

KATHLEEN HODSON

The Eugenics Review 1909-1968

The Early Years

“The publication of this quarterly periodical marks a definite epoch in the history of the Society.”

This statement in the second Annual Report (1909–10) of the Eugenics Education Society is apparently its first printed reference to the REVIEW.

On 9th December 1907 a provisional council had convened a meeting when the rules of the new society were approved and officers and a Council of twenty-one members were nominated. It thus appears that the publication of a quarterly journal which was launched in April 1909 must have been one of the earliest subjects of discussion.

Correspondence files and records (apart from Minute books) of sixty years ago have, for the most part, long since been destroyed and what remains is, to our sharp, mid-century, business-like eyes, to say the least of it, somewhat sketchy: “A meeting of the Council took place here on February 14th.” What council? Where? What year? Who was present? sighs the despairing archivist.

Yet the early history of the REVIEW is in many ways more interesting than that of the years within living memory, for one can trace from the very start the seeds of the policy which led to its end in 1968: it set out to be all things to all men—a news sheet, a scientific journal and an organ for eugenic propaganda.

Eugenic propaganda was the over-riding aim of the Society in those days. Again and again one comes across mention of the importance of spending the available money on propaganda work, and from the financial point of view the REVIEW, in its guise of a scientific journal, seems to have been the cinderella of the Society’s activities.

The Bibliography of Eugenics is constantly mentioned in early Minutes and Annual Reports. Although not strictly a part of the history of THE EUGENICS REVIEW it deserves mention here in that the REVIEW was one of the main sources of its material. Books on eugenics and ancillary subjects were referenced in detail and filed with clippings of all available reviews and notices. This Bibliography, under a somewhat complicated classification, is to be found in the Society’s library in a series of small loose-leaf binders. It was a stupendous task undertaken by Edith Corry in the early years of the Society’s existence and continued by her, as Honorary Librarian, until shortly before her death in 1947 (39, 3). It was then allowed to lapse. Possibly it may some time be discovered as a source of historical material. Few people now know of its existence and it was not mentioned when, on 23rd May 1944, she was presented with a silver memento in appreciation of her services to the Society.

In the Council Minutes, the first reference to the REVIEW is at the meeting held on 12th January 1910, where it is stated that the fourth number had been completed and would be published on 15th January. At the following meeting the REVIEW account for 1909 was reported: the last two numbers of Volume 1 had cleared their expenses and therefore only 25 per cent of the Guarantee Fund needed to be called upon. Circulation was steadily increasing. Volume 1 had been bound and would be on sale at 5s. 6d.(!)

Sir Montagu Crackanthorpe amplified the position in his Presidential Address recorded in the Annual Report (1909–10): “THE EUGENICS REVIEW, of which five numbers have

been printed, has had a great success in England and America. Its circulation has increased each quarter, and it is already 'paying its way.' Unfortunately there does not appear to be a record of the sizes of the first printings.

The President went on to refer to objections which had been received to an article by E. Lane. This paper had been criticized on the grounds that it rendered the number in which it had been printed unsuitable reading for young persons. This the President did not deny, but he denied the relevancy of the objection—the REVIEW was not "written for young persons but for grown-up men and women". He refrained, however, from naming the offending article in mixed company: it was "Racial Poisons. 1, Venereal Disease" by J. Ernest Lane, FRCS.

Apart from underlining the contrast between suitable information for "young persons" in 1909 and "teenagers" sixty years later, here in the first volume is an indication of the ambivalent attitude of the sponsors of the REVIEW and members of the Society towards the readers they hoped to attract—"educated laymen" or scientists.

In his Foreword to Volume 1, number 1, Francis Galton (who was congratulated on his knighthood in the second number, and whose death was formally recorded two years later in Volume 3, followed by a nine-page Memoir by Sir Montagu Crackanthorpe) wrote that the Eugenics Education Society required its own publication which would have both a business and a general purpose.

Its business purpose would be to acquaint members with past transactions and prospective arrangements of the Society and especially with papers read at meetings and discussions.

Its general purpose would be to give expression to the eugenic movement and to place eugenic thought, where possible, on a strictly scientific basis.

It was hoped to reach a wider circle of readers than the present members of the Eugenics Education Society.

The Society, he continued, emphatically disclaimed rivalry in any form with the more technical publications of the Eugenic Laboratory at University College; on the contrary, it proposed to supplement them. The aim of the "Managers" of the REVIEW was to invite the co-operation of independent observers.

Following the Foreword, an Editorial Note sets out in greater detail the general policy, which seems somewhat to belie Galton's "strictly scientific" basis:

It is not a collection of papers arranged to suit the miscellaneous tastes of the British public; nor, on the other hand, is it a dry scientific serial only to be understood by the initiated. And yet its catholic, and at the same time solid character gives it some qualities of each production. Its range is wide and varied including

Biology, in so far as that branch of learning is concerned with Heredity and Selection;

Anthropology in so far as it throws light on questions of race and the priceless institution of Marriage;

Politics (in the classical and broad sense of the term) in so far as it bears on Parenthood in relation to Civic Worth;

Religion in so far as it strengthens and sanctifies the sense of Eugenic duty.

The Review will not ignore the importance of Environment.

The Editorial ends on a lyrical note, which with hindsight covering the intervening incidents of 1914-18 and 1939-45 and the present population explosion and world-wide strife, can but produce a wan smile in the reader:

As soon as the nations of the earth shall compete with one another not in armies and navies but in the art of Race-betterment, they will be less disposed to sacrifice the

flower of their youth and manhood in devastating war. When limited populations are the rule, nations will not hanker for each other's possessions. Eugenics will thus bring a new blessing to mankind for it will prove to be the harbinger and handmaid of Peace.

