My dear Fisher,

I can now answer your two letters, and I will take the last point first. I think Lancaster's suggestion incorrect. I have forgotten that you included it. I suppose it was at the back of my mind when I wrote. There are other points which may come in, and I only mentioned for my own amusement. You try finding your way about in a dark room in complete with a blind man and you will be hopeless creature. Blinagers may possibly be an advantage in some circumstances, if this selected. Again imagine a strange nebulose mass with a few bright eyes in the center which, making it seek a care at that time. If in the core conditions were such that it could not produce offspring, it would be inadmissible. If having unoccupied, it might produce many more, and then have a great advantage over the outside folk, which can only produce 2 or 3 on the average. Hence there would be a selective advantage to fish without penetrating the core for part of the year. This is one example of the laws that natural selection abhors as vacuous. Am I quoting The Origin of Species? I wonder?

Then as to my old friend, free will, Sam
afraid you don't help us. Eddington says we can forecast an average because it is an average. I don't agree. Take two squads of men firing at a target. The first let's shots centre around a spot X, while in our turn, the centre of our shots will centre around X. Because the aim of every shot is correlated with C., the Centre of the target. It is nothing to do with the same fact that it is an average. It is a statement of a probability, and it necessarily a rigidly true probability correlation. If the men had free will in the second squad as to where to aim, your law of probability would help you not at all in deciding where the shots would centre around. If the first squad repeats the round and the second the offsprings, you must assume the same forced correlation in the 2 cases, if there is to be hereditary transmission. There may be no going behind the seconds, but there must be this forced correlation, which is inconsistent with the one monad having any free and relative to the other. You do not see to me to get one law that determines it a recently postulate of Science, or to help.
me is believing this at the same time as free will. Possibly I misunderstand absolute probability, but so far it seems level a probably needs a force conclusion. If the conclusion is due to something internal to the mind, I cannot see that it helps. If so far as the choice is arbitrary, it cannot be inherited or foreclosed.

Then as to my father's view. I clearly see my mistress that I said on Organism evolution, for I said our own adjustment to the effect of the pressure to make our

natural selection. What you propose now to say seems to me quite correct, it 'could not be easily dismissed....'
you leave out the word 'importance', which I believe constantly leads us into trouble, we being defined. Looking to the future we

say that the discovery of the methods of evolution are far greater importance now than the fact of evolution. But it would be

had to say exactly what was meant. Hughes it would simply that the fact of evolution growing established. It fact is well admitted.
then we should say that the loss of a belief in Evolution would be a more important
Calasparry Fasc. The loss of a belief in natural selection, the whole being greater than the part.

I wonder if you can read all this, which is scarcely written. Hope the family keeps flourishing.

Your sincerely,

[Signature]