

12th October, 1951

My dear Gerrish,

Peter Ball

Many thanks for your letter of the 6th October with the names of the Selectors and the marks. I find it very difficult to understand how you could plough a man with these marks. You say that on the vocational side he is not a very strong candidate, but he is marked $\beta+$. And \leftarrow surely implies more than adequacy on the intellectual side.

I shall see Peter Ball myself in the vacation; but I don't feel at all inclined to accept the judgment of the Selectors as at present given. His housemaster, who happens also to be a Selector for CACTM, tells me that he was Junior Squash champion for the South of England and Sussex, and is regarded as a possible Blue at Cambridge. He represented Lancing at soccer, athletics and tennis, besides being head prefect, and managing the school remarkably well, though undoubtedly a reserved boy. Surely this says something for character. And can you expect a boy of 19 to be mature and developed, or to have had many opportunities in the pastoral sphere?

Is it realised, I wonder, that if CACTM sticks to its rejection now, it will be too late in 3 years time for the boy to get a university career - for which he wants a grant. At present he is at queens', Cambridge, having been accepted there. But unless he gets grants he will not be able to stay there very long.

I refrain from expressing a final judgment till I have seen him myself. But I feel bound to say that I am greatly disturbed about the present position.

Yours sincerely,

EMMA PALACE