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: my reply to S. Knight's criticism. I was much surprised this morning to receive back our note with the enclosed letter from Hays.

My immediate reactions are these:

1. Hays is not a fool, far from it, and if he can write as he has done I see no need for some sort of reply to Knight—seems all the safer.

2. It may be necessary to expand and clarify somewhat our note, if a man like Hays 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 he can alter our reply to Knight to suit his (as it happens)
Tonight. It may therefore be necessary to publish our note elsewhere than in Evolution. What about Nature?

Of course there is an obvious advantage in publishing a reply in the place where the criticism appeared. But evidently it cannot allow one venue to drive the other, things as might. Explain more fully if he so desires.

In general, I am in doubt whether it would be well to expand and then by May's again, or still have to state publish elsewhere; and I should do much like your view on the point.

There is also another matter, that is some sort of personal reply to the private criticisms (as it were) contained in May's letter. That seems needed which the be do. I have May's. I drafting something for you consideration, (or attempting to do so) but it seems to depend so much whether or not he is going to send its typescript. Talk to May. That probably he should be considered first. Greetings,

[Signature]