The first article in Volume 1 of the REVIEW is by the then President, Sir Montagu Crackanthorpe, on "The Eugenic Field" starting with Plato and going on to a discussion of negative and positive eugenics. The twenty-two articles in this volume are mostly from the sociological angle and include Sir Edward Bradbrooke on The Poor Law Commission, Dean Inge on Some Moral Aspects of Eugenics, Dr. Mary Scharlieb on Adolescent Girlhood, Dr. C. W. Saleeby on Psychology of Parenthood and A. F. Tredgold on The Feeble-minded: a social danger.

Readership

By 1916 a reaction to Galton's "strictly scientific basis" had set in. Proposals for an alteration in style were put to the Council, and readers were asked for suggestions as to how the REVIEW could be made more popular. These (unrecorded) suggestions were discussed at a later Council meeting and it was agreed that by their adoption the value of the Society's periodical to its members would be lessened. In the following year, however, the Council accepted an invitation to send free copies for "index" in *Readers Digest*; this was to continue until 1920.

The first six volumes carried some hundred articles as well as "Discussions" on a varied range of topics. A. M. Carr-Saunders, R. Langdon-Down, David Starr Jordan, E. J. Lidbetter, Raymond Pearl, R. A. Fisher, E. Schuster, Cyril Burt, E. Nettleship were among the contributors.

The Editorial Notes were abandoned after the first two volumes and the Notes of the Quarter did not start until Eldon Moore's editorship in 1928.

In 1924 attention was drawn to the technical nature of recent articles in the REVIEW (among them papers by R. Austin Freeman, A. S. Parkes, E. W. MacBride) and it was suggested that each issue could with advantage contain a "popular" paper. The Council then agreed that a popular and a propaganda article should be printed alternately and published as a supplement to the REVIEW. Each member of the Society should receive two copies and be asked to use them for propaganda purposes. Whether this ever became a regular feature is not revealed.

Soon after this, the President, Major Leonard Darwin, reported a conversation he had had with Dr. Campbell on prospective eugenic work in America; there was a danger, he said, of another solid eugenic periodical being published in the United States unless the REVIEW became a recognized organ for eugenic work. In 1927 a small committee consisting of Edith Corry, Julian Huxley and R. A. Fisher was appointed to consider "Editorial co-operation with the United States". Their report, however, seems to deal with practical rather than editorial matters. It will be touched on later, but it contained the suggestion and hope that *Eugenical News** (which had been launched in 1915 by the Eugenics Research Association of Lancaster, Pennsylvania) might have a considerable circulation in the United Kingdom as it would provide the short, more popular monthly journal for which there had been a persistent demand.

A further propaganda measure was the reprinting of C. J. Bond's 1928 Galton Lecture "Causes of Racial Decay". It was thought that its wide distribution was likely to produce a better understanding of eugenics, and to further co-operation within the medical profession.

* The American Eugenics Society discontinued publication of *Eugenical News* in 1954 when *Eugenics Quarterly*, a periodical of quite a different calibre, was launched.

For this purpose the sum of £17 was raised from the Consultative Council and the Society added a similar sum to pay for its distribution with a covering letter.

In the Annual Report for 1927-28, by which time the Eugenics Education Society had become the Eugenics Society, it is stated that the Honorary Officers thought it might be possible to swell the volume of eugenic propaganda if the REVIEW could be produced in a more attractive form, and in addition to dealing with current scientific problems it gave eugenic comment on current affairs. This venture was entrusted to Mr. Eldon Moore, whose editorship started with the April 1928 issue. In an appreciation of Eldon Moore's work (25, 143) it is stated that up to this time the REVIEW had preserved its character as a predominantly scientific journal, but it was now felt that its value as a medium for propaganda would be increased if its contents were to include matter more suitable to the general reader.

Some of the editorial policies and methods now came in for criticism but it seems to have been agreed that the REVIEW had been improved under this regime. But financial pressures were at this time overpowering. Although Mr. Moore was in favour of two organs, one popular and one scientific, and in June 1930 Sir Bernard Mallet wrote "It is a difficult matter to combine a popular journal, designed for the propagation of eugenic truths such as we know them, with a scientific journal dealing with heredity in its various aspects", the Council agreed that the production of two journals was beyond the Society's means. In September 1930 Mr. Moore pointed out that the Society could not hope for the REVIEW to become a genuine financial asset unless it was prepared to spend quite a considerable sum for a year or two on developing circulation, paying for advertisements and so on. Such a sum was not then available.

It is possible that, if the Society had been able at that time to underwrite higher production costs of the REVIEW, as envisaged by its new Editor, it might have been possible to achieve Maurice Newfield's ambition, eight years later, of having it available, and in demand, on all the station bookstalls. But in that case it would obviously not have been a "strictly scientific" periodical.

The four subjects enumerated in the first issue as included in the range of the REVIEW—biology, anthropology, politics and religion—have been dealt with in varying depths, but with the increase in knowledge and the expansion of scientific research in directions undreamed of in 1909, far more emphasis has of late fallen upon the various branches of genetics, on demography in its widest range, on many aspects of sociology, on family planning and on population in relation to world resources. THE EUGENICS REVIEW covered a wide field but, as has already been mentioned, the policy of providing something for everybody has, in this age of specialization, been its undoing. Many times have the editors seen papers they would have been glad to print offered to other, more specialized, quarterlies.

