February 1, 1957

Dear Dave:

Thanks for the prompt reply.

Your comments were well enough taken; they have all been complied with and the ms. will be sent in Monday after being retyped. I hope that "F is remarkable for its high contagiousness" will be agreeable. We had no intention of raising the issue you pointed out, at least not here, though I do distinguish F, which can spread through a population (i.e. increase faster than the cells) from any other markers, which does segregate on crossing.

Your comments:

1)- phrase deleted. 2) as supra. 3) Explicit enough, but addendum to footnote 4 that plates are among suitable methods when convenient. 4) Mis-reference. Stocker Zinder and L was intended. We will either revise, and shift 10... accordingly, delete, or make a more awkward reference to 3. 5) have deleted statement, and leave just a bare reference to Hirota without comment. [But Alan Richter and Ann Cook both tried to repeat, without success. Ditto for Eisenstark's claim of 750 X increase in fertility with tersene treatment.]

We have done controls on plate reinfection, using 3-way mixture of F+, Hfr, F-. The (marked) progeny of Hfr x F- are almost always F- on same plates as F+ x F- come out always F+. This is my principal objection to the necessity of F+ → Hfr to account for all fertility of F+. Alan has some unstable [illegible] where the F+ cross-progeny are less frequent, and come out F+, the Hfr cross-progeny come out F-.

I didn't want to encourage unwarranted talk at a delicate point in the discussions, but I can tell you something now of possible plans, that you may hear mis-rumored.

We went out to California over Christmas to discuss possibilities with Stanford, vice Ed Tatum in Biology there. Then we took a week's vacation at Berkeley, where my brother lives. While there, the Genetics Department learned of the purpose of our travelling, and promptly tendered an offer which has recently become fairly firm. We are very sorely tempted, and have a hard job trying to decide which if either. Meanwhile, a Medical Genetics program (department?) idea is catching fire here, which has some extremely attractive possibilities. We are much in a quandary, and this is one reason I've been so slow getting other works out this month. But as one of our friends has said, none of the alternatives is exactly distasteful, except having to make a choice.

Why is UCLA so improbable?

Please confirm whether the reprint arrangement suggested will be ok.

Best wishes,

Joshua Lederberg

P.S. Had you preserved ahy serotypic recombinants, e.g. the wgl x wg4? Since Frits Orskov has all the standard typing serums, they could easily be run throgugh.