Dear Sir,

It was civil of you to reply to my cross letter. I have had enough experience as Editor, though not of such attractive journals as yours, to understand your difficulty about the reviewer. I mentioned it because it looked as though you or your adviser had been imposed on.

On the other point I am sorry to trouble you with a second letter, but you do seriously mistake my meaning. You write, in your first paragraph: "In other words you say that physical anthropology has quite certainly got no future at all." Now, I did not say this, and it would be very unfair to others in this laboratory if I had said it. I said, if I remember right, that I could well understand your expressing this opinion - if it really were yours - and that some such stimulus seemed to be needed to persuade physical anthropologists to make clear to themselves and to others exactly what questions they thought could be resolved by mass measurements. This is not the same as prejudging the issue in
the way you suggest.

The jolt I felt at the point indicated, in your editorial comments, was rather as though an eloquent African had been pointing out convincingly, many of the disadvantages of fetishism, and when one was expecting him to say clearly that fetishism must go, had fallen away somewhat disappointingly by saying that the future of African religion undoubtedly lay with the Illiluema fetish, which had, in the past, done him some important service.

In fact, on the question of the future of physical anthropology, it is clear to me, on technical grounds, that such hard work has been very ill applied; but I am not willing to conclude that the same type of work, directed to well-defined and more suitable ends, might not have a very real value.

Yours sincerely,