Committees

Research into the committees and sub-committees which "managed" the REVIEW in its early years is fraught with difficulties. Administrative, Executive, Honorary Officers, Publications Committees, Editorial Committees and Sub-committees were appointed, met and apparently faded out, and were later resuscitated as the brain-child of some member of the Council. This *modus operandi* may account for a rather curious memorandum by the Secretary, in 1925, about "a difficulty which has arisen since the Executive Council has been given up: no ruling now exists to prevent different Council meetings in quick succession rescinding or altering resolutions, entered into the Minute Book and put into effect".

The Council minutes for 6th April 1910 show that the last number of Volume 1 had been completed. Here is the first mention of a Review Committee, but the names of those

serving on it are not stated; at the Council meeting on the 30th May 1910 this Review Committee was re-elected with power to co-opt.

In February 1911 it is stated that, owing to the formation of branches of the Eugenics Education Society during the past years, there was a need for ensuring that the REVIEW be the organ of the Society as a whole. It was suggested that each branch should nominate a representative to the Publications Committee, which should be enlarged and made an advisory committee meeting quarterly. After a policy-deciding meeting, REVIEW matters should be in the hands of one "executive person" under the direction of the President. No immediate steps seem to have been taken, and a year later, in March 1912, is recorded the decision that there should be a Publications Committee dealing with the co-ordination of publications of different branches of the Eugenics Education Society.

In December 1918 a Council minute suggests that an Editorial Committee should be formed consisting of three or four members and the work should be carried out by Mrs. Alexander under the Committee's direction at a salary of £2. 5s. 0d. a week, part time. Mrs. Alexander, however, did not accept the appointment and the whole project seems to have fallen to the ground, for in April 1919 Miss M. E. Robinson was appointed REVIEW secretary with an honorarium of £5 a quarter. She resigned in 1920, and who shall blame her, following the princely offer to Mrs. Alexander.

It was now proposed that the Administrative Committee should serve as an Editorial Committee. The members were Mrs. Gotto, Major Darwin, Lady Chambers, Mr. Fleischl, Professor MacBride and Dr. Edgar Schuster. By the following September it was minuted that the Review and Administrative Committees should be "one and the same" and meet weekly; at this time A. M. Carr-Saunders was co-opted on to the REVIEW Committee and soon afterwards he undertook the editorship; it was then decided that the Editorial Committee should meet once a month.

On 3rd February 1920 there is a somewhat cryptic recommendation to the Executive Committee that "two members of the Review Committee should read signed reviews of books. The two members to decide whether it is desirable that such reviews be published in THE EUGENICS REVIEW, giving no decision as to the correct or incorrect versions of the books so reviewed."

It was minuted on 5th February 1922 that the officers of the Society should form an editorial committee to carry on the REVIEW, and in January 1926 Dr. Fisher's suggestion that editorial comments should be brought before the Editorial Committee in final form and should also be sent to one of the Honorary Officers in proof was agreed to.

On 25th October 1927 when Eldon Moore was appointed Editor he was to serve under the Honorary Officers Committee. It was at this meeting that R. A. Fisher put it on record that, in his opinion, it was desirable to constitute an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee. This was done, after a decent lapse of time, and according to the Minute books this Editorial Committee met for the first time on 8th June 1928: Sir Bernard Mallet in the Chair, Miss E. Corry, Mr. Cutler, Dr. R. A. Fisher, Dr. Austin Freeman, the Editor and Mrs. C. B. S. Hodson.

In July 1930 Eldon Moore was appointed full-time Editor and in the following October the Council endorsed the recommendation of the Executive Committee to set up an Editorial Committee (though Mr. Moore pointed out that there had been an editorial committee in nominal existence for some time; it had been no use to him, and he would like a panel of experts to be appointed). The 1930 committee consisted of C. J. Bond, J. S. Huxley, Lady Chambers, R. A. Fisher, R. Langdon-Down and could be increased by co-option to six members; in January 1931 C. P. Blacker, as General Secretary, was co-opted on to the Editorial Sub-Committee.

According to the Minutes, the Executive Committee on 21st October 1931 agreed that

the REVIEW should be carried on at the same scale and suggested that the proposed contents of each issue should be submitted to the Executive Committee, which might appoint an Editorial Sub-Committee, at which the Editor might be present, if required.

On Eldon Moore's resignation and Maurice Newfield's appointment in 1933 another Editorial Committee was formed (R. A. Fisher, K. B. Aikman, R. Austin Freeman, B. S. Bramwell, Edith Corry). It did not meet regularly, and Dr. Blacker in his obituary appreciation of Newfield recalled that "a specially appointed Review Sub-Committee was designated to scrutinize and approve the Notes of the Quarter. But it was not long before a sense of reassurance was noticeable. The Review Sub-Committee gradually began to take its duties less seriously." The Notes of the Quarter were circulated to committee members but at that time most of the articles were the texts of papers read at the regular Members' Meetings of the Eugenics Society. The fact that the speakers were chosen and invited by the Council simplified the Editor's task and saved him from the problem of the lack of sufficient suitable material which bedevilled the editorial side of the Society's work after the Council decided to abandon the often ill-attended Members' Meetings.

