

5/3/1952

Dear Sam,

I found the enclosed WGs as I came back from and am returning it after fast reading, to avoid delay. There is no question of the subject matter. The presentation, however, is (~~to~~ my probably reactionary mind) somewhat unfortunate. First of all, I do not see why complex material of this type should be written up in full short hand, without even the help of a few diagram figures to help the reader. Second, the text itself has no attempt to clarity, and the lack of tabular material with some data on frequency or presence of recombination forces the reader to take paper and pencil, construct maps etc. - I tried as an exercise to do so for the first few pages (up to 5) and gave up, partly because table 1 was missing, partly because some of the pertinent data on materials is given by reference to unpublished papers (in press etc.). The whole thing is a matter of philosophy - If articles are to be read by one's own graduate students only, then one might as well not write them - If for publication, they ought to be geared to the reader - Josh can write superb papers (see Genetics 1947 and Zinder + Lederberg) - This one is a night mare - Especially disturbing to me ~~are~~ the summary, without any evidence and with statements that may mean any of 100 things, and the discussion, where none of the evidence was summarized -

I have pencilled a few suggestions here and there - The major factual one ~~is the~~ concerns the relationship of F⁺ to a latent virus (page 7) - How do we know that the F⁺ forms don't carry another phage?

In summary: either accept the paper as it is, on the basis that the reader should pay with hard work for the privilege of reading good work, or ask Josh to write a paper of the usual type, with the aim to make himself understood to the greatest proportion of mortals (like myself) -

You may show these comments to Josh, he knows
that I am well motivated -

Cordially,
Livia