

Cripps's Corner. Forest Row.

Sussex. Apr. 13 24

Dear Fisher.

When I was looking at the pedigrees on Friday, and since then, I have been thinking about our conversation, and I want to put down 3 thoughts, though I know I shall do it badly. I agree that if you measure a quality in the parent, the grandparents count for little in prognosis. But does not this omit a lot of factors?

- (1) Suppose notoriety is due to a combination of a number of factors. Then if a man is not notorious, all you may know is that one or more of these factors are absent. If so what you want to know is the probability of these ^{other} factors being present, and to do this you must look to the ancestry. Does it not follow that whenever you draw an arbitrary line in regard to many factor qualities, the ancestry counts for more than when you go by the measurement of a single quality?
- (2) Assortive mating is a great force. But I think the correlation is largely, not between the 2 individuals, but rather between the qualities of the ² stocks they come from. If a man springs from a good stock, he will, independently of his own qualities, be likely to pick a good mate.

It follows that there is a kind of inheritance which comes out in the partner, a form which is generally ignored.

(3) May not the desire for a superior type of wife be a quality which is inherited?

If so, it will show itself in many notable appearing in that stock. And the fact of such an appearance of widespread ability in a pedigree is some indication that this quality exists. This is not a sure matter.

Don't trouble to answer. All I am trying to do is to stir you up to an interest in this question!!

Yours sincerely

L. Dawson