

6 May 1931.

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

Dear Major Darwin,

Your two letters arrived together this morning. Thank you for asking me to let you know if financial or other difficulties stand in the way of a German edition. I have not yet heard from my publishers, to whom I sent the offer. I put it to them that a German edition would doubtless compete with their English edition in Germany and, to a less extent, in Holland and Scandinavia but that its existence might be regarded as a very fine advertisement in England and America. However I may have missed some important point on the business side. I asked them to tell me on what terms they would let him do it, and whether they would ask for a lump sum for the edition or a share in royalties. Perhaps it would have been wiser to have suggested neither.

I am impressed by the way your father insisted that

each variation must have had its particular cause. In saying this I think it is clear he meant by variation, not an ordinary difference due to different heredity, but something new and destined to be inherited, and therefore, to use the modern word, in a broad sense, a mutation. I should guess that he did not think of a mutation as a discrete step, but as quantitatively variable, its magnitude being determined by the intensity of the cause which brought it about, and in this his notion would have been more general, but not less definite, than the modern notion of mutation. One is inclined to wish that he had used some more distinctive term than variation to distinguish the heritable novelty just induced by its particular cause, from the inherited differences between individuals. But I think I see why he did not feel any need for this, for, with blending inheritance and high mutation rates, all differences within intra-breeding groups, such as a single breed of dogs, would be due to quite recent causation, i.e. only a very small fraction could be more than ten generations old. I should be very much interested if you are inclined to think over this point of view, for it seems to me an entirely logical position, and fits very well with many of the phrases your father used in writing; I gather, however, that he felt he expressed himself with difficulty, but this was perhaps only because he felt the need of guarding himself against the unintentional

misinterpretations which people would put on his words. His spoken words, especially when explaining his dissent from some view, which he felt, rather than saw, to be ungrounded, might be very illuminating.

Thanks for sending me the 'Keynes' article. I think I feel as you do about him, and heartily condemn his one incursion into theoretical statistics. But he does write well, and is wonderfully clever at characterising different points of view. As far as I can see what he says is that as we have got to pay non-economic rates of wages, then we must subsidise industry out of general taxation, and he would like to do this by lowering wages, and giving the wage-earner additional benefit through social services. I don't see any particular advantage in this course as compared to, say, subsidising the employer to the tune of ten per cent. of his wage bill, a process which I, being, as you know, "in African darkness", think could be done relatively economically and sufficiently selectively by means of a tariff. This assumes, of course, that an honest tariff is still a possibility.

As to family allowances I do still feel that a state paid scheme financed out of general taxation would be deadly to the principle of proportionate benefit, unless it

were introduced after that principle had become established in separate occupational associations.

In the context of our outline I take redistribution by means of taxation to refer only to redistribution as between those with and those without children, and not to taxing the rich for the benefit of the poor. I have just noticed that you say do not write, so now I am done for. Is it too late to say do not read?

Yours sincerely,

May - 6 - 31

CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUBSEX.

Dear Fisher

Mome has sent me  
Haldane's Review to read,  
d seemed to want my  
opinion on it. I have told  
him that I am in future  
going to take no part in  
the Review - to take no  
responsibility. I only said to  
him that I wa much  
interested in it. To you I  
say that from such an  
authorit<sup>y</sup> it will do you  
and the cause much more  
good than harm. If any

note appears it should  
be appreciative and not too  
caustic. This is my personal  
view to you, and need  
have no weight attached to  
it. His last sentence is  
the one to quote.

Yours hastily

J. Dawson

6 May 1931.

Major Leonard Terwin, M.C.D.,  
Cripps's Corner,  
Forest Row,  
Sussex.

Dear Major Terwin,

I have read Payne Evans' letter and your reply, and I think you do all that is possible to keep them on the right track. Salvesen's address will be a good opportunity to introduce him to the society. He might very well be useful, especially if he shows a broad mind in his address.

Yours sincerely,