

A New View of Darwinism

I HAVE noticed that NATURE is very catholic in its sympathies, and allows all views which are not palpably absurd to be discussed in its pages, and I therefore venture to ask for some space in which to present a few of the difficulties which have been suggested by Mr. Darwin's theory of Natural Selection, and which have not, so far as I know, been as yet discussed. I have not the taste for the language nor the arguments which were used by a *Times* reviewer, and I have much too great a reverence for one of the most fearless, original, and accurate investigators of modern times, to speak of Mr. Darwin and his theory in the terms used by that very ignorant person. Approaching the subject in this spirit, and knowing how very small a section of biologists are now opposed to Mr. Darwin, I may be very rash, but hardly impertinent, in stating my difficulties.

I cannot dispute the validity and completeness of many of Mr. Darwin's proofs to account for individual cases of variation and isolated changes of form. Within the limits of these proofs it is impossible to deny his position. But when he leaves these individual and often highly artificial cases, and deduces a general law from them, it is quite competent for me to quote examples of a much wider and more general occurrence that tell the other way. In this communication I shall confine myself to Mr. Darwin's theory, and shall not trespass upon the doctrine of evolution, with which it is not to be confounded.

The theory of Natural Selection has been expressively epitomised as "the Persistence of the Stronger," "the Survival of the Stronger." Sexual selection, which Mr. Darwin adduces in his last work as the cause of many ornamental and other appendages whose use in the struggle for existence is not very obvious, is only a by-path of the main conclusion. Unless by the theory of the struggle for existence is meant the purely identical expression that those forms of life survive which are best adapted to survive, I take it that it means in five words the Persistence of the Stronger.

Among the questions which stand at the very threshold of the

whole inquiry, and which I have overlooked in Mr. Darwin's books if it is to be found there, is a discussion of the causes which produce sterility and those which favour fertility in races. He no doubt discusses with ingenuity the problem of the sterility of mules and of crosses between different races, but I have nowhere met with the deeper and more important discussion of the general causes that induce or check the increase of races. The facts upon which I rely are very common-place, and are furnished by the smallest plot of garden or the narrowest experience in breeding domestic animals. The gardener who wants his plants to blossom and fruit takes care that they shall avoid a vigorous growth. He knows that this will inevitably make them sterile; that either his trees will only bear distorted flowers, that they will have no seed, or bear no blossoms at all. In order to induce flowers and fruit, the gardener checks the growth and vigour of the plant by pruning its roots or its branches, depriving it of food, &c., and if he have a stubborn pear or peach tree which has long refused to bear fruit, he adopts the hazardous, but often most successful, plan of ringing its bark. The large fleshy melons or oranges have few seeds in them. The shrivelled starvelings that grow on decaying branches are full of seed. And the rule is universally recognised among gardeners as applying to all kinds of cultivated plants, that to make them fruitful it is necessary to check their growth and to weaken them. The law is no less general among plants in a state of nature, where the individuals growing in rich soil, and which are well-conditioned and growing vigorously, have no flowers, while the starved and dying on the sandy sterile soil are scattering seed everywhere.

On turning to the animal kingdom, we find the law no less true. "Fat hens won't lay," is an old fragment of philosophy. The breeder of sheep and pigs and cattle knows very well that if his ewes and sows and cows are not kept lean they will not breed; and as a startling example I am told that to induce Alderney cows, which are bad breeders, to be fertile they are actually bled, and so reduced in condition. Mr. Doubleday, who wrote an admirable work in answer to Malthus, to which I am very much indebted, has adduced overwhelming evidence to show that what is commonly known to be true of plants and animals is especially true of man. He has shown how individuals are affected by generous diet and good living, and also how classes are so affected. For the first time, so far as I know, he showed why population is thin and the increase small in countries where flesh and strong food is the ordinary diet, and large and increasing rapidly where fish or vegetable or other weak food is in use; that everywhere the rich, luxurious, and well-fed classes are rather diminishing in numbers or stationary; while the poor, under-fed, and hard-worked are very fertile. The facts are exceedingly numerous in support of this view, and shall be quoted in your pages if the result is disputed. This was the cause of the decay of the luxurious power of Rome, and of the cities of Mesopotamia. These powers succumbed not to the exceptional vigour of the barbarians, but to the fact that their populations had diminished, and were rapidly being extinguished from internal causes, of which the chief was the growing sterility of their inhabitants.

The same cause operated to extinguish the Tasmanians and other savage tribes which have decayed and died out, when brought into contact with the luxuries of civilisation, notwithstanding every effort having been made to preserve them. In a few cases only have the weak tribes been supplanted by the strong, or weaker individuals by stronger; the decay has been internal, and of remoter origin. It has been luxury and not want; too much vigour and not too little, that has eviscerated and destroyed the race. If this law then be universal both in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, a law too, which does not operate on individuals and in isolated cases only, but universally, it is surely incumbent upon the supporters of the doctrine of Natural Selection, as propounded by Mr. Darwin, to meet and to explain it, for it seems to me to cut very deeply into the foundations of their system. If it be true that, far from the strong surviving the weak, the tendency among the strong, the well fed, and highly favoured, is to decay, become sterile, and die out, while the weak, the under-fed, and the sickly are increasing at a proportionate rate, and that the fight is going on everywhere among the individuals of every race, it seems to me that the theory of Natural Selection, that is, of the persistence of the stronger, is false, as a general law, and true only of very limited and exceptional cases. This paper deals with one difficulty only, others may follow if this is acceptable.

Derby House, Eccles

HENRY H. HOWORTH