

Dare one suggest that perhaps these "orchids" rather like going to shows?

It is, of course, very easy to criticise and very difficult to construct. It would be presumption on my part to suggest how the Association should proceed to preach the good tidings to all the world, but no one can doubt that the thousand or so of scientific men who attend the meetings year by year could do a great thing for humanity if they chose, and could very soon discover the best means of doing it also. But the methods of the days when, as one of your correspondents recalls, crowds used to appear wherever Huxley was expected to speak are certainly ineffective to-day. To begin with, I am not aware that we have any Huxleys nowadays, and if we had I doubt if they would have that sort of hold on the common or British Association public of to-day. Scientific men should be the last to try to put new wine into the old bottles; it should be an easy matter for them to devise newer and better bottles.

An old member of the Association said to me during the Cardiff meeting: "Well, you may say what you like about it now, but it's a kinema compared with what it was when I first knew it!" I was reminded of this by a chance paragraph in the newspaper the other day describing "the most remarkable film which has ever been made in France," called "Les Mystères du Ciel," and there is no doubt that it made an impression on the Parisian correspondent of the *Observer*, who belongs to a profession which takes a lot of impressing. He lays stress on the fact that some of "the best-known experts have been glad to assist in the making of this remarkable and ingenious film, which has a real educative value." I suppose this will horrify some of our revered seniors, but really the British Association might do worse than kinematise itself a bit further. After all, rightly or wrongly, the kinema does attract and instruct the people more than the Association does, and it certainly collects their money.

R. V. STANFORD.

Radyr, October 23.

Testing Einstein's Shift of Spectral Lines.

I AM not aware that anyone has applied centripetal acceleration to the outstanding Einstein prediction, instead of depending on solar gravitation. It is feasible to whirl a steel disc, 1 metre in diameter, at 3000 revolutions a minute; and this gives a peripheral acceleration five thousand times earth-gravity, whereas solar-gravity is only 25*g*.

A few vacuum tubes braced to such a disc would give the effect of continuous illumination; and someone with refined spectroscopic appliances may be willing to try the experiment—unless there is a fallacy in the suggestion.

OLIVER LODGE.

Gullane, October 20.

Recapitulation and Descent.

IN NATURE of October 14 my friend and colleague, Mr. L. T. Hogben, contributes a thoughtful letter on "Recapitulation and Descent," on which you will, perhaps, allow me to make one or two comments. Mr. Hogben traverses the position taken up by Dr. Bather in his address to the Geological Section of the British Association that "recapitulation" in the development of animals is a proof of evolution. His objection is that "experimental breeding" does not justify the inference that a mutant recapitulates the characters of its ancestral type, and that "factorial omission" rather than "the perennial desire of youth to attain a semblance of maturity" is the key to "the omission of some steps in the orderly process."

Now I fully agree with Mr. Hogben that if by

NO. 2661, VOL. 106]

"experimental breeding" and "genetic investigation" we mean the endless and wearisome repetition of the crossing of "Mendelian mutants" with one another and with the parent species, we shall wait until doomsday before we obtain any light on recapitulation, or, indeed, on any of the other broader aspects of the evolution theory.

When the upholders of a theory confess, as does the leading British Mendelian, that it is totally unable to throw any light on the origin of adaptation—which is, after all, the very heart of evolution—the biologist must indeed regard it as bankrupt, at any rate if it claims to be a full exposition of heredity. Not all "genetic investigation," however, is of the Mendelian type, and quite recently some patient researchers claim to have accomplished something like evolution on a small scale experimentally, and to have found traces of recapitulation. I am aware that these results have been regarded by Mendelians with scepticism, as I think quite unfairly; but until the Mendelians have repeated the experiments and disproved the results, these results must stand as the relevant facts. They are beginning to come in from widely divergent sources, and the easy method of getting rid of them by doubting the *bona fides* of the researcher is no longer available.

The great evidence in favour of the reality of recapitulation is that in our survey of the animal kingdom we encounter facts which literally compel every naturalist who encounters them to interpret them in this way and no other. When, for instance, we find a tortoise with a soft, flexible skin devoid of the bony plates which support the carapace of all his brethren, and it transpires that this tortoise enters on his career as an ordinary tortoise with a regulation carapace, what other explanation than recapitulation can be possibly entertained? When, further, we find that *Cœloplana*, which looks like a flat-worm, and *Tjalfjella*, which resembles a Sponge or an Ascidian, both begin their free life as exquisite little *Cydidippid* Ctenophores, does anyone consider it possible to doubt recapitulation, and therefore evolution? This may not be logical, but it is convincing, and as Huxley long ago said: "If a man chooses to maintain that a fossil oyster-shell is a concretion, and not the remains of an organism, it is impossible to drive him from his position by logic."

I differ totally from Mr. Hogben in believing that the "omission of factors" has anything to do with the shortening of the developmental process. Rather I am convinced that this shortening is akin to the greater quickness with which an habitual act is performed after countless repetitions. If, for instance, we compare the degenerate eyes met with in the pathological cripples known as Mendelian recessives with the degeneracy due to loss of function owing to changed habits, we meet with a totally different picture in the two cases, as anyone consulting the literature can see.

Nor can I agree with Mr. Hogben that much of the reasoning of the past originated in an emotional recoil excited by popular prejudice. The reasoning of the past reflected the burning impression created by the impact of myriads of new and unsuspected facts, and we owe Dr. Bather a debt for pointing out in his brilliant address that the old methods are perfectly sound if properly applied. At first they were applied in a wild and careless manner, and hence the reaction against the doctrine of recapitulation which set in, and of which Adam Sedgwick in his later years was a victim. But this reaction was no more justified than would be a reaction against Egyptology because some of the earlier Egyptologists drew rash conclusions from insufficient facts and sketched out