

12th. May 1948.

Dear Bateman,

I am sure Darlington misunderstood me if he suggested that I thought you guilty of plagiarism. Of course that would be nonsense.

I certainly had supposed it was obvious, and had been taken as obvious by writers on the subject, that the reproductive capacity of females being more limited than that of males, it was inevitable that they rather than the other sex should exercise selection and that the males should be more conspicuously modified by sexual selection.

Rather later, I believe, Wallace suggested that there was a positive and not only a negative reason for the females being less modified, namely that they were often exposed to predators during incubation, and therefore were usually of cryptic coloration.

Of course, if it is true, you might say in your first paragraph, "The evidence on intrasexual selection has so far indicated that it acts mainly on males, but why this should be so has not been discussed, or has not been largely discussed". Offhand I would not like to say that it had not been, but it may be so. I can scarcely imagine that in any discussion, say, of human polygyny and polyandry no reference has been made to the

different reproductive capacity of the two sexes. However, I do not think all this matters; at least your paper makes sure that future writers will be able to find the general principle clearly stated.

Yours sincerely,