

Oct. 12. 28

CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher.

I have ~~sent~~<sup>sent</sup> on the proofs to Moore. I think it very interesting, and I am sure it will do good in America. One point for further consideration in the future. If you select those belonging to small families for promotion, as is really done, will not the larger families amongst their descendants be the result in part of the ordinary regression to the mean? I don't myself quite see how this affects the question, if what I say is true.

I am glad you are at work on your evolution book. I shall be delighted to be of any use, and could read your chapter any time — or that I expect to be of use. How about your new statistical work? I hope they can go on simultaneously. Don't hurry evolution, but do go on with it.

Then as to the Royal. You have my best wishes, both on your own account, and because I feel strongly that the statistical side of biological and

Other problems is not nearly enough  
recognized. I must fear that you  
may be disappointed. I was put  
up twice, as a geographer and as  
a linguist - 2 or 3 times in each  
capacity. Now statistics are not  
so low down as geography or linguistics,  
but I fear there is a sort of  
allotment of places according to  
subjects - or used to be - which  
gives a very unfair pull to some-  
body used to be the case.  
The fact that so few statisticians have  
got in makes it harder for others  
to get in. On the other hand, I  
was told that they generally turn  
a man down first shot. This  
may have all changed. I should  
have thought the Director going

For you was all to the good.  
Anywhere I wish you the best of  
luck.

No more, as a bit tired

Yours sincerely

L-Darwin

My little book, copy herewith,  
is not published till the  
20<sup>th</sup> inst. - Will then, keep it  
dark!

CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUSSEX.

P.S. On another point:

by Pearson

I noticed a remark in a  
long review in Nature on 2  
Engel's books (by the way quite  
temperate review) in which he  
hits out at pure line arguments  
in a way I cannot understand.

I also notice in Engelman's  
News. p. 183. 2266 Castle  
& Pincus. seems to give evidence  
in favour of mutations in  
pure lines.