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 English Review seems to me to be a good one, and the article on fertility important. The arguments showing how little facts tell in favour of anticipeation in lunacy seem sound; but I think here 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 it occurs late, after a family has affected, it is likely...
occur in all three loci, the disease appears early in life with no family, will not some anticipation occur in these or any similar circumstances? I guess it will, and that assoluteri making 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 and 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 Noyce to say that I agree with you in great measure, but that my father's theory of heredity was definitely particular. I should like to ascertain if Johansen's figure has been spelled his name. When he invented the name 'gene', had pangenesis in his mind
at all. In fact I should like to ascend various from the historical point of view of the Mendelian particularistic theory of inheritance to any degree the descendant of the theory of pangenesis. But I don't know who to ask. Perhaps Ruggles Gates would know.

I have been re-reading and correcting a little paper on my 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 twice
going.

I have written another paper, as I think I mentioned, on the uniformity of unclear characters, which I made more you into something, and probably no one else! Just one you!

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

I wonder what you are looking at.

Yours sincerely,

Demands Davies