal atresia, clefts of lip and palate, leukaemia, and malignant tumours of children.

E. V. Kuenssberg, M.B., Ch.B. Edinburgh

Dr. E. V. Kuenssberg is one of a group practice in Edinburgh whose members have been carrying out research into familial morbidity among their patients. The initial stages of this study were financed by the Eugenics Society and in January 1961 an interim progress report was published in this Review (52, 225-8). Dr. Kuenssberg has been awarded a B.M.A. Scholarship 1962-63; he is a member of the Research Committee of the College of General Practitioners, and Chairman of the Scottish Council's Research Committee. He is also Honorary Secretary of the Research Foundation Board, College of General Practitioners.

S. A. Sklaroff, B.Sc. London

Mr. S. A. Sklaroff has been associated with Dr. Kuenssberg in the mechanics of the ingenious filing system used in recording this research. He has worked at M.R.C. Social Medicine Research Units in London and Aberdeen, with special interest in epidemiology and recording in general practice; he is a member of the M.R.C. Committee on General Practice Research and is at present Lecturer in Demography and Vital Statistics in the Department of Public Health and Social Medicine in the University of Edinburgh.

Professor A. S. Parkes, C.B.E., M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.

Professor A. S. Parkes, who was for many years on the Staff of the National Institute for Medical Research, has been Mary Marshall Professor of the Physiology of Reproduction, Cambridge, since 1961. He is a Fellow of
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Christ's College, Cambridge, and of University College, London, and is President of the Association of Scientific Workers.

Professor Parkes has long been associated with the Eugenics Society as a member of its Council and as a Vice-President; in 1945 he read a paper at a Members' Meeting on Some Problems of Reproductive Physiology, and in 1957 he took part in the Society's Symposium on Artificial Insemination (Donor).