

December 30, 1962

Dear Jim-

Thanks for your notes on sex ratio: they were just what I had remembered hearing from you. Walter Bodmer and Anthony Edwards have also published on it, and you should have reminded me what you wrote in your chapter in *Methodology of Human Genetics*, which is the most quotable.

If you have any chance to think about such matters now (we just recently heard about your entrapment in the dean's office -- but what an undeserved bonus to the school!) I would be very grateful for your reactions about "euphenics", and more broadly how such problems should be looked for and studied.

One more point you are very well aware of, whose full significance is just coming home to me-- the immense importance of sexual dimorphism for further evolutionary advance. Given the sharp differentiation of roles of the sexes, at least in recent human cultures, there are very few fundamental changes which will have the same impact (perhaps not even the same sign) in the two sexes; indeed recombination might be disastrous. Then why isn't there more Y-linked variation? Perhaps there just hasn't been enough time for the culturally exaggerated dimorphism to begin to push the genotype. (Medawar's query at London, why genes for homosexuality hadn't selected ~~themselves~~ themselves out of existence provoked my reply that this looked like a polymorphism -- either by heterozygous advantage or on Haldane's suggestion of differential coaction with XX?XY-- and further, this general line of thinking.) I predict this will be a ~~major~~ very serious problem for eugenics; of course, GBSHaw/Terry have already anticipated it, and another reason for euphenic technique: for some while it will be easier to program alternative sets of developmental

CRW

controls based on the finding (or determination) of sex than to work out how to achieve ~~this~~ this canalization under the domination of the existing sex-switch mechanisms. In fact this might be so hard to do that I might argue that a predictable consequence of eugenix activism is the convergence of the sexes to a common norm.

Jim, surely this problem has been written about in extenso. Where?

As ever,