

Sunday [January, 1923?]

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher.

I wish you would kindly look through enclosed paper, & when we meet - tell me if it is all right or all bosh. It seems to me right, except in one respect. What right have I to assume that the recessive qualities will centre round the mean of the whole? If recessives are mere absences, this seems highly improbable; or that supposition I should expect dispersion rather than regression when breeding from those selected as being below the mean in

any quality. In any case I really don't know why recessive qualities necessarily have the same mean as dominants.

Do you see Nature? Mac. B. has a fling at Mendelism in the last number. He says something to the effect that it is becoming more and more evident that the gene is a pathological entity — these are my words, not his. If he were to say that the genes, representing or determining the large and sudden mutations with which Mendelians love to deal, were mostly pathological in origin,

I should be with him.

Dr. Davenport, when here not long ago, surprised me by some such phrase as 'Mendelism had disappeared'. He agreed that segregation remained as an established fact. I never understood what he meant. Has Mendelism changed at all seriously, except in the view that unit characters have disappeared, and that factors are held to affect many qualities?

I find it ^{hard} to know what words to use in connection with Mendelism in my book, which is intended for those without any scientific education. I am inclined to use 'factor' only, because it

wish to have to explain as few terms as possible.

Of course it will give the appearance of ignorance on my part if I am not careful. I don't know if the Americans do use 'allelomorphic'.

There is what seems to me a good general article by East, "As genetics comes of age" by East in the May 22 Journal of Heredity, recently issued, by East.

Yours sincerely
J. Dawson