The reader whose head may be spinning in an effort to get these early extravagances into focus will be relieved to find that a new Editorial Committee finally settled down to a jog-trot existence in 1952 when one was appointed to support me in producing the REVIEW. This Committee met regularly four times a year to discuss the contents of the forthcoming issues and other matters. For a time it was combined with the Library Committee, but it was later agreed that Library matters should be decided by the Executive and Finance Committee and that an Editorial Board should be responsible for the REVIEW; the Board met for the first time in September 1966.

The Committee appointed in 1952 consisted of Dr. C. P. Blacker (Chairman), Mr. Cecil Binney and Dr. C. O. Carter. It was later enlarged to from six to eight members and, following resignations and fresh appointments during those fifteen years, the following attended Editorial Committee and Board meetings: D. Sherwin Bailey, Paul Bloomfield, D. R. Brothwell, P. R. Cox (who was Chairman from 1957 to 1967), P. Sargant Florence, E. Grebenik, H. Lehmann, Hilda Lewis, H. G. Maule, John Peel, J. P. M. Tizard, C. W. Usher. The President, Honorary Officers and the General Secretary attended meetings *ex officio*.

Editors and Editorial Policy

In its early years the REVIEW was, as has been mentioned, produced by an "executive person" under the direction of the President. These persons are nameless and the word editor does not appear in the REVIEW or in Annual Reports or Minutes until May 1920, when it is minuted that Mr. A. M. Carr-Saunders had agreed to take over the editorial work for one issue "experimentally". Up to this time most of it had, in fact, been done by Mrs. C. B. S. Hodson, then Secretary of the Society, although contributions were to be sent to the Honorary Secretary. Cora Hodson died in 1953 and an obituary notice appeared in Volume 45, pages 78-9.

Carr-Saunders's resignation is noted six months after his appointment, but he was evidently persuaded to reconsider this decision, for it is again minuted (7th November 1922) that he brought up the matter of his resignation "saying he thought it would be wise to have someone resident in London and suggesting that a small honorarium, say £50, might help some young scientist". In the event, he continued his editorial duties until 1927.

Alexander Carr-Saunders, who joined the Society in 1912, was one of the men with an international reputation who have given a great deal of their time and energy to the Eugenics Society. He was elected to the Council in 1920, he was a Vice-President from 1936-39 and

1945–48 and was President of the Society from 1949 to 1953. He gave the Galton Lecture in 1935—Eugenics in the Light of Population Trends—which was among those reprinted in the first number of the REVIEW's final volume (60, 46), and he was awarded the Galton Medal in 1946. He said with a smile, when Chairman of a Galton Lecture during his Presidency, that his Life Fellowship of the Eugenics Society, taken out when he was a young man, was one of the best bargains he had ever made. His death is recorded in the March 1967 issue of the REVIEW (59, 4) where appreciations from Dr. C. P. Blacker, Mr. D. Caradog Jones and Lady Simey are printed.

It was, apparently, not the policy of the Society to name the editor of its publication in the REVIEW itself and Carr-Saunders's name is not given therein. It was not until April 1928 (20, 1) after Eldon Moore had been appointed, that with the new format the name of the editor for the Society was printed in each issue.

Eldon Moore, who had for some years given considerable help in the production of the REVIEW, was appointed editor in October 1927 under an Honorary Officers Committee. He was to work in collaboration with Ward Cutler (one of the Honorary Secretaries) who was appointed liaison officer between the Committee and the Editor, who would only attend meetings by invitation. The Editor's salary was to be £100 per annum to produce a volume with 320–350 pages. It was suggested that an editorial secretary should be appointed at £75 per annum; this was not agreed to, and the Society's secretary was instructed to arrange for one of the permanent staff to carry out work for the Editor. This Honorary Officers Committee met for the first time in June 1928 when Ward Cutler said that he had read the whole of the REVIEW material in MS and suggested that this arrangement should be adhered to, instead of sending a certain number of MSS to different members of the Committee; the offer was gratefully accepted. In 1929 the Editor was empowered to print all correspondence submitted for publication which he considered to be "relevant and not libellous".

In April 1929 it is minuted that Eldon Moore had left London to take up an appointment as Chief Officer of the Imperial Bureau of Animal Genetics in Edinburgh, and Ward Cutler undertook to give more time to supervising the production of the REVIEW. He stated at this meeting that the position regarding the REVIEW was quite satisfactory, particularly in connection with increased publicity. In July of that year he undertook to take personal charge of the office for one day a week at a fee of 30s.

What might be called the Great Editorial Controversy blew up, in 1930, in the face of the then President, Sir Bernard Mallet who, as Registrar General, had in 1911 been the first to introduce calculating machines for work on the Census. This long-drawn-out argument, which was not resolved until late in the following year, involved Professor E. W. MacBride, who was then a Vice-President and, as we have seen, had had a finger in the REVIEW pie since 1919. He objected violently to the (rather curious) editorial policy of sending certain book reviews to authors for approval thus inviting them to write rejoinders to critical notices which would be printed immediately following the review itself; Mr. Ward Cutler claimed his right to do this. MacBride's slashing review of de Beer's *Embryology and Evolution* and the author's reply take up more than three pages of Volume 22 (pp. 71–4) and the reviewer counter-claimed his right to a further rejoinder. This "breach of every decent literary convention" had, according to Professor MacBride, already been adopted by a previous editor and a Council resolution had been passed condemning it.

In spite of Sir Bernard Mallet's tact and fairmindedness, a long series of vitriolic letters from Professor MacBride—and apparently acrimonious argument as well—culminated in his exclusion from another newly formed editorial committee on the grounds that it would be impossible for the Editor to work with a Committee member who was so inimical to himself and his policies. The inevitable outcome was MacBride's resignation from the Council and finally from the Society.

