

## Francis Crick

My only meeting with Francis Crick, at a cocktail party in San Francisco, was memorable, both warm and unique. So someone had prepped him about me, I obviously needed no prepping about him. We exchange some pleasantries, when he turns and asks, BTW why are sex ratios so often 1:1. I said because they are selected against whenever they deviate. If the sex ratio has become 1:3 (male:female) each male is worth 3 females, so selection favors producing males. If the sex ratio has become 1:1/3<sup>rd</sup>, a male is worth only 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of a female, so selection favors producing females. In both cases, the sex ratio returns to 1:1 where it is in equilibrium.

He looked at me. "So it's that easy."

I said, "Yes, it's that easy."

"I guess it would be."

"Yes I guess it would be that easy."

In later years at the Salk Institute in San Diego he worked on "consciousness"—what did it mean, what did it consist of—especially biologically and perhaps genetically. I do not think he made much progress but I am pretty certain that no one else did. It was one of those problems Jeffrey that could be stated well before it could be solved, like Freud and stages of psychological development.

Regarding his own work I believe that he was the person who set the context and Watson was the brilliant man who fit in every peg (or base pair). So Crick knew that the genome consisted of two intertwining helices.—while Linus Pauling would have won a third Nobel if he gave up his vision of *three* intertwining helices—which in

retrospect made no sense—so much of genetics was going from one to two and two to one—very hard if your fundamental unit is 3! But your friend Watson was the brilliant mind that actually constructed the first DNA molecule.