

Oct. 29 22.

CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher

Many thanks for your long letter. But you must not write unless you feel a call to do so — unless I ask you a direct question, then I know you will.

Your idea of absolute measures being more useful than relative measures (my bad way of putting it) is interesting and new to me. I can only now say that as I don't know how the coefficient of variability is measured (tell it me in Galt.) I can't judge about your figures. As far as I can guess at these

things. I should not know that this coefficient when dealing with absolute measures was truly comparable to when dealing with ratios. But I think you must be right on such a point. Then I think absolute measures must be much more affected by differences in environment than relative measures. Take plants in different soils, for example. I know that you make out that human measures are little affected by environment. This, however, has I confess, always rather surprised me - I mean as to the smallness

of this effect. Quits seem to me  
much taller than they were, and I  
think I have seen this confirmed  
by statistics. I have put this down  
to difference in food, probably more  
meat. But taking your figures as  
all right, and environmental  
differences as counting for little,  
can we get any idea whether the  
differences in variability can be  
fully accounted for by selection?  
I confess I fail to see how.  
I hope this gives you something  
to think about! That is all I  
could for.

As to terms probably my  
suggestion is untenable. Do we  
know for certain that after  
the reduction division has  
taken place the germ never

then splits in two? I  
suppose ~~they~~<sup>we</sup> do, and if so  
my idea must be ruled out.

I am glad you are  
going on with experiments - about  
it -

Yours sincerely

J. Daurin

—