Dear Darlington,

Thanks for your letter and the high compliment of inviting me for the 'Bateson Lecture'. It seems a long way off, so I will accept, though I know it will be a chore when it comes to writing it. At the moment I am a little preoccupied with having undertaken to give the Eddington Lecture next November, and consequently, shall have to reflect on the semi-vitalistic or quasi or pseudo-vitalistic tradition through Bergson, to Smuts and so on. I hope it may be possible to disentangle some unnecessary confusions.

As to your consanguinity question, I do not think that it has been established as a fact that consanguineous marriages have fewer surviving boys, or what is a different thing, more male deaths. I say 'a different thing' because it would seem that nothing conduces more to surviving children than some disease-like haemolytic jaundice which greatly increases the number of still-births and infantile deaths.

If the Galton Lab. were not committed to Communistic obscurantism I should consult them. As it is, I should think Fraser Roberts would be more likely than anyone to be willing to give time to sort out what data are available.

Yours sincerely,