Dear Members,

I hope very much that each and every one of you will very soon (before 1 March, if at all possible) mail to me your copy of the enclosed postcard, identifying yourself (for the records only) and checking response 1, response 2, or response 3. Of course, the members of the <u>ad hoc committee</u> (James F. Crow, Harrison Echols, Walter E. Nance, Janice B. Spofford, J. R. G. Turner, with myself as chairman) will be particularly pleased to receive large numbers of votes for "response 1," but we would much rather get response 2 or 3 than to be left in doubt. This statement is not intended as an official stand of the Society as a body, but rather as a careful assessment of the topic, which "X" members of the Society are willing to endorse.

Throughout the long and devoted labors of the ad hoc committee since last August, the members have kept in mind last spring's original version of the statement, which received a strong positive response but which also elicited many important suggestions and criticisms. We also considered very seriously the second version presented by Oliver Smithies to the 1975 Annual Meeting. We have been greatly helped by contributions from added consultants (Douglas Futuyma, Robert F. Murray, and Sewall Wright). The single most important part of cur activities was a full day's meeting as a group at the O'Hare Airport in Chicago on 23 November. We hope we have addressed all salient questions, made no false claims, and represented fairly the variations of attitude possible among members of the Genetics Society. We hope that the resulting document will be useful in increasing public understanding in a difficult but important area. The magnitude of its impact depends on the size of the vote. Genetics Society members number more than 2,600. I hope that when this statement is published in Genetics, we can report the response of at least 2,000 geneticists who are members of the Genetics Society.

Hoping to hear from every one of you,

Sincerely,

Elizatett S. Russell