Dear Cyril,

I am returning your last batch of papers including two of the three from Birmingham. Hayman and Dather on Frogress of inbreeding who: h mozygotes are at a disedventage". second one, "Components of Variation ender ath meting" I am retaining antil I can look at Welder's paper with it. third, "Mixed selfing and rand " unting" by Hayman I am returning herewith. This neems to me such the best of the three. Mather has had my e-iticist of the first and if he likes to persist with it as it is, that is his offsir. I think it quite grossly overestimates the effects of selective disadvantage through not osparating the effects of such disadvantage within an inbred line from the effects which seem to be greatly exeguerated by their formula of the elimination of some inbred lines as compared with others. The trouble arises, I think, through taking as model, a patch of selfed cereals in which, of course, if homozygotes are at a disadvantage, the completely homozygous lines are constantly being replaced by lines still heterozygous. To apply this continuing process of elimination to sib mating lines without regard to their fertility seems very artificial. However, I have done with all of these except the one eme for which I amawaiting proofs of Nelder's paper for comparison.

I will let you know later if either Henry Bennett or George Owen are driving me over for the Council Heeting on October 16th. In successing this to them, I shall be assuming that whichever of them it is can be put up for the following night.

Sincerely yours,