July 19 22

CRIPPS'S CORNER
FOREST ROW.
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher

Thanks for the Dommouer
Ratio – which I shall read with
interest, that is as far as my
brains carry me.

On the problem on which
you wrote before, certainly
what you now write makes me
look at the matter somewhat
differently. I began with a strong
instinctively feeling that much
too much attention was being
paid to men of genius and to

the feeble - mi - mind of the
ultimate eugenic effect on the
race is the point to be considered.
The immediate consequences may
call for different treatment -
perhaps. It seemed to me that
if one had to act on a whole
class in a similar manner, and
if different classes needed different
treatment, then the two classes to
which most attention should be
paid were those centred about the
two points of standard deviation. I
tried to illustrate this in my
American address. What you now-

Write confirms and strengthens my view that it is not the extremes to which attention should be especially directed. By I now doubt whether it is not the class centred about the median which is ~~HHH~~ from all points of view the most important. But I fail to think it all out clearly in my mind, and I should like to be able to point to some adequate discussion of this question. I cannot quite see what is involved by your assumption that the rate of flow past any one point of different particles is the same — that is I think what neglecting long jumps comes to. Does not this ~~point~~ question, also present some points of theoretical interest from the natural selection point

of view? If the chances of death, for example, are proportional to the distance from the mean + and −, then will not much the same laws apply? This is no doubt an erroneous assumption; just as you point out that the assumption about fertility is erroneous. But we often must begin with general assumptions. But I won't bore you more

Yours sincerely

L. Darwin