Dec. 16, 29.
Cripps's Corner,
Forest Row,
Sussex.

Dear Fisher,

I have been pouring some cold water on your back today, and I want you if need be to pour some on mine - though it is a disagreeable job. I wrote 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 else there? I have just nothing 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 Mrs. Bird too easy an opening. Is what I say about monogeneans right? Is the term right?

Would you show it to Cutler, and then you could share the responsibility of advising cremation or embalming? I have been turning over the papers of a big book, Wheeler's
Sociol Insecta. 1928. For me it is an interesting book. He simply loves new scientific terms, and as I find them difficult to remember, especially as I have no chance to help me, I was constantly swearing at him. My father used to say that every one inventing a new term should be fined. I expect better out of biology in effect that in these insects, we have many wonderful instances of other genera 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” —which I did not see why he thought so. He advocates instead the “several evolving
"Natural selection". Say nothing but ignorance. That seems very sound advice to himself! But his book contains a lot of facts.

That is a muddled letter, but I guess you will see its drift.

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

Yours sincerely,

Leonard Darwin
I am sending you the Economic Journal, not to be returned. See p. 354. Would you like to get your feet into it?

That is to write a short article for that Journal or see if they would take it? Forgotten whether me, but it seems to me that his figures and his conclusions are at variance. He does not meet with insignificance as going rise to a fall from upper to lower clans. The failures in one clan insignifi to a considerable extent, and the may affect his figures, as he has no insignifi excluded.
I agree that the rise is always greater than the fall, because failures in our class often do not carry. See p. 562. How would "a point of Bankruptcy" show itself? What does it mean? How does he show that the reserve (a bad term) are not unexpectedly. He seems to fail to itself to see how 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 100 would be kept on the average. No answer, anyhow, I hope you will reach it when it comes.

L.D.