

Jan 24 [1932]

14 HERIOT ROW,
EDINBURGH.

Dear Dr Fisher

Many thanks for your papers and letter which I have studied with great interest.

I am delighted to hear that your dominance theory is turning out well; I suppose you will have to wait some years for the fowls to give their results with the wild Gal. bankiva. I have an uneasy feeling about your theory, which you can no doubt answer, that you are not removing the idea of dominance but only pushing it back out of sight. My point, below, has nothing whatever against yours since it does seem entirely right that if dominance can vary in a heritable manner Nat. sel. should be able to work it.

My difficulty is that when you have explained the dominance of the somatic character *A* in terms of a character *B* which shows no effect but to make *A* dominant, then you will have to go on to explain the dominance of *B* in terms of a character *C*, which

presumably has no effect but to allow B to display the character of permitting A to exhibit itself. And then what about D controlling C. You will have thought about such things, and can answer my difficulty, but it seems to me, looked at in the crude and untidy way that is all I can do, that unless you are prepared for one of the chromosomes to have an enumerable ∞ of genes on it, you have got somewhere to assume something like a different type of inheritance law, ^{not Mendelian} and my feeling when I first read your book was that one might as well do it at the first step. Your work, with the new confirmation pushes it on to the second, ~~that~~ that is B is all right but C is not a Mendelian gene at present. Is this a faulty argument?

Your book seller was misinformed about my book being sold out. It is still going, though getting towards the exhaust point of the first 1,000.

With kind regards
yours sincerely
C Darwin