

16 November 1931.

Professor J. S. Huxley,  
Dept. of Zoology,  
King's College,  
Strand,  
London, W.C. 2.

Dear Huxley:

I ought to have told you that Langdon-Down on later enquiries found that there was nothing to complain of in the case in which he had at first thought that Moore ought to have consulted Blacker. The case is typical of the sort of thing I complain of, an accusation of bad faith against Moore without his being asked for an explanation or having the opportunity of knowing what had been said against him. Langdon-Down now says that the Editorial Committee drafted a form of words, and instructed him if he wanted to vary it to consult Blacker; the statement that Blacker had not been consulted, and that that showed how untrustworthy Moore was, was widely circulated, before the "Review" appeared, and canvassed as a point against Moore. Actually when the "Review" appeared it was found that Moore had decided not to alter the form of words already approved, as he could have told anyone before had they asked him.

Again it appears that Gates' paper was refused not by Moore but at a meeting of the Committee, at Cutler's proposal. Langdon-Down and I, being in the Spring Lady Chamber's colleagues on the Editorial Committee both had to go in great detail into the facts of the affair of Sir Theodore, and though we were both utterly reluctant to give pain to Lady Chambers, we could not avoid the conclusion that Moore was in the right. Our report to the President was confidential as it bore somewhat directly on Sir Theodore, and not published <sup>to</sup> the Council, as of course Sir Theodore's complaints were, nor does it seem to have made any impression on Mallett's mind. But I can certainly say after examining the facts and reading the letter, I formed a very different impression of Moore's conduct from what has been conveyed to you.

I think you are absolutely right about Mallet. He is a dreadful chairman, knows very little about eugenics, and wobbles at a touch.

Yours sincerely,