

Dec. 16. 29.

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher.

I have been pouring some cold water on your back lately. And I want you if need be to pour some on mine - though it is a disagreeable job. I write enclosed as a possible letter to Nature - It has turned out longer than I suspected. My question is, should it go to Nature or the waste paper basket? Or elsewhere? I have not much to do, and so like writing something, because I can

do that as slowly as I like.
But I have little self confidence
when Science is concerned, and
I don't want to make an ass
of myself for the sake of the
Society: nor do I want to give
Dunc Bude too easy an opening.
Is what I say about orthogenesis
right? Is the term right?

Would you ~~show~~^{show} it to
Cutler, and then you could
share the responsibility of
advising cremation of Embred?

I have been turning over the
pages of a big book, Wheeler's

Social Insects. 1928. For me it is
an ^{aggravating} ~~aggravating~~ book. He simply loves
new scientific terms, and as I find
them difficult now to remember,
especially as I have no chance to
help me, I was constantly swearing
at him. My father used to say that
giving one inventing a new term
should be fined. I expect Wheler is
right in saying in effect - that
in these insects we have many
wonderful instances of convergence
or parallel evolution. But in all
matters of theory he is flabby. We
see the usual phrase - "natural
selection has lost its value as an
Explanation of the origin of adaptive
variation" - though I did not see
why he thought so. He advocates
instead of "frequent coexisting

'Natural selection' "^{to} Say nothing but
ignoramus. That seems very sound
advice to himself! But his
book contains a lot of facts.

This is a muddled letter,
but I guess you will see its
draft.

Now don't be afraid of
applying the cold water cure

Yours sincerely,

Leinas Dawson

P.S

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

I am sending you the Economic
Journal, not to ^{be} returned.

See p. 354. Would you like
to get your teeth into it?

That is to write a short article
for the Journal & see if they
~~would take it? Fogelin writes~~

me, but it seems to me that
his figures and his conclusions are
at variance. He does not

mention migration as giving rise
to a fall from upper to lower
classes. The failures in our class
emigrate to a considerable extent,
and that may affect his figures,
as he has no emigrants included.

I agree that the rise is always
greater than the fall, because
features in our class often do
not vary. See p. 562. How would
"a point of exhaustion" show itself?
What does it mean? How does he
show that the reserves (a good term)
are not being depleted. He seems to
fail entirely to see that a small
drain for a long time can do
the job. A drain of 10,000 one year
in 10 would be less harmful than
a drain of 1000 a year, because
the 1000 would be kept in the
average. No answer. Anyhow I
hope you will read it when
it comes.

L.D.