

15 January 1931.

Dr Olof Tedin,  
Keltullsholm,  
Landskrona,  
Sweden.

My dear Tedin,

When Sonderff and Roemer ran me in for that committee in Copenhagen, I expressed the opinion that standardisation of notation must, to be effective, wait upon standardisation of statistical method; from which we are very far at present. I do not think the scheme can do any harm, so long as no one feels under any obligation to use it. It is the author's business to use a notation which shall be intelligible to his readers, and though an editor may advise, I do not think even an editor should insist on a point like this. International intelligibility is, of course, a great thing, but I do not think it is our notation, but our very confused ideas which are the real obstacle. The Germans are so fond of organisation that they tend to think that everything international must have for its aim international organisation, rather than international understanding. There is an indiscreet answer for you!

Your barley data interests me greatly. If  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are the mean heights of the three genotypes, based on  $n_1$ ,  $n_2$  and  $n_3$  observations will not

$$b = \frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}c$$

have a variance

$$\frac{1}{n_2} + \frac{1}{4n_1} + \frac{1}{4n_3} = \frac{4n_1n_3 + n_2(n_1 + n_3)}{4n_1n_2n_3}$$

giving an effective number

$$\frac{n_1n_2n_3}{n_1n_3 \frac{n_2}{4}(n_1 + n_3)} \quad ?$$

This should raise your "between families" variance very considerably, about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  fold.

About dominance I do not wonder you hesitate, I did myself, as my first very tentative paper shows; but do you not think that the polymorphic species ( I have sent you the last paper) fairly prove the general case for modification, apart from the light thrown on the special problem of polymorphism?

Now what do you think of this? You have some very fine barley data. I have long been looking for anything so good to try out a number of genetical-biometric ideas. Also Dr Lamer, whom you knew at Minnesota is now working

in my laboratory. If you think it worth while, and if the idea appeals to you, (do not hesitate for a moment about refusing), we should rather like to try our hands on your measurements, with a view if we made anything of <sup>them</sup> ~~it~~, to joint publication with you. This should not, of course, prevent you from publishing anything you liked on your own data separately, but would bind us to put our results (if any) before you, and discuss with you how they should be published; perhaps in a series of papers in the same journal. Of course the same end would be achieved in time if you publish your measurements in full, and we each had a shot at interpreting them, but there is something to be said for the other idea. Let me know just what you think.

Yours sincerely,