My dear Fisher,

Thank you for your exceedingly helpful letter. Please forgive me for not answering by return. I have now caught my father's influenza (my second dose since Christmas!), so we are out all here together. Yesterday I combined a high temperature with such a ghastly head ache that I felt too stupid to write.

In regard to the points...
which you raise, the form of which I fully see:

Of course I realized there a title in some official form would probably be desired. Would you be so kind as to alter it to the correct wording in your copy. The title which you supply brings out the importance of the occasion. I so much feel the honors of being asked to give the lecture, especially at that time.

I fully see the importance of a few paragraphs at the end.
bringing out the more important general, and other, conclusions. Your criticism
that one comes too suddenly upon the summary is quite justifiable. To
dwell on the truth I had had a conclusion in mind; but, when I
found I had already exceeded 10,000 words before reaching the summary,
I felt I ought to cut things down. It is very nice to have
12 clauses of adding this. I will
think it over and send some
paragraphs tomorrow.

Is it so much like your
plan for the arrangement of the
histograms. It is really rather
striking to see the lines moving
in opposite directions in the
Selected lines. Let me know if
they need redrawing for this purpose;
but in any case to draw the
reductions, which will be necessary,
can be done all right at the
phototyping.

I think the Stars a
grand plan. I am in your
l lude in the matter, but my
own feeling is this: truly wholly
your own idea, and such a
A simple and effective plan (the use of which may be explained much beyond its present shape), it would be well to have a short explanation of them written, and signed, by yourself (I'm sure would kindly do so). This might be added appropriately as an appendix.

The appendix could simply to be you or, if you prefer, could stand with a note by myself in the following terms (adjecti as you think):

'When I supplied the histograms...
Illustrating this paper they were not
mentioned with Tans to show the
approximate points of divergence between
the genotypes. This useful addition
was suggested by Prof. Fisher, who
does kindly contribute. The following
note upon the calculation of their
position.

About the place, which is
going to be such a nice addition to
the paper, I will do as you suggest
and plan it out, having regard to
the size and scope of the Annals,
so as to make my intentions clear.
This I will do tomorrow if (as
I quite expect I can get to the Museum today. As I still have a temperature, I have not to go out today. I will then either supply the models, or get a painting made, which ever the Press require for their purposes.

That I feel it essential is to have the 8 colour roses used in The Selection works, if it can be managed, I should like also to have the 2 forms of Papilio ariadne, producing the white spot by flavius and flavus pigments respectively, and the normal and melanistic forms of my Botanica.
expand data. Of course this would mean reduction considerably below life-size (with the Exsenterdata only, they could to life-size).
Personally, I do not feel there is any considerable objection to having the figures reduced.

Now there is the question of the plan of the detection experiment. Having in mind your own work, I had in fact intended to use a procedure involving the back-cosine much as you outline in your letter. I was dissuaded therefor by technical reasons. I should like to
Know whether, in the circumstances, you feel I was justified.

Your own scheme stated the lightest individuals are selected from the homogamous mating
Gomphus variatus x gomphus variatus (3 x 3) and the back-cross mating (2.3 x 3)

... Now here at once you meet my difficulty. In
unselicit material, you cannot
pick the lightest gomphus variatus!

Except for very occasional specimens
in class 2, they are all alike. (The
Effect of 'modifier' is so very small in homozygous grandiflora; only a very few possessing the earlier collection of the + gene become recognizably darker. Otherwise they are pure white anyway, so that the - type is without visible effect. You will notice that even at the end of selection, homozygous grandiflora never get pushed beyond the base cream of class 2.

Then I attempt a selection making of parent heterozygote $X$ homozygous grandiflora; I do not
know that I am using a homozygous wild-type modifier. The only thing I can say is that (not knowing which one of the rare homozygous of class 2), it at least has not the most extreme of tendencies. In this case, was it sensible to use that x test, in which it can be seen that both parents possess pale modifiers? I see that it appears to have made a mistake in labeling one of the families represented in a
histogram. I will put this right when I can get to the data in the Museum tomorrow.

I am so sorry to hear of your indisposition. I do hope you are getting on all right. It is such a tetchy thing.

Thank you for all your kind help.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]