

Do not
trouble to answer
this.

Aug 29. 22.

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher.

Thanks for yours of the
22nd. I am not sure now whether
I shall put in that note because,
as you imply, I don't suppose anyone
has or even could use correlations
for such purposes. I was thinking of
my old row with Pearson. If one
wanted to ascertain what benefit
had come from compulsory elementary
education, in so far as the results
are uniform, ~~the~~ the correlation
coefficient for environmental effect,
the "nurture number", would be 0.
I was wondering if in this way

a false impression could be created. The only way to get the results would be to take correlation coefficients over a series of years or ages, and then I think the results might be striking. Pearson seems to me to begin by excluding as far as he can all results due to environment, and then, almost arguing in a circle, to say that his facts prove that environment counts for nothing. If one wanted, moreover, to search for the results of the inheritance of acquired characters, such a statistical investigation as that which I had in mind, if it were possible, would

be that thing.

As to the other point on which I wrote in a previous letter, two examples of the way I want to apply the results of what you have told me are as follows.

(1) Income tax reform to increase fertility. This is useless as applied to the mean section, and worse than useless to all below it. As far as I can see the maximum effect ^{would} ~~be~~ be as applied to those at the position of ^{the higher} standard deviation ^{in income}, if beneficial qualities were proportional to wealth, which of course they are not. This point is of practical importance, I rather think, in considering how to apply this principle.

(2) In Utopia it might be decided in order to encourage birth limitation (by artificial means

