general public a better awareness of certain major issues affecting the future of mankind. With his biological background and his evolutionist approach, he was admirably equipped to understand such problems and put them in perspective. In matters concerning the preservation of nature and its ecological balances, the proper management of the resources of the biosphere, the quantitative and qualitative implications of population growth, and the problems of human settlements, the views and the programmes that Julian Huxley recommended to UNESCO were a quarter of a century ahead of the ideas of the time. They showed a remarkable perception of the true mission of international organisations, which we are now just beginning to discover. That mission is not simply to help member states in solving their particular problems. It is above all to bring the people of the world to understand the vital problems of mankind as a whole, which require for their solution a sense of togetherness and the joint efforts of the community of nations. □

René Maheu

By the death of Sir Julian Huxley we lose not only a distinguished scientist but a man with whom it was as easy to talk of art or literature as of biology. I met him first, I think, in 1921 in the exciting society at Garsington, where he and his wife were staying with Lady Ottoline Morrell.

At that time Huxley was a Fellow of New College and Senior Demonstrator in Zoology at Oxford. Though about as much archaeologist as biologist, I attended his course on genetics. In the practical classes which accompanied it we studied the inheritance of eye colour in a small superficially shrimp-like animal, a species of *Gammarus*. Chancing to make an unexpected observation which seemed to open up certain possibilities of general interest, I discussed the matter with him. In a flash he saw the point and greatly extended my ideas in our subsequent talks and in our delightful excursions to Plymouth to study the animal in its natural habitat and to obtain further material for our investigations. He, already a well known scientist, and I, an unknown undergraduate, at once started to research together. Our first account of that work appeared in *Nature* in 1925, and we published extensively on it in the next few years. And here I would stress a quality entirely characteristic of Julian Huxley. When we published our major article (in the *British Journal of Experimental Biology*), giving a detailed account of our results with the conclusions to be drawn from them, it appeared not under the names of Huxley and Ford but of Ford and Huxley. It has been a lesson to me all my life: to encourage and give priority to my junior colleagues.

This seems to have been among the last pieces of experimental work in which Julian Huxley took part. His scientific writings, extending over many years, have been of fundamental importance; his success as Secretary of the Zoological Society of London, and as Director-General of UNESCO was outstanding and needs no encomium from me. I would, however, like to draw attention to his greatest and least recognised achievement.

In his position, he was frequently visiting universities and scientific institutes of various kinds. He would talk to those researching there and from this something unprecedented would emerge. He would encounter those who had, perhaps for months or years, been devoting their time to some biological problem of which, often enough, Huxley would know very little. In a short conversation he would almost invariably be able to throw a new light on it, and those who talked with him felt that his visit had been an outstanding occasion. It was a contribution to science of a most unusual and unselfish kind; one which only a genius could make. He obtained little recognition for it, but its cumulative effect was great and can never be assessed.

It is difficult to impart an idea of Julian Huxley's friendship. It can, perhaps, be comprehended in this. He would always speak of a friend better behind his back than to his face: few indeed deserves such a tribute. □

E. B. Ford

Julian Huxley was a great teacher, and not only in the early academic phase of his career. The extent of his influence on zoologists of my own and younger generations is not always realised.

He was a leader of the movement which gathered so much momentum in the early 1920s, away from conventional comparative anatomy and the construction of evolutionary family trees to experimental embryology, genetics, comparative physiology and functional analysis. In 1923, with Hogben, Crew and J. B. S. Haldane, he launched the Society for Experimental Biology and its journal, then called the *British Journal of Experimental Biology*; Hogben has described the quartet as the Founding Fathers of the society —and the society has done more to guide the development of biology and of young biologists in this country in its half century of thriving expansion than any other.

My association with Julian was closest in the late 1920s, when we collaborated with my father, H. G. Wells, in writing *The Science of Life*. This was conceived by H. G. as a companion to his earlier *Outline of History*, to set down plainly and clearly "everything that an educated man—to be an educated man—ought to know about biological science . . . We three got together in 1927 and we made a scheme that covered every division of our immense subject. We worked very harmoniously throughout and, after a part publication, produced the book in 1930." My quotations are from H.G.'s *Experiment in Autobiography*.

Those were strenuous years. Julian has written in considerable detail about *The Science of Life* in the first volume of his *Memories* (1970), and told how the harmony of the three authors was occasionally obscured by superficial dissonance. Most of the text was first written by Julian (who produced far the greater portion) and myself. H.G.'s functions were to edit what we wrote and to drive us on to write it. There were times of special stress in 1929, when the first of the fortnightly parts were published while others were in page proof, others in galley, others in typescript and some even in the planning stage. H.G. was never an easy man to work with, as many tempestuous episodes in his life reveal, and he could be furious when his collaborators failed to deliver their copy as soon as he wished, or wrote at much greater length than had been planned. But the storms soon subsided; in Julian's words "H.G. lost and recovered his temper, and so did I, but on the whole the atmosphere was gay and friendly". I am sure that the violence of H.G.'s storms was lessened, partly by his great respect for Julian's store of vivid and accurate information and partly by his realisation that he himself was being educated. He had studied under Julian's grandfather at the Royal College of Science; now he was learning from the grandson how far and how excitingly the subject had evolved since those days.

In any event, the book was written and widely read, appearing over the years in several editions and revisions and in several languages. In Julian's own assessment, "The work was indeed an important achievement . . . It is now out of print . . . but its effects are still manifest in the increased space allotted to biology in the educational curriculum, and the greater interest of the general public in biological facts and their consequences." What he does not say is that the work would never have seen the light had it not been for his enthusiasm, his great abilities, and, as I have hinted, his fundamental friendliness and generosity. □

G. P. Wells