

20th January, 1956.

My dear Riddell,

Thank you for your letter and its enclosure. With regard to the latter, it would not be fair to say that Kalmus had been using Ishihara for diagnosis, or even for ^{the} recognition of tritanopes. His paragraph was, I think, mainly concerned to say that tritanopia generally gave normal response to all Ishihara plates, and this, I think, was entirely useful information to give, since many in various parts of the world, and without specific ~~and~~ ^{ophthalmo-}logical training, might have expected otherwise. It was also proper, and I think not without utility, for him to say that tritanopes generally gave abnormal reaction to Plate 5 with the implication that this Plate could be used as confirmation in doubtful and suspected cases. What seemed to me regrettable was that for these cases the information he gives is exactly the opposite of the truth, in that normals nearly always read '5' while tritanopes often see other numbers. As his paragraph stands, he indicates reading '5' as confirmation of tritanopia, whereas in reality it is a counter indication.

I suppose the colorimeter is the only thing that would satisfy you in the long run, but I am sure there is room for more, and a greater variety, of colour charts using a principle which, as Ishihara has shown, can be very successful.

Yours sincerely,