

21 December 1932.

Professor E.B. Poulton, F.R.S.,
Wykeham House,
OXFORD.

Dear Prof. Poulton:

Thanks for your letter. There is really not much to say about the meeting at MacBride's, except as to persons. The most interesting thing perhaps was MacBride's own attitude. He had been talking, in the loose overconfident way he has, as though McAtee had completely demolished Natural Selection, as anyone but a fool could see. However, he had evidently enquired about the Entomological Society, and in opening the subject himself was as mild as a lamb, cautiously referring statistical questions to experts in such things, and commending McAtee for putting forward a body of evidence which at least required consideration. Nobody seemed to want to talk, so *faute de mieux* he got me to start, and I made only general criticism on the line that his data could not possibly be used to prove the negative proposition he was trying to establish, and that his positive evidence was weakened by the entire lack of a full triple classification, by locality, species of bird, and time of year, of the birds shot, without which their evidence could not be

assessed.

Uvaroff was rather grumpy, having evidently been somewhat offended by the reception of his views at the Entomological Society. He tried to make out, what McAtee does not claim, that the smallness of his numbers of butterflies shows that butterflies were seldom eaten. Several speakers gave slight reminiscences, such as Pycraft having thrown green and black and yellow caterpillars to chickens which ^{only} clearly ate the green, but not the black and yellow. The burnet moth man, I forget his name, had not observed bird attack on occasions when butterflies were abundant.

I shall be very glad to read an account of the material which Carpenter delivered for you. Will you have any offprints of the discussion for distribution? — if so, I should be glad of one for myself.

Yours sincerely,