

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON KING'S COLLEGE.

TELEPHONE:
TEMPLE BAR 5651.
(4 LINES)

STRAND, W. C. 2.

28th November, 1932.

Dear Fisher:

I was sorry you were not at the Committee meeting on the human heredity scheme of the Eugenics Society last week, as there were several matters I wanted to consider with you. You will receive a report of the meeting from Blacker, and I think our recommendations correspond with those which you had in mind at the previous meeting.

I am glad that you have accepted membership in the human heredity committee of the I.F.E.O. These two things should I think supplement each other rather than

interfere in any way. *I am assuming that you will also become a member of the British Committee, & shall be very glad if you will accept.*

You will doubtless have had from Blacker a copy of his paper, General Aspects of Hereditary Disease, which contains two serious mistakes. On page 7 he makes the elementary error of identifying characters with genes; and on page 15 in the last paragraph you will see how he plays into the hands of the Pearson school and supports the method of lumping pedigrees regardless of whether they are dominant or recessive, which was the

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON KING'S COLLEGE.

TELEPHONE
TEMPLE BAR 5651.
(4 LINES)

STRAND, W. C. 2.

-2-

point I criticised in their work. He is on friendly terms with Dr Julia Bell, and when I remonstrated with him for this statement he merely replies with an attempt to justify it. Now it seems to me a serious matter that the secretary of the Eugenics Society should, although his statements on genetics are full of inaccuracies, be allowed to pose as an authority in genetics. I think I told you how I overlooked the impudent way in which he attempted to revise my manuscript, his additions and alterations being full of misstatements. I hope you will agree with me that it is necessary to curb his activities in this direction.

That the Pearson school are as hostile as ever to the Eugenics Society and the Genetical study of human inheritance is shown by their recent review of the Baur-^{in Sci. Progress} Fischer-Lenz book, in which they support the statement, which they obviously know to be untrue, that it is the only book on the subject.

I should be glad to have your views on this matter, as the situation has in my opinion become extremely serious.

Yours sincerely,

R. A. Fisher