

**From:** [REDACTED]

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** jeevacation@gmail.com

**Subject:** genomic imprinting and smell vs sex

**Date:** Sat, 31 Mar 2012 23:07:32 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

**Attachments:** cool\_mice.pdf

---

dear Axel

it was fun meeting you at Jeffrey's the other day

here is but the latest in a surge of papers on imprinting in mammals that continue to give strong support to Haig's kinship theory—itself in fact established in 1989 via numerous data on reciprocal crosses in plants as these affected relative paternal and maternal contribution to the endosperm, (which you will remember is triploid, two from the maternal side)

as for your statements about no evidence for an olfactory dimension in human sex i must say i wondered what kind of a sensory cloud you travel in—as for the scientific evidence, they are many, congruent and hard to explain away, women not on birth control show at ovulation but not two weeks later discrimination in favor of the odors of males whose bodies are more symmetrical and whose genotypes at MHC loci are less similar—in what way is that a failure of olfaction to affect human sexual preferences ??

molecular biology is fine but let's be clear it can only generate data, never the theory to understand the data, that requires a much deeper understanding of biology, including here especially evolutionary genetics

all the best

robert