Dear Fisher,

I am decidedly surprised that the L.M.S. have turned down the paper on Latin Squares in such an off-hand manner, and I entirely agree with your summary of the important points of the paper in your letter to Watson. The remark about Jacob's paper having a certain scientific basis (which ours presumably lacks) seems particularly fatuous when one considers that the two places where our work has overlapped Jacob's, namely the number of $6 \times 6$ Latin squares and the number $n \times n$ complete cycle squares, Jacob is in error. It also seems particularly presumptuous on Watson's part to make suggestions as to how the paper should be revised for another journal.

As you have probably noticed, "construction of criticism" appears to be equivalent to classifying the reduced squares according to the position of the letter $A$ instead of according to the leading diagonal. The intramutations sets
would be much more troublesome to construct, as they would involve squares from several sets of fixed A. I do not see how one can avoid constructing such sets if the apparently fundamental transformation sets are to be arrived at.

What are your suggestions as to the future of the paper? Should it be put away, or submitted, either as it is or modified, to another journal. It seems a pity that it should not see the light of day, as I feel it is a worthy (due entirely to your share in it) successor to Euler's paper, and has demolished several houses of cards. But perhaps that is what the L.M.S. feels, and that the less said about Latin Squares for a few years the better.

Please keep your off-print register. We have a duplicate which I use.

With best wishes for Christmas and the New Year.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

P.S. I shall be away tomorrow, but I hope to be here the Saturday after if you want to have a chat about the paper.