

Feb. 9-32

CRIPPS'S CORNER,

FOREST ROW,

SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher,

I return enclosed as I suspect you want to keep it. I am glad to have read it. It is not to the point, but you seem to me to have dealt especially clearly with the fundamental difference between the theory of natural selection and its various rivals. I should like Ford, when he attacks Lamarckism after ~~the~~ July, to see it, or something like it. I am glad you liked what I said about the desires to lead us to follow. These instincts would be a hard nut to crack for Lamarckians. As to the point where you did not follow me, I think

I now see where I was wrong. You speak of thousand year old mutations being preserved in a species, or words to that effect. Such a process would not make them recessive, and if that was all that had to be said about this store of mutations of various ages, I do not see why they should be any regressible from the midparent in a uniform environment. But ^{these} recessive mutations were probably in some past state of affairs harmful, and if so probably many or most of these stored mutations are recessive, & do give rise to regressives.

In the J of H, just to hand, there is an interesting paper on scholastic tests and heredity. I wonder if the figures there given fit in with your statistics as to regressives. Possibly to test them would be difficult.

No answer

Yours sincerely

L. D. Darwin