

6 The main advantage of mating together eminent persons, in comparison with their selecting their own mates and mating at random, would be the consequent appearance of intellectual giants in the next generation or two. As to ultimate results, apparently the same effect - would be produced by eminent persons mating together and producing ~~two~~^{two} additional children and eminent persons mating at random and producing ~~three~~^{three} additional children.

and not finding suitable children.

object to aim at

It ~~would~~ is a nice choice which would be the more costly and troublesome proceeding! It should also be noted that if the selected persons were, in consequence of their selection, moved out of a more fertile into a less fertile stratum of society, and if their descendants remained in the ^{their} less fertile stratum, the ultimate results would be dysgenic whatever might be the more immediate consequences. In these circumstances, to create an improved type in perpetuity would necessitate the establishment of a rigid caste system.

in a note

I state ~~that the racial advantages of~~ ^{only}
mating together selected couples as compared
with allowing each ~~selected~~ person to select his
or her own mate are (1) the immediate effects,
~~on the effects on the next 2 or 3 generations,~~
and (2) that greater results ~~would~~ perhaps
thus be obtained for the same money, as
one stimulus will affect 2 selected individuals.
Is this so? Say we select a man and a
woman in a population of 8000, height being
the quality, and they have two children extra.
Their height is 9" above the average, and their
2 children 6" each; 12" ^{has 12"} to be distributed
amongst the 8000. Let them mate separately
to average ~~mates~~. They will have children
4½" above average, will they not?
Or, if they have one child extra each,
there will be nine others to distribute.
Thus the same results will be produced
by making the selected individuals if
mated at random produce 3 children,
or if mated together produce 2 children.
This seems an odd law, if true. My old
note is ^{not} strictly accurate. Should
I not say the chief racial advantages?

~~"For instance, after two children produced by
selected couples will be as valuable to the race as
three children produced by selected individuals of
similar quality."~~