His letters reveal him as Past Master of the Home Truth: the last Galton Lecture he had attended had been "a torrent of wearisome platitudes". (Its subject-matter had been chosen in the teeth of his advice.) His two distinguished guests had "declined to take it seriously" (but they had already been inveigled into proposing and seconding the vote of thanks). Lady Askwith had told him that "the Eugenics Society 'cut very little ice', an American expression I was surprised to hear from Lady Askwith".—It was the Americanism and not the comment that shocked. A certain person is utterly condemned as "no gentleman"—another is "an outsider"; the REVIEW editor is a "mere journalist of the *Daily Mail* type"—doubtless the opinion of one of the 'top people' among newspaper readers. The impression will grow that the Eugenics Society has fallen into the hands of cranks and that therefore serious biologists must shun it. Added to which all those who do not see eye to eye with him are forever offering him snubs and insults.

Professor MacBride in a Memorandum on the subject of THE EUGENICS REVIEW (8th November 1930), in which he states that "formal Mendelism is scientific Calvinism", advocates that the Society should have, as Editor-in-Chief "a man who has received a thorough biological training including under the term biology the medical sciences" and an Assistant Editor "confined to the technicalities of journalism, his functions rigidly limited to proof-reading, advertisements, printing, etc.". An ideal arrangement, but utterly impractical in view of the Society's financial position.

Every effort was made by the Honorary Officers to dissuade him from resigning from the Society. His resignation is recorded with regret in the Annual Report for 1930-31, where it is stated that "it would be difficult to exaggerate the debt which the Eugenics Society owes to Professor MacBride", a tribute which may have been intentionally ambiguous.

Such was the storm that made Sir Bernard Mallet wish that he had never accepted the Presidency and sent Major Leonard Darwin to bed for twenty-four hours with a headache. Let Mr. B. S. Bramwell, then Honorary Treasurer, have the last word: "The subject of eugenics seems fertile in raising rows".

The incomplete file of correspondence between members of the Council covering these years throws a curious sidelight on what might almost be called the formative years of the Society, although it was by now twenty years old. Birth-controller strove against anti-birth-controller; Mendelists and Lamarckists were at daggers drawn; the subject of eugenic sterilization was a battlefield. Luckily Neo-Malthusianism does not seem to have raised its ugly head at this time. Professor MacBride had presided over the Eugenics Section of the International Neo-Malthusian Conference at the Kingsway Hall in 1922.

Eldon Moore had, in July 1930, been appointed full-time Editor and shortly afterwards Ward Cutler reluctantly resigned from his role as liaison officer. (In a letter to Mallet, Leonard Darwin had written "it would be a disaster if Cutler left us".) Eldon Moore resigned his position in Edinburgh to give more time to developing the REVIEW, a development "naturally conditioned by the funds placed at his disposal for publicity". However, in the Annual Report for 1931-32 it is recorded that, in order to help the Society over a period of financial difficulty, Mr. Moore had resigned his post as paid editor and had undertaken to edit the REVIEW in an honorary capacity. He was elected a Fellow of the Society and appointed Honorary Editor with an expense allowance of £200 per annum. At the meeting of the Executive Committee at which this was agreed, Lady Chambers and Mrs. Grant Duff had dissociated themselves, as they believed this step would be detrimental to the Eugenics Society, but the Council was confident that it was voicing the opinion of Fellows and Members of the Society in recording its keen appreciation of the efficient way in which Mr. Moore had managed the REVIEW.

In May 1933 Eldon Moore resigned his position as Honorary Editor. The Annual

Report for 1933–34 records that “The thanks of the Council are due to him for his loyal and painstaking services to the Society”.

In an appreciation printed in the first issue of the REVIEW under its new Editor (25, 143) the writer praises Moore’s fluent yet scholarly manner and his light touch, which so many scientists lack, combined with an exactness in which journalists tend to be deficient, and commends the freshness and vitality of his work; his abilities as an administrator and organizer were of no mean order. Eugenics was an absorbing interest in his life and he had given a large number of lectures for the Society. He had been the Secretary of the British section of the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems and a member of the Commission (on differential fertility, fecundity and sterility) of the Union. The writer of this appreciation is aware that his words have something of the flavour of an obituary notice and it is good to know that they were printed when Moore was still a young man. He died, aged 53, in November 1954 (46, 202). He had been a free-lance journalist writing under many names, edited *A Bibliography of Differential Fertility* (1933) and wrote *Heredity, Mainly Human* (1934). In an appreciation, Dr. J. A. Fraser Roberts (47, 15) writes of his “transformation of the REVIEW”, his enthusiasm, and the warmth and friendliness of his personality.

The first number to appear under the editorship of Maurice Newfield was that for October 1933. He had been Assistant Editor of the *British Medical Journal* and had helped Sir Humphry Rolleston in editing the *British Encyclopaedia of Medical Practice*; as Michael Fielding he had written *Parenthood, Design or Accident?* which was first published in 1928 and ran to several editions. The differences of opinion in the Council at that time included the subject of birth control and Newfield had to contend with doubt in some quarters as to the suitability of his appointment, but to quote again from Dr. Blacker: “During the fifteen years of his editorship his touch was unfaltering; not once did he take a false step”.

When Maurice Newfield became severely ill Richard Titmuss came to the rescue and the Council in the Annual Report records its thanks for his able editing of the January and April 1942 numbers. For the same reason Dr. Blacker and I worked together to produce the October 1947 and January 1948 issues.

