

Aug 3. 27

CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher.

I ought to have written to you before about the Huxley idea. I am inclined to think that if he took it over in order to make a profit out of it, its character might change in a way we should not like; and we might find it hard to draw back. If we could feel assured as to our income for the future, I am inclined to think it would pay us to give him an honorarium of £100 a year to edit the Review on the present

lines. I take it there are 2  
very distinct objects to be  
held in view. (A) To keep  
Eugeneists in touch with what  
is going on. (B) To convert outsiders  
to be Eugeneists. I incline to  
make our Review purely (A). But  
I want to move more in the  
(B) direction. But to do this  
we must get articles in the  
ordinary press and magazines.  
I have got an article in this  
month's Forum. I guess this will  
reach more outsiders than our  
Review would reach in 5 years  
or more. I don't know if Husley  
could do more in that line.  
I tried to move in this direction

once in the Council but got no support. If I write rather discouragingly about the Huxley idea, please don't turn it down altogether. I had a confidential chat with Hazle about it, and I think he agrees with what I have said. This is a badly written letter, but I guess you see what I am driving at. We must talk it over some day.

When I wrote about 'Moore's' book, I got mixed about the identity of the author. I thought it was Moore, the philosopher of Cambridge. It is Moore, an American. I advise you not to bother yourself about it, in spite of the fact

that MacBride admires it  
greatly! There is a new  
American life of my father  
coming out - which I think you  
will like to read. I do not  
possess More's book, I am  
glad to say.

I am very glad you have  
a favorable letter from Morgan,  
and much pleased that you  
are going on on that line.

Your Nature article makes  
me wonder who 'Student' is.

Yours sincerely,

L. Darwin