
My dear Henry,

I think you know that the great pleasure which the award of the Darwin Medal has given me is largely because I know it has the approval of friends like yourself, and that the special mention in the award of the theory of dominance, which your own experiments have done so much to confirm, was to me a peculiar satisfaction.

In spite of searching the Times I have been unable to find the list of the other recipients, though I heard last week from
Salisbury of my own case. I have heard that both Jeffreys and Gray here have been honoured, I suppose with Royal Medals, but I have not heard about the others.

I expect you will be sending along the data you spoke of during the next month, in preparation for your visit at the time of the Perse Feast.

Yours sincerely,
My dear Ron,

I have just received the invitation to the Perin dinner and have sent my acceptance, as instructed, to the College Stroud. Thanks for your very kind offer. It is indeed kind of you, and am honoured to see that you should invite me to this important function. I shall be delighted to be with you then.

By the way, the invitation states "Doctors will be at Scutari", I assume this refers to Cambridge. Doctors only: how it applies, I would certainly think Scutari, but I believe one here in any circumstances means the staff of one University in another — but do correct me if I am wrong in this.

I now send you herewith one data on the Common Blue (Polygonia icarus) obtained in Tain this summer. You will remember in general feeling on the matter: that it is not as any difference in survival rate between populations of different ages could be detected, it would be very sustainable. Now further could be attached
The results of a second year tended, if in agreement, provide a far better check. Moreover, the two years of Piceums could be a valuable contact compared with the Hapiata pustina data: for the barriers of the one species are the colonists of the other.

There are one or two general points to notice about the data this year compared with last. In 1947 as studied, as in many remember, three populations - of large, small, and intermediate sizes inhabiting, respectively, Areas 1, 2 + 3
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This is a sketch only, but gives the general impression.

This year the numbers were considerably smaller than last, and it proved impossible to obtain samples in the smallest area (2); two people hunting for an hour produced in all three specimens the first day, two the second.

Thus be concentrated on the large area 1 and the small area 3 (being the intermediate one in size last year). I am sure their return to the same numbering.

The population being considerably more smaller, we are able to mark higher proportions than before, and for the first time to have a really extensive body of data giving multiple recaptures. You will, I think, be quite surprised to see what a lot of these multiple recaptures are listed for the 3’s of both areas (which are much more easily obtained than the 3’s).

Here is, of course, the important potential criticism of all such marking work, that—
marked specimens do not survive as well as unmarked. I am wondering if these multiple recapture data could possibly show whether specimens marked a number of times survive as well as those marked only once or twice.

As I have said the data is regarding to migration from one area to another. You will see the amount of such migration is small. Specimens found in the wrong area are returned to the correct one. They are listed in the triangles as if they had been taken in the area in which they had been released, i.e. a specimen marked in Area 3 was treated throughout as a member of that population. I am not certain if it should have done this, as the chances of recapture are of course affected by an individual moving into a larger or a smaller colony. However, I think the records are sufficiently complete to enable such data minds to be directed upon how marked individuals are treated differently as to chances of recapture.

Information in regard to migration and multiple recapture is given on the back of each triangle.
I have always found it difficult to record in a clear way the multiple recaptures. This year you will see I have put them in a standard form, which I hope will be convenient. Relevant data are in the margin, and the previous date-marks of each specimen are given in brackets; a multiplication sign outside each bracket gives the number of specimens of each type. Thus:

22. VIII.

(19 + 20) x 3; (15 + 19 + 20) x 1

means Rel. on August 22nd three specimens were caught which had each been marked on the 19th and 20th, and that one specimen was caught which had been marked on the 15th, 19th, and 20th. If a multiple-marked specimen is killed, it is distinguished.

Finally in regard to the construction of the triangles:

Numbers within the triangle are, of course, marks not missed.

The (inner) totals down the two sides six, respectively, missed, caught, marks released.
But, in addition, it seemed worth to supply rather fuller data, as a second (partial) set of totals.

Under Captures, the order totals give the number of unmarked specimens caught - [the order totals being all marks caught, marked + unmarked]. You will see this information is rather informative. Look at the way in, e.g. Area 1D, that the proportion of unmarked captures drops to the 26% or 27% and suddenly rises again, suggesting an emergence at that time.

The order totals under releases give themselves released. This shows, in comparison with the capture data, how many have killed (or vanished for breeding). Thus, to be quite clear about these two sets of totals, to have under Area 1D the information that on August 25th, 20 specimens have captured which I only had not previously been marked, that of June 19, having in all 37 marks, were released.

You will know, my dear Ron, how delightful it is to have your help and interest in all this.

Yours ever,

[Signature]