

The Galton Laboratory,
Rothamsted Experimental Station,
Harpenden, Herts

December 8, 1939

My dear Ford,

Thank you for the postal order for the reprints from
Nature.

There are always a number of modifications appropriate when a lecture is reprinted, and I should like you to consult your own convenience in how you deal with them. It is certainly possible, and I think usually appropriate, to give the objective evidence more fully in writing than you find possible in speaking, and, if convenient, I should certainly take the opportunity of inserting other good examples which occur to you illustrating or emphasising each point you wish to make. I mean that you should certainly not feel bound to limit yourself to the examples discussed in the lecture.

When on any point, such as the survey of the pigments, you intend to write it up in detail elsewhere, I think this intention should be stated and, ideally, reference to the journal you propose to offer it to would be needed.

Unfinished work is, I think, rather easier to handle, for the ideas which are governing your further investigations are of current interest, and, unlike a finished report, you are under no obligation to discuss any aspect of your results which seem not to bear on these ideas.

As, owing to other engagements on the London programme, many of the foreign geneticists I had hoped would come were not at your lecture, I should like it to be rather ~~fully~~ distributed in print, with at least enough detail to show how really substantial your work on the subject has been.

The position about the paper we submitted to the Royal is as follows:

Hostile, and in one case virulently hostile, reports were made from two referees, whom I imagine to be Haldane and Hogben. Hill, who told me he had not looked at the paper, was inclined to take the line that this relieved him of further responsibility, whereas, I imagine, properly the rejection of the paper is the work of the secretary on the advice of referees, and perhaps of the relevant Committee. I have asked the Committee to look at the matter in detail, but it would not surprise me if they think it would be irregular to overrule their appointed referees' reports. The actual objections made by the referees seem to me to be without any substance whatever.

Yours sincerely,