

9 November 1932.

Major L. Darwin, Sc.D.,
Cripps's Corner,
Forest Row,
Sussex.

Dear Major Darwin:

Thanks for your note on Huxley. I had not before understood what you thought of him. So the son may not be to blame. Thanks too for the point about Lamarckism or rather Erasmism, as I suppose your great grandfather antedated Lamarck. It would seem inexplicable if your father had attached the importance to use and disuse (though never to "slow willing") which he is sometimes represented as having done, that he should not have been impressed by Erasmus. As I suppose he (Erasmus) developed the argument from structural affinity quite largely, and perhaps touched on rudimentary organs; and that kind of argument unless associated with something (though perhaps only a too speculative attitude) which your father strongly disagreed with, must have made some appeal. Yet had he felt any strength in use and disuse, as a general principle of modification, it is not easy to see why he should have been put off. But I am only repeating your point; a bad

habit, only better than repeating one's own.

Yes, I put in regular work as Steward for the 1st. Eugenics Congress. It was C.S. Stock whom perhaps you remember and I (and a socialist in my college) who had founded the Cambridge Society in 1910, and ran it up to about 150 members with regular meetings in each of the Colleges in turn. For the Congress Stock roped in Balzarotti, a school friend of mine at Harrow. I forget any others.

I was tempted to join in the Nature correspondence, but could not lay my hands on my copy of McAtee's paper. It was such incredible bosh that I might have thrown it away, but I should like to rub in to Uva^roff that statistical methods of that kind, are not everywhere well thought of.

Yours sincerely,