October 1948 saw the completion of Newfield’s fifteen years with the REVIEW and the Council expressed its appreciation of his capable and tactful editorship over this period.

Maurice Newfield died in August 1949. A symposium of appreciation of his personality and of his services to eugenics and to the Eugenics Society appeared in the REVIEW for October 1949 (41, 103) and was separately produced. Lord Horder headed the twenty-two contributors; those with no very definite links with the Eugenics Society included S. Vere Pearson, Robert Graves, Michael Heseltine, Oliver Simon, Andrew Morland, Josep Trueta, Raymond Swing, Abraham Stone, Ernest Raymond and A. L. Bacharach.

Dr. Blacker and I produced the next few issues until Cedric Carter took up office as Editor with the July 1950 number. He at that time held a research post at the Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street. His appointment ceased with the April 1952 issue, when he succeeded Dr. Blacker as General Secretary of the Society. I had worked with Maurice Newfield since 1935, was appointed Editor with the June 1952 issue and continued to be responsible for the production of the REVIEW until the end of 1967.

Contributors and Reviewers

Some of the earlier papers and Galton Lectures have been reprinted in the first two issues of this volume. Publication of the Galton lectures has been, of course, one of the more important of the REVIEW’s functions; another was the printing of the reports of workers who had received research grants from the Society. The cumulative index which will appear

in the final number will show the wide range of subjects which have been covered in the past sixty years.

A great many specialists and people of high academic standing have written articles and review-articles, reviewed books and undertaken, year after year, the abstracting of periodicals. Their labours have perhaps not been fully appreciated.

In 1928 it was agreed that the American organizations should be invited to propose a correspondent to the Editorial Committee, one of whose functions would be to suggest articles dealing with eugenic work in the United States in addition to supplying, from time to time, "shorter notes of topical interest, including research". About this time a start was made on a proposed Imperial and Foreign Section which would carry contributions from Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada, India and European countries; this was not easy to organize but some correspondents from abroad contributed more or less regularly up to 1939, notably Christopher Tietze from Austria, Renato Kehl from Brazil and Sören Hansen from Denmark as well as writers on eugenics in Czechoslovakia, the United States, Australia and Japan. This feature lapsed in 1939 and was not revived after the war, at least not to the extent of inviting regular contributions from foreign correspondents, but articles and notes on all kinds of sociological and population problems in many parts of the world have been published regularly. International conferences on population and those convened by the FPA and IPPF have been reported. The "Some Facts" pages have dealt very thoroughly with comparative vital statistics and short news items have been reprinted without comment under "From the Press Cuttings".

The book review section has maintained a very high standard. Apart from the many Fellows and Members who have supported the Society by reviewing books or suggesting reviewers within their particular fields, many specialists unconnected with the Eugenics Society have been willing to undertake the task or to invite a colleague to do so. This, and the fact that notices of important books almost invariably appeared in THE EUGENICS REVIEW earlier than in any other quarterly, may be the reason why, in spite of its comparatively small circulation, all the leading publishers have found it worth their while to keep the REVIEW on their mailing lists and send the Editor pre-publication review copies of books of importance within the Society's various fields of interest.

Reviewers have for many years been entitled to keep their review copies, and many have done so, though a good proportion of Fellows and Members have presented them to the Society's library. A minute of 9th March 1926 contrasts the position then and later. It states that books for review should never be sent to non-members. All books sent to reviewers must be stamped as belonging to the Society's library. This must have been a financial stratagem, but it very much narrowed the field. The shortage of reviewers and abstractors is noted as early as 1917; indeed, an appeal for reviewers was a regular item in the Annual Reports up to the late 1930s.

At the same meeting, in 1926, a memorandum from the editorial secretary especially hoped that the minute on reviewing genetical material passed at the Honorary Officers meeting on 23rd February might be reconsidered: "Dr. Fisher proposed that henceforward no genetical journals should be sent out of the office for review. He furthermore stated that he would undertake all the reviewing of the English and American Genetical literature and *Hereditas*." The memorandum urged that each reviewer should be a specialist in the various branches of genetic research published in the material sent in for review. It seems curious that what is now a routine procedure should then have been a revolutionary suggestion.

Finally, Maurice Newfield should be classed among the contributors. During his time as Editor his Notes of the Quarter were outstanding literary essays on current topics of eugenic interest, and were by some people considered to be the most important section of the REVIEW. Since then, the Notes of the Quarter have been written by members of the Editorial

Committee except for the signed contributions from specialists on current research and matters of topical interest.

Miss M. H. James compiled the REVIEW index for many years until, in 1921, Miss Edith Corry undertook the work; this she continued to do until 1935, when it became part of the routine work of the Editor's secretary.

Circulation and Finance

The REVIEW was first published under a Guarantee Fund; its financial position was carefully considered by the Council in October 1911 in order to decide whether, on the expiry of the three-year guarantee in April 1912, the fund should be renewed; it was agreed that the guarantee should be allowed to lapse. In September 1914 it was realized that the war would bring about a considerable reduction in the Society's income, but it was decided that it would be extremely undesirable to discontinue publication of the REVIEW; this should be proceeded with, but the size of the journal should be reduced. In the event, although the size of the printings may have been cut down, the average number of pages per volume was only reduced from 360 to 320, in marked contrast to the stringent reduction enforced by paper control in 1940.

