

18th. February 1947.

Dear Raven,

A few weeks ago Heaton lent me your book "~~The~~ Greater Spirit", thinking, very rightly, that I should be interested and find in it much to encourage me in my own ideas. In fact, I have myself for some years been nibbling at the edges of the enormous task which you clearly had in view in that book. And as so often happens, while finding myself in complete harmony in respect of fundamental aims and needs, I find I have taken at another level an almost diametrically opposite view of the bearing on deeper questions of the various rival theories of organic evolution. This leads me to hope that further discussion may be particularly helpful if you are still, as I hope, actively concerned to ~~straighten out~~ our fundamental ideas.

The point of difference which springs to the eye is that, at least when you were writing, you attached a certain fundamental importance to differences in the possible means of organic modification, whereas I have come to think of these differences as a purely domestic concern for students of evolution, and I am writing to suggest that possibly the fundamental issue that you sensed is not intrinsic in the differences between natural selection on the neoDarwinian interpretation, neoLamarckism, orthogenesis, etc., but is inherent in the question of the determinism of the evolutionary

process, a characteristic ordinarily ascribed by all schools to selective modification, but not ordinarily ascribed to any process dependent on will or effort. This, I imagine, is why the Darwinian Theory is shot at as "materialistic", while the others are not.

Some years ago I had a ~~shot at trying~~^{try} to see what an indeterministic picture of the world would look like from the point of view of organic evolution as conceived by Darwin. I enclose an offprint, which, I regret to say, is my only copy, in the hope that you may agree after considering^{ation} that as a means of progressive creative activity the selective process is not to be peremptorily rejected, and that when cleared of such excrecences as "the mutation theory" it provides a very pretty model of indeterministic causation in general, so that in my view evolutionary biologists are on familiar ground^{the very} in ~~any~~ territory in which philosophical physicists are still foundering bewildered.

However, this is irrelevant, and I hope you will forgive also the frequent and annoying interruptions of the argument of my paper, occasioned by my feeling bound to turn aside to deal with one irrelevancy after another. After all, if any false view has been long held, there is bound to be a crop of provisional^{ally} ~~acceptable~~^{possible} propositions, the credentials of each of which have to be challenged, if they are not to ~~impede~~ the understanding.

Yours sincerely,