

May 4 - 27
CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher.

I think I was rather muddle-headed when I wrote to you about cross-fertilization, and also I may have misunderstood what you said in the taxi. I thought you had said you did not see why plants had come to reject selfing so generally, but in your letter you seem to me to explain it very thoroughly. On page 29 of my father's book he says of a certain experiment that all the crossed plants attained a greater height than their antagonists. The

Selfed ~~crossed~~ plants. I should have
included a few bad plants
with the majority showing no change;
but there is a sentence in your
letter that makes it probable
that there is an explanation for
this ^{result} based on recessive qualities,
which I don't understand. Tell
me sometime when we meet, I
don't bother to write, as I am not
working at this question. The
Experiment in question was
carried on for 11 generations, &
the first cross gave results not
much better or worse than the
average of the whole 11, which is

again what I should not have
expected. There seems to be to
be a lot of theoretical spade
work to be done here. Does it
not look, moreover, ^{as if} that the
recessive evil qualities a very
numerous indeed? And how
does this affect eugenics? No
answer expected.

On another subject, I am
glad to say Goodrich will
try to attend the meeting
about black butterflies on April
13. Would it be a good thing
or a bad one to invite Stanley
to be there also? I am rather
inclined to say a good thing,
as Goodrich is wrong. (3 at 1)

Myself shall not move in this
direction.

Yours sincerely,

Samuel D. Newson

The average difference in the
first 5 generations is almost
identical with the average
difference in the next 5,
in the experiment above
mentioned.

March 4 - 27.

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher.

In regard to the
Enclosed, I never heard that
you had told Mr. H. that
this literature was not to
go out. I don't think you
mentioned it at the meeting,
I have written to her on
the subject. I am bound
to say that for those who
have no easy access to
genetical literature it might
be inconvenient never to be
able to borrow a number.

It they can only be consulted
at the office it diminishes
their usefulness. I don't see
why this rule, if admissible,
should not apply to all
periodical literature. And
with a proper system, current-
losses be detected? Could
the rule be that no periodical
literature should be out for
more than 14 days? These
are my ideas. As to reviewing,
your suggestions will work
all right, I think, if you

would really take the trouble
regularly to write to the
others. I should have thought
to send a list ^{to Mrs. H.} of the articles
others are to review would
be better.

Of course Mr. H. is very
treasonous in some respects.
But ^{her} ~~the~~ indication is very
valuable, and one does not
want to squander it.

We will talk it over at
the meeting.

Yours as usual

Edward Darwin