I have just seen your book on "Fabricated Man", and believe it to be one of the most important contributions to discussion of the nodal ethical questions we face.

However, I think that the "disingenuousness" that you attribute to me is simply my failure to live up to the stereotype that you had built up about my position from rather fragmentary knowledge of it. This would warrant a good deal of profound discussion, and I hope we can come to that. Meanwhile, you might wish to see some of my more recent writings.

What you may have faulted me for most stridently was my reluctance to take an explicit stance on the moral values of a number of perplexing questions. I had felt this needed much more discussion, like your own, and that my most useful function would be to expose the possibilities, precisely for such discussion without imposing my own judgments about their value. Very few people have been as well able as you are to bridge the technical and the ethical challenges.

Could you believe that I was advocating utopian eugenicism when I took such pains to point out the technical difficulties of it. Or did you infer that I had no concern for the moral problems for not having also gone over that already well-covered ground?

Sincerely,

[Signature]