

Schiller seriously suggest. Bernard  
Shaw as a Galton. Aug 26. 22  
lecturer. Surely that  
won't wash.

CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher.

Would you be so kind  
as to give me your advice on  
one point? I told you that I  
am trying to write a book on  
Eugenics, which I find no easy  
task. It is intended for the  
intelligent uninstructed reader,  
and I am trying to paint matters  
with a very broad brush. I  
am dealing most superficially  
with conelation coefficients, but  
I want to put in a note  
making people look out on  
two points. Kindly read note  
over leaf, and tell me if it is  
correct. And arising out of this

There is another point on which I should be glad of a reply. You said, I think, that all the correlation coefficients for father, mother, and all other relations come to about 0.6. I forget the exact figure. This makes the variance ~~to~~ .64. You say, I think, that your conclusion indicates that in many ways environment counts for very little. Let it count for 0.6, making 70. Where does the remaining 30 of the variance come from.

Westermark & Schuller refuse to Galton lecture. I don't know who to ask. Nycoin - A Thomson. Pigeon are names that occur to me. I don't much care for Thomson. Forgive me  
Worship you Yours L. Darwin

## Foot notes

There are two technical points in regard to correlation coefficients which may be worth noting. In the first place this method is applied with great difficulty when endeavouring to ascertain the causes of any slow and uniform advance in civilization; because such investigations would require heretofore measurements of human qualities, and of all the alleged factors suggested as causes of the change of civilization, at many different dates and at long intervals of time. This consideration is of importance in regard to changes in mental environment, which ~~take place more slowly and far more uniformly than changes in physical environment.~~

is much more nearly identical  
at any one time than is  
physical environment. In the  
second place, the sum of the  
squares of all correlation  
coefficients, ~~between two factors~~  
~~amounts to unity~~  
\* ~~effects~~ in regard to any factor  
amounts to unity; and for  
this reason correlation coefficients  
give a somewhat exaggerated  
impression when used as a  
numerical measure of a cause.

x I don't like the expression "in  
regard to any factor".  
What should I say?