

No hurry to answer.

Feb. 1<sup>st</sup> '32

CRIPPS'S CORNER,

FOREST ROW,

SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher

As I think I mentioned before, I have been writing some notes on Evolution &c, and I am going to ask you not only to read them, but, what is more difficult, pick them to pieces as much as you can. I have been doing this mainly to interest myself, as I now find writing difficult, and in consequence the results generally unsatisfactory. Galton gave his Rouseher lecture when he was a good deal older than I am, and I confess I have something

wondered whether I should ever  
hold forth again; and, if so,  
whether the Saljeet would do.  
Galtor made the stipulation that  
if he did not feel equal to  
the strain, he might be absent,  
and get someone to read his  
lecture for him; and that did  
take place. I doubt if I should  
have the cheek to suggest such  
a condition. But, in truth, I only  
mean all this to show that  
if you conceal your real feelings,  
and praise when no praise is  
due, the consequence may be very  
serious!! I am also sending  
you a few separate notes in my  
own hand writing. With you also  
kindly scribble your remarks in  
pencil opposite them also, and

return. As to the type written  
stuff, I may add something  
as to the way in which the  
way I have presented the  
evolution problem reacts on  
religious propaganda. I feel  
very sure that you, and possibly  
a couple more, will be the only  
audience for these two efforts.

Did you notice in the last  
Nature, in a review on an  
entomological book by one  
Camerun, the following sentences?  
"the adherents to the theory of  
natural selection have invariably  
stressed .... the effects of  
environment on the colour schemes  
of insects, they have utterly  
failed to realize that such a  
simple explanation is not

readily tenable since colour is the result of an intricate chain of ~~various~~ chemico-physical processes within the organism."

Does not this show that the blighter has not the faintest idea how selection acts? But I do not feel certain what he means.

Blood is red because the most-suitable chemical compound for the purposes is red. But blood is only used to give external colour where that would be useful for other purposes. There is a lot to do to make up natural selection yet

yours sincerely

Charles Darwin

I ought to apologise heartily for giving you this trouble. I can only minimise it by sending ~~you~~ <sup>you</sup> a