In July 1918 it was again agreed that, as an economy measure, the REVIEW should be cut down as much as possible, but by the following January it was obvious that the position would become acute with the April number: either voluntary or paid help would be necessary, but all the resources of the Society were needed for propaganda work. It was even suggested that there should be a publication link-up with some other society, such as the National Council for Combating Venereal Disease (which had been constituted in November 1914), but a decision on these lines was postponed. In May 1919 there was an appeal to Members for an increased subscription, or a donation to pay off the deficit on the REVIEW due to publication throughout the war years. (It was noted at this time that some issues were out of print and a complete set of the first four volumes was unobtainable.)

There seems to have been no suggestion of raising the price of the journal to meet this crisis. We have seen that the bound copies of the first volumes were sold at 5s. 6d. each, but it was not until 1921, when Macmillan took over publication, that the Council agreed (Professor MacBride abstaining) that the annual subscription should be put up to 10s. It rose to 12s. in 1927 while subscription for membership of the Society remained at 10s. This coincided with the adoption of a new type-face, format and the change to the royal octavo size which was approved by the Council in December 1927 and was first used under Eldon Moore with the April 1928 number.

The small committee already referred to which was convened in 1927 to consider editorial co-operation with the United States had proposed (a) that the annual cost of the REVIEW to subscribers other than members of the English and American eugenic organizations should be raised to 12s. and \$3, (b) the price of the REVIEW to members of the American eugenic organizations should be reduced to \$2, and (c) that a substantial rebate should be asked for in the price of *Eugenical News* to Fellows and Members of the Eugenics Society. However, in this year a Council minute shows that it was agreed that the REVIEW should be sold to the American Eugenics Society at £1. 10s. 5d. for one hundred copies, and at the same time it was also agreed that the total expenditure on the REVIEW should not exceed £500 per annum.

Although there do not seem to be precise figures available (these would have been shown in publishers' and printers' invoices), the Annual Reports display a general satisfaction with the expanding circulation of the REVIEW. In 1929 Ward Cutler submitted the Editor's report to the Council: "owing to Macmillan's method of accounting" this could only be a

complete report of the first four of the seven numbers of the REVIEW printed in its new form. Outside sales had more than doubled, but revenue from advertisements had dropped, leaving a financial gain of only £10 over that of the previous year. There was criticism of "certain" advertising matter, but the Council agreed that the refusal of material seemingly repugnant would greatly reduce advertisement revenues.

In the opinion of Ward Cutler and Eldon Moore, the increase in sales was not as great as it might have been with larger funds available for publicity. Only £25 had been spent on advertising. It seems obvious that the Society's journal was thought to have a high profit-making potential for at about this time Eldon Moore offered to edit the REVIEW on the basis of a commission on profits; this suggestion was declined by the Council and he agreed to revert to his salary of £100 per annum.

The perforated page in the REVIEW with a request for information about the Society was introduced in 1929, and at that time it was agreed that, as an attempt to increase membership, up to forty free copies of each issue should be distributed to Common Rooms of hospitals and medical schools. This policy has continued until the present time (the list was re-checked in 1958) and it would be interesting to know whether it has "cut any ice".

It is minuted on the 18th November 1931 that the *total* cost to the Society of producing the REVIEW should not exceed £650 per annum.

The Annual Report for 1937-38 states that, corresponding with the Society's activities, there was an extension of the influence exercised by the REVIEW. Since July 1936 the American Eugenics Society had taken 500 copies for distribution to its members. The REVIEW could now be regarded not only as the organ of the Eugenics Society but as the one eugenic journal which dealt authoritatively and with a spirit of scientific inquiry with population problems both in their qualitative and quantitative aspects.

At the start of World War II the circulation, if not the financial assets, was further improved by arrangements for the bulk dispatch of one hundred copies each to the Eugenics Societies of Victoria and of Canada. The latter was somewhat abortive as the Canadian Eugenics Society was disbanded shortly afterwards; this was about the time of the Eugenics Society's Homes in Canada Service which absorbed so much of the staff's time at the beginning of the war until the sinkings of passenger liners brought the scheme to a halt. The arrangement with the United States only lasted another year and some time later the Eugenics Society of Victoria cut down and finally ceased to take its copies. The war, naturally, was responsible for the cancellation or lapsing of many foreign and overseas subscriptions. The Annual Report for 1943-44 shows that conditions had stabilized and the circulation was being maintained, but restrictions imposed by the Paper Controller limited each issue to a maximum of 950 copies averaging 32 pages each, including the index, and to keep within the Society's paper quota, the annual reports and accounts were included as part of the subject-matter of the REVIEW. In the following year the general quota was restricted to 20 per cent of the weight of paper used in the year ended September 1939, but as the result of a special application the Eugenics Society was only restricted to 33½ per cent and it was hoped to use the extra space for articles and other material of demographic importance in relation to the war situation. The relaxation of paper control allowed for an increase in size in 1946.

As has been noted, only £25 was spent on advertising in 1929. In 1930 it was agreed that it was impossible to spend more than £100 per annum on publicity. Except for leaflets distributed by the publishers with their other publicity material, and its inclusion in their periodicals lists, nothing whatever has been spent on conventional advertising of the REVIEW for more than thirty years. A few publicity and promotion projects have been mooted and preliminaries have been worked out, but on each occasion they have been put off for a more propitious time which never came. But more successful was a most generous

offer from Dr. Clarence Gamble, then of Massachusetts, to meet the cost of a free one-year subscription for American University and other Libraries. The initial response was good: some 117 of the 460 libraries approached accepted the offer of a subscription for one year and at the end of the period, in 1955, it was reported that sixty-nine libraries had continued to take the REVIEW.

There is no way of knowing whether the exchange advertisement agreements with half a dozen periodicals have produced new subscribers, but at least they have fulfilled one of the basic rules of the advertising trade—that of keeping a name before the public eye. An advertisement exchange arrangement was first discussed in 1920.

Exchanges of journals are another matter; they have been entered into with two motives: first, the periodical is an important one, needed for the Society's library and for abstracting in the REVIEW, and, second, the suggestion for an exchange has come from some part of the world where, in the Committee's opinion, the REVIEW might do some pioneer work for eugenics. Requests from the Roman Catholic countries of Europe and Latin America, and from States behind the Iron Curtain have usually been agreed to, even if the periodical received in exchange is not of particular eugenic importance.

Although the cost of the REVIEW to the Society caused the Council some concern in 1952 the subscription remained steady—it was, of course, linked with the Members' subscription to the Society—and it was decided to print on "cotine" instead of "antique" paper. This economy measure, an estimated saving of £59 per annum, did not last very long and it certainly detracted from the appearance of the journal. It was not until July 1958 that the price was raised from its 1927 level to 5s. a copy; this was the first step towards putting the publication of the REVIEW on a more economic basis, and a further price increase was to be considered in two years' time. In February 1960 a decision by the Council raised the price to 10s. a copy and 40s. per annum, and in 1965 this went up to 17s. 6d. a copy and £3 a volume when Oliver and Boyd took over publication.

Publishers and Printing

The REVIEW was published by the Society until early in 1921 when proposals for publication through Macmillan & Co. were approved. The procedure which has been followed up to the present time was then initiated: the publisher was to collect subscriptions and dispatch the journal to subscribers, the printer to distribute copies to Fellows and Members and others on the Society's list, and to the copyright libraries, and a number of copies were to be delivered to the Society's headquarters "for purposes of propaganda".

In 1926 a memorandum from the editorial secretary suggested that the office should be able to deal with the whole circulation of the REVIEW; the existing arrangement had not led to the expected expansion in circulation, and it would be more profitable for the Society to act as publisher. Macmillan, however, continued to publish the REVIEW for some twenty-five years when, with the reorganization of their journals department in 1946, they handed over to Hamish Hamilton Medical Books, of which Maurice Newfield was then Managing Editor. This arrangement did not last very long and with volume 41 (1949–50) the contract passed to Cassell & Co. In 1961 the Society was again forced to find a new publisher and an agreement was signed with Pergamon Press. Their anticipated outside circulation of 1,500 did not materialize and the arbitrary increase of the price of the REVIEW from £2 to £5 to subscribers justified the Council in discharging its side of the agreement. Oliver and Boyd have published the REVIEW since 1965.

The first volumes were printed by the Women's Printing Society Ltd., of Brick Street, Piccadilly. There is a note that in 1912 a change of printer was considered, estimates were received from various firms, but in the end no change was made; in 1920 the Society

entered into a contract with Wadsworth of Keighley who printed the journal until the Garden City Press of Letchworth took over. A satisfactory association of more than thirty years was ended in 1965 when the new publishers undertook the printing in their own works, T. and A. Constable of Edinburgh.

In 1914 the colour of the cover was objected to, but it was decided that green should be adhered to, but a better shade sought. Later a buff cover printed in green was introduced and used for many years until the change to the blue cover in 1959.

The complete change in style when Eldon Moore took over in 1927 has already been mentioned; a new format was approved in 1946 and first used with the April 1947 number. The front cover was re-designed to include the quotation from Galton's Autobiography (Man is gifted with pity and other kindly feelings; he has also the power of preventing many kinds of suffering. I conceive it to fall well within his province to replace Natural Selection by other processes that are more merciful and not less effective. This is precisely the aim of eugenics) and the reproduction of *Galtonia candicans* (syn. *Hyacinthus candicans*), a flowering bulb so named in 1880 by Professor J. Decaisne of the Paris Museum of Natural History, in honour of Francis Galton.

A new type-face and lay-out was adopted in 1958 when the printing of the contents list on the back cover was introduced.

Some further changes were made when Oliver and Boyd took over in 1965. Up to this time the REVIEW had been published in April, July, September and January, the new volume starting with the April number. Volume 57, number 1, was dated March 1965 and with publication of the other issues in June, September and December a simple adjustment was made which allowed the volume to coincide with the calendar year. Two other major improvements were made at this time, both of particular advantage in the bound volume. One was the collection of all advertisements into one section instead of their being interspersed among the reading matter, the other was that each number was sewed in sections to obtain a square spine as compared with the previous method of saddle wire-stitching.

March 1967 saw the final and perhaps the greatest change in format with the disappearance of double columns and the adoption of the full-page type spread. The cover was redesigned, *Galtonia candicans* and the quotation from Galton were no longer shown but the names of the members of the Editorial Board were clearly displayed.

Conclusion

The method here adopted of setting out this history of THE EUGENICS REVIEW, the Eugenics Society's journal for the first sixty years of its existence, has obviously entailed a certain amount of repetition, but a year-by-year diary might have been more difficult to assimilate.

The cumulative index will be a pointer to the subjects and policies which succeeded one another in eugenic interest and importance through the years, and will form the bare skeleton of a history of the Society as reflected by material published in the REVIEW. The preceding pages have, at least, recorded the names of the men and women who have, in varying degrees, influenced the production of THE EUGENICS REVIEW between 1909 and 1968.