

Oct 24. 32.

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher.

I am writing this for my
own amusement, so take no more
notice of it than you feel disposed.
The current number of the *Englewood*
Review seems to me to be a
good one, and the articles on
fertility important. The arguments
showing how little facts tell in
favour of anticipation in lunacy
seem sound; but I think there is
a problem which might keep some
of you statisticians out of mischief
for a day or two. If lunacy is due,
for example, to 2 out of 3
homozygotes appearing simultaneously,
and if ^{with them} ~~it~~ occurs late, after a ^{whole} homo.
family has appeared; ~~whatst~~ ^{whatst} ~~it~~ ^{then} ~~they~~

occur in all three loci, the disease
^{with} appears early in life with no
family, with not some anticipation
occur in these or any similar
circumstances? I guess it will, and
that association must also promote
anticipation. But, if so, it would
not affect the Eugenic policy in regard
to disease. Very likely I am muddle
headed over this.

I have glanced only at Hodge
on Haldane. It gives me the feeling
that he does not really understand
the action of natural selection. It
also made me wish to write to
Nature to say that I agree with
you in great measure, but that
my father's theory of heredity was
definitely particulate. I should
like to ascertain if Johansen - I
forget how to spell his name - when
he invented the name 'gene',
had pangenes in his mind

at all. In fact I should like to ascertain purely from the historical point of view if the Mendelian particulate theory of inheritance is in any degree the descendant of the theory of pangeneis. But I don't know who to ask. Perhaps Ruggles Gale's would know.

I have been re-reading and correcting a little paper on the working of natural selection which I showed you and of which, I think, you generally approved. It has occurred to me that I might send it to Science Progress, the only publication which I think might take it. But I have become very doubtful about my own performance, and I always have my brother Frank in mind; for he gave us much anxiety by sending worthless papers to scientific societies and having them rejected to his great annoyance. His memory was taken

going.

I have written another paper,
as I think I mentioned, on
the uniformity of useless
characters, which I shall bore
you into Sunday, and probably
no one else! Hurd on you!

Well I won't inflict any
more on you today.

I wonder what you are
working at.

Yours sincerely

Samuel Johnson