

Cupps', Corner. Front Row. Swson. Sept 24
28

My dear Fisher.

I like to dump things on you, because they are unlikely to be of use to me, and I want someone to consider them rationally. This seems to me a careful and honest enquiry, and as some of the results are not what I should have expected, it makes it all the more worth considering. If the recessive genes causing mental defect, when segregating singly, are a hindrance to the labourer, they should be found most frequently in the lower ranks. This enquiry indicates that this is not so to any marked extent. May this be due to the higher death rate in the lower ranks, especially in bygone times, almost completely counterbalancing by its selective influence the effects of the transfer of these genes to the lower strata? Moreover some of the genes causing mental defect, when segregating singly, may actually favour the labourer (success in really intellectual employment) by endowing him with such a quality as docility. • It is rather surprising that bad stock does not produce a worse kind of mental defect than good stock, if I understand it rightly. If a given number of recessive genes have to segregate simultaneously in order to produce mental defect, and if some genes - alleles - produce worse effects than others, would this result be thus brought about? Do not answer, as my questions are only to make my meaning clear. If you happen to remember it, return this into The Builder of America in October.

Yours L. Darwin

I may be wrong segregating in a wrong class