

May 19  
22

for about  
a week →

Jollerocks. Stone  
Stafford.

My dear Fisher

I have been settling my Landa house, and leaving a troublesome executorship, and other worries, all now over. But I think they made me exceptionally muddle headed. I now think I see things more clearly.

Assuming (1) The existing diversity of human types, and (2) that the inferior types are always the more fertile; then (A), if the inheritance is Mendelian, there will be a continuous deterioration with the lowest type alone surviving as the ultimate end, whereas, if the inheritance (B) perfectly blended, it will end in perfect uniformity somewhat below the existing mean type. - It thus so, it shows how important is this difference, a fact I had not really appreciated. My Edinburgh lecture is in abeyance sine die; but if I ever deliver it and publish it, and if you ever print anything on this point, I should like to refer to it.

I am now bothering myself about a paper for the Feeble-minded Association - hardly the correct title - and fear my muddles may not all have gone. So it correct to write as follows? May one

reverse the picture as I have done?

"... and from past experience it may be concluded that probably between 85 and 90 per cent of ailments "are the products of a defective germ plasm" (Tredgold). Accepting this as a true guide, we may lay it down as a law that if parenthood be permitted in the case of a mentally defective person, and if a family tree is thus, as it were, created which spreads out into the future to the same extent as the investigated pedigree spread out into the past, it would be found in <sup>asked about</sup> 9 cases out of 10 to be of "pronounced neuropathic stock" (Tredgold) and to contain an excessive proportion of mentally defective, insane, epileptic, & paralytic persons."

It is the "in 9 cases out of 10" that I am a little doubtful about; whether this can be <sup>found to be</sup> deduced from only 85 to 90 % being the product of defective stock, and that stock being characterized as described.

It is a shame to bother you; but a single line in reply would be a kindness. I have to get this job done by a certain date.

Yours sincerely

L. Darwin.