

Aug 2 1918

GRACE CORNER

FOREST ROW,

SUSSEX

Dear Fisher

I think it would be best to be quite sure about publishing your article in the Review. So I have written a note on the subject to Prof. Knott.

Please read what I have written on the next page, which kindly return with any remarks, or no remarks. Does it put the matter in a slightly new light and a little illuminating to the mathematical mind? Is

filial regression the right  
Supremum? It beings were  
valued according to rarity,  
what figure would the  
coefficient-tend to approach as  
the mean was approached?  
But perhaps I am talking  
nonsense.

Yours sincerely

L. Darwin

I don't know how to suppress the  
last sentence neatly.

Another way of stating the point the consequences of which I have here discussed is as follows: - Take any normally distributed group of human beings, and assume the coefficient of filial regression to be 0.5. Then if these individuals ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> valued in accordance with the measurements of their qualities, this coefficient ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> indicate the regression in value of all offspring in comparison with their parents. Economic values, however, very frequently do not coincide with the physical measurements of the things valued, and this is probably true of the economic values of

human beings. Men should, however, be valued according to their utility to mankind, and this value in a measure depends on the rarity of the type. If men were valued according to the rarity of the type, the <sup>filial</sup> regression in value would not <sup>be</sup> the same in all cases. This regression would be ~~low~~ extremely high in the case of extreme types, whilst <sup>coefficient</sup> ~~it~~ would be <sup>more</sup> less than 0.5 in the case of the mediocre types.

The regression of filial upon parental economic value would be high for the extreme types and low for the mediocre types. [R.A.F.]