

Read at your
leisure

March . 25 . 33 .

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,

SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher.

I am very sorry for your anxiety about your eye, which I trust is over. But if you go to your ocellist again, I should be glad to hear his account.

I return enclosed, which is interesting, and new to me. I believe I misunderstood Salisbury. I thought he meant that it put an end to natural selection altogether. I made the same mistake reading yours, and have corrected it to indicate my muddle-headed mistake -

I mean what might make such
a blunder less likely in others.
Even if what S. says were true,
would it be important? I
can well imagine that some
organisms are so well adapted
to their surroundings during part
of their development as to concentrate
selection on the other parts. Indeed
some are so well adapted as to
have put a stop to selection
altogether, judging by the small
change that has gone on for long
periods

Yours sincerely

Samuel Darwin

Of no importance; read at-
your leisure - March 25. 33

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher.

I have the evidence before me which is to go to your Committee from the Society, and I think it is very valuable -

The way in which mental defect is now divided into two classes, primary & secondary, seems to me utterly illogical. A division into the following 3 classes would be logical.

(1) Cases where no possible difference of environment after conception would have lessened the defect. (2) Cases where such

a difference ~~could~~^{might} have resulted
in a lowering of the defect. (3)
Cases where such a difference
might have resulted in
normality. It would be necessary
no doubt to define 'defect' &
'normality' - no easy job. As
things are, class (2) is divided
between (1) and (3), and probably
very differently divided by
different authorities; which accounts
for the great variety in results
partly. I wonder if your Committee
would do good by pointing out
this want of logic.

There is an interesting table
on p. 9 of the paper giving the
German results. Are not all of-

them explicable on a purely
hereditary basis? This does not
mean that they are necessarily so
explained. But it shows that
it does not follow, as stated,
that the heredity comes into
play more in the milder cases.
It may be explained, I imagine,
by feebleness being due
to 2 or 3 rather common recessives
occurring simultaneously; to
imbecility being due to one of
such recessives occurring simultaneously
with 2 or 3 other rare recessives;
and idiocy with 4 or 5 such
other rare recessives. Could not
a scheme of this sort be devised?
The opinion from The Wood Report,
quoted in the middle of p. 22

that Kennedy plays a greater
part in ~~low~~ ^{high} than ~~high~~ ^{low} grade
defect - need not be true. But
all this is not important.

Enclose two letters on
same date!

Neither needs an

answer

Your sincerely

L. Darwin.