13 June 1933.

Dr. J. Wishart, F.R.S.E.,
  School of Agriculture,
    CAMBRIDGE.

Dear Wishart:

Thanks for the log tables which I return herewith.   A
small point which occurred to me in looking over the differences
is that I expect$_\wedge^{ed}$ to find the differences in the same line from
0 to 9 divided by 90, ~~unless~~ -but you have evidently used some
other convention.   Between 9 and 0 I suppose the reader
would either take proportional parts or the mean of the
differences given for the two lines.   Whatever convention is
used, however, it should be noted and explained.

I enclose also 7-figure frame for an extended table of z.
The missing values in the last column should I think beobtained
from   (even) interpolating the odd values.   I forget
why there are four missing values in the first column, these
do not affect interpolation, but it would be as well to get them
in.   I will try later to recover the 5 per cent. material.
Values for   15, 18, 21 could be interpolated as easily for
7, 9, 10, 11; and as we are only printing 4 or 5 figures in
each table this would make a better double page (18 columns than

the present 15 columns).

I have scarcely the vaguest ideas about the B.A.   I
must see Mrs. Nicholson about it.   I may cut it altogether,
as it is a waste of everyone's time to get up and talk for
the sake of talking.

The Department at University College looks like being
the Hell of a job to pull together, but one can but try.

Yours sincerely,