

7th February, 1952.

Dear Frank, *L. A. Rothchild*

Lowe has been unable to give a series of dates to choose from and I am writing to ascertain if you could possibly attend a meeting in London at 2.30 on March 6th.

If this is really impossible, perhaps you could name one or more subsequent dates that would suit you, in case, after all, the meeting has to be postponed.

On quite another matter, Rothchild has been consulting me on the ethics and proprieties of co-operation between biometricians and others in scientific work and is concerned that the biometricians do not receive such formal and explicit acknowledgment as should weigh with the A.R.C. in assigning grades, etc, or with universities for higher degrees.

Evidently, what would suit him best would be for the Biometric Society to draw up formal <sup>recommendations</sup> ~~recognitions~~ which should make clear to directors of research stations, and not least, to the biometricians themselves, exactly what form of recognition or acknowledgment their colleagues think appropriate to different cases.

Of course, the cases are quite diverse, and it is not to be assumed that participators in joint work always form a just opinion as to the originality or scientific worth of their several contributions. In fact, I think we must proceed partly by options, e.g. if A does a job of statistics which meets B's requirements, but which B had supposed (rightly) A *be*

of a comparatively routine nature within the known techniques of the statisticians craft, while A imagines (mistakenly) that he has done something exceptionally bright, it might possibly be held that none the less, A should have the option of ~~being~~ *adding* an appendix explaining, or demonstrating his method under his own name.

I shall be very much interested to hear how you react to all this and how you think the Biometric Society should take it up.

Yours sincerely,