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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, and kindly return with any remarks or no remarks. Does it put the matter in a slightly new light and a little illuminably - the mathematical mind? Is
filial regress in the regu-
supremum? If beings were
valued according to rarity,
what figure would the
coefficient tend to approach as
the mean was approached?
But perhaps I am talking
onsense.

Yours sincerely,

C. 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 were valued in accordance with the measurement of their qualities, this coefficient would 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 thus is probably true of the economic values of—
human beings. Men should, however, be valued according to their utility to mankind, but this value in a measure depends on the rarity of the type. If men were valued according to the rarity of the type, the regression in value would not be the same in all cases. This regression would be extremely high in the case of extreme types, whilst it would be less than 0.5 in the case of the mediocre types.

The regression of filial types from parent types would be high indeed for the extreme types, it would for the mediocre types. [R.A.F.]