Grendy Hall, Burgh-le-Marsh.
Aries. Jan 22. [1926]

My dear Fisher,

I have just returned to the consideration of the paragraph about which you have taken so much trouble. I have decided to put it in, changing one sentence only. Instead of "It must be seen whether the argument can lead us to modify ..." I put it "It is, however, questionable to what extent their argument should lead us to modify ...".

I think I still attach more importance to U than you do. With women in India, parental influence is all important in marriage in the higher castes. In France the dot makes a vast difference, I believe, even among the lower middle classes; the larger the family, the smaller the dot; and hence there must be in each rank an optimum family protecting those who marry in their rank. I am sorry to say I now find mathematical reasoning difficult to follow, but in your letter I think you have stated the problem correctly. I had in my mind a stationary condition of things, when
I think $X = 2 + D + V$; and I was considering how that arose. There must have been, I imagine an optimum $D$ and an optimum $V$; or perhaps $I$ should say an optimum $X$ dependent on $D$ and $V$. And select in scale $X$ produce these optimum numbers. I agree that all this is highly theoretical, for it assumes a long continued stationary population, which has not continued in mankind for some centuries anywhere. I shall have another so at your last letter someday.

Whether happen, I know I shall our present policy in this paragraph, and I am equally certain I shall continue to be thankful for your help. If my book help to induce you to write on the mathematics of evolution it will have served its turn, and I pay in my preface.

Comparative sanity reigns in their home to day, with the wedding behind us.

Your truly,

Leonard Darwin