

25th. February 1947.

My dear Henry,

Many thanks for your letter. I think it is an excellent idea to get Hardy's signature for Race's certificate. ^{9 for now with Robin} About age, I think Race must be forty and, as you say, his name will probably be considered for some years before election, even if, as I hope, he is elected on this certificate. In general my idea is very strongly that men should be elected at a stage when their election makes some difference to their careers or to the opportunities for scientific work which life may offer them. My impression is that the pundits of the M.R.C. would be quite prepared to regard Race as a tame technician, chained up in his kennel, without in the least appreciating that as regards the advancement of science he has done more than most of the medical fellows in the Society. I think the status of his department in the M.R.C. would, in fact, be materially affected if he were elected during the next five years. I should hate it if his department came to function merely as the ultimate scientific guarantor of the quality of products marketed by Allen and Hanburys, like a ^{few} certificate on glassware; and, after all, the Lister must make money somehow!

I have just had a very cordial reply from Hindle on Race's candidature.

If you think it would improve the paper I feel sure that we ought to have the three genotypes in colour on a single plate, with,

I suppose, four specimens. At our meeting I understood that Darlington was enquiring of Oliver and Boyd as to whether they would work from colour photographs, paintings or living specimens only. I hope he will get a clear reply.

I have just received the paper by registered post. I am enclosing a copy of a ^{revised}redraft of paragraph 15 of the summary.

Yours,

15. It is, in fact, found that the observed fluctuations in gene ratio are much greater than could be ascribed to random survival only. Fluctuations in natural selection (affecting ~~equally~~ ^{equally} large and small populations) must therefore be responsible. The possibility that random fluctuations in populations much smaller than 1000 could be of evolutionary importance is improbable in view of the frequency with which such small isolated populations must be terminated by extinction within periods which must be extremely short from an evolutionary point of view.

16. Thus our analysis, the first in which the relative parts played by random survival and selection in a wild population can be tested, does not support the view that chance fluctuations in gene-ratios, such as may occur in very small isolated populations, are of any significance in evolution.