Dear Albert:

Harriet and I are grateful for your nice letter which we received in Greenwich. We hope Sylvia and you will enjoy the sea shore in the best way. The entire family is at Paris with the exception of Louisa, who was happily married in London on the 15th, and Rutte, who is 125 miles away at camp.

I met casually Dr. Rivers before I left (on the 11th). He was dubious about old Cathell accepting the paper because of the photograph, but when I explained some points he became less dubious—but not wholly enthusiastic. I hope he is wrong.

I received bills for extra space (about 30c charged to my account) and for reprint from the Soc. Bot. It was sent on to our German. I also received here, on top of the mountain, a registered letter from Dr. Pears containing Papers II & III (of Harvard). He was not at all pleased with them—nor is not pleased with the style; the argument was not criticized. He ran through them with a sharp
pencil, leaving "the usual corrections: "now it is
demonstrable" changed to his "since then it has
been demonstrated," etc. etc. He suggests that papers
be shown to Dr. F. As he confidentially avers, no
one (including Dr. F) should be told of this suggestion!

Of the English is, of course, not perfect. Only
titans write perfect English! The papers are not
wholly in the best style since Harford wrote and I
patched patched - a mistake, to be sure. But they
are understandable. W.R. believes I wrote every
word - the responsibility, however, should not and
cannot be evaded.

If I do not intend to show them to Dr. F.
In the first place, the Colonel is on