

29th May, 1953.

Dear Chester,

I do not think there are many statisticians in the Royal Society though among what there are I think you might count Kenneth Mather as more of a statistician than Lancelot Hogben, who seems not to be able to do the simplest thing right. For my part, I should prefer also Gaddum and Trevan to Haldane, for they have both carried out work the success of which depended on the statistical methods being adequate. L. F. Richardson has, of course, also done a good deal of statistics as a mathematical physicist. Peierls at Birmingham came pretty near to developing χ^2 theory and the Poisson series for the use of physicists about 25 years after they were familiar to biological workers. Some would count also Harold Jeffreys. Yule, I am afraid, is no more. In my case the election was certainly by Section 1. Mathematics and Physics, and I imagine the same would be true of Frank Yates but not of the others we have spoken of. Hogben was got in by a group of zoological friends in spite of the protests of nearly all geneticists. I suppose the trouble with the National Academy is that their mathematicians, like the inhabitants of many American mathematical departments, think it classy not to recognise Applied Mathematics

P.T.O.

and think that they should disguise themselves under other names such as physicists, biometricians, etc. I should think the right solution for the National Academy would be to have a section of Biometry.

I very likely shall be away from Cambridge when you arrive, but do not let that inhibit you in any way. I shall probably see you in Nice at the rather silly I.U.B.S. show.

Yours sincerely,