

Westwood
Poole

Oct 24.02

My dear Kate

You letter arrived yesterday.
I send you by this post my answer
to a ^{very} malicious attack on the book & on
myself which appeared in 'Nature' in
August. I answered it as you will see
Nov. 2. The Editor seemed disinclined
to publish it, but I told him that I was
accused of dishonesty as to dealing with
quotations from Darwin. Then he ~~consented~~
but as you ^{saw in 24th of November} postponed publishing my reply
until he had ~~seen~~ his reviewer back
to make some answer again. I think
the reviewer's reply is paltry & petty in
the extreme.

The *Star* is a review in "Gardening"
It is a very good review as it hits the
very point of the whole book, which our
Star review now has done.

The book has been reviewed very
unfairly indeed by the *Guardian*. I have
had some correspondence with the Editor
& he declined to publish my reply.

This is still unfairer of him. He
says it is a 'Controversial' subject
& he has no wish to engage in one
in his columns. I replied that he
should not have begun the 'Controversy'
by attacking the book & myself.
It was written by some Darwinian
fanatic. I wrote the Editor that I declined

to yield in knowledge of the subject to his
reviewer. So then it is indeed I suppose
as this last letter I sent off yesterday.
I had not expected from the *Guardian*
such a one sided advocacy for Darwin.

Which is the latest form,
Dutton's or the *Star* you speak of
Dodd, Mead, & Co.? Grant Richards
had all the arrangements with Dutton
& he managed to make it ^{made more} ~~rather~~ for
the interest of the publishers than for
the author. ~~After it was made~~ I had
declined the offer & after that the
arrangement however was made
between them. I then wrote to G. Richards
saying that under the terms he had

Sold Dutton the 100 copies, Dutton ought
honourable of his word all to make some
Richard tells me he told Dutton's agent what I had
share of the profits over to me, You
writer.
might keep this in mind, but they
the firm will probably do nothing
in the matter. I shall be interested
to know what their share is. Here
it is 6/ net.

Harry has got his leave for a
year. He ~~leaves~~ intends when leaving
Bombay to go through the South of India
& take the P. & O. in Ceylon. He hopes
to go to Mysore, Seringapatam, the
Belgaum hills - (the West-Indian
Sanatorium), then ^{from} Puntacruce across by
steamer to Ceylon. Then to Candy & on

me a two other places, ^{in Egypt} I think it is a
very good plan of his as he can do it
through 'Cork' at comparatively little
more expense, i.e. he gets 1300 miles
paid & he pays for 800. Such an
opportunity he says he should hardly
have got again. So it is well for him
to ~~make the~~ do it now as it will
give him certain advantages even in
a business point of view. Now that he
would occupy about 5 weeks taking
the box steamer from Egypt, which
would be a rather 3 through Suez Canal.

I much preferred anonymity
in P.R. & D. I am very glad I did so, as
should hate to have my name bandied

about in the papers. 'Nature' is
fanatical Darwinian, & Darwin's followers
are regarded as everything but Darwin.
Every attempt at criticising Darwin
is in their eyes unendurable heresy,
especially on the points attacked, as
Darwin spent 11 years on his experiments,
& the book shows demonstrably that
they are all invalid & consequently
that the many theories he built upon
them are invalid as well. This
is their cause against the book.
However I believe that ultimately
~~that they~~ it will be acknowledged
that Darwin was wrong in his
method. I expect now after my
reply in 'Nature' that his advocates
will be more restrained in their views.
I will send you any further reviews

that may come to hand.

Yours loving
Father.

I am glad the coal strike is
over in New York.

Some time ago

~~Since~~ a review of ¹

appeared in yr. paper of
a book called "The P.R.D."

(no author's name, published
by E. R. & Co) ~~Since~~ what

~~you have~~ ^{you have} a copy
of it. I have recently bought
one in the N.Y. City.

After such an attack
on the part of yr. reviewer
~~(who is not a book on Scientific
at the paper is so close to)~~
I am somewhat surprised

be a ~~cor~~ reply for the ²
author. If, however, there
has been such a reply
published, kindly send
me that number of the
paper containing it ~~and~~^{on}
~~ob~~^{look} ~~it~~ follows the argument.

I hear, ~~from~~^{from} the other side,
that such a reply has
been written but that the
C₁ has refused to publish
it! I can scarcely credit
this, as the C₁ is usually

3.
Considered, by its readers
over here, a liberal
minded paper in things
ecclesiastical & it
seems ^{rather behind the age to} ~~a pity & draws~~
~~down~~ ~~the~~ ~~curtain~~ down Scientific
substituting Scientific
for ecclesiastical
bigotry. Wm. S. C.

~~Of course I will pay for paper~~
1844

Miss Ball

26 W. 25th St

New York

