

February 28th.

My dear Ron,

I enclose a separate and more formal letter in regard to the Blood group nomenclature.

This is on a different matter: one reply to S. Wright's criticism. I was much surprised this morning to receive back one note with the enclosed letter from Mays.

My immediate reactions are these:-

1. Mays is not a fool, far from it, and if he can write as he has done the need for some sort of reply to Wright - seems all the greater.
2. It may be necessary to expand and clarify somewhat on note, ^{or} if a man like Mays can take it as he has done. (But I do think this shows that any trouble involved in making a reply, and getting it published, is necessary).
3. Beyond explaining somewhat more fully and clarifying a few points, I don't see that we can allow one reply to write to suit those who support-

might. It may therefore be necessary to publish
our note elsewhere than in Evolution. What
about Heredity?

Of course there is an obvious advantage
in publishing a reply in the place where the
criticism appeared. But evidently we cannot allow
our views to reach the Editor, though we might
explain more fully if he so desires.

In general, I am in doubt whether it
would be best to expand and then try Mayr again,
or tell him we shall publish elsewhere; and I
should so much like your views on the point.

There is also another matter, that of
some sort of personal reply to the private
criticisms (as it were) contained in Mayr's letter.
That seems needed which we do. I had
thought of drafting something for your consideration
(or attempting to do so) but it seems to depend so
much whether or not we are going to send the
typescript back to Mayr that probably that should
be considered first.

Yours ever,
Huxley

I am inclined to think it better to tell him we shall publish elsewhere than to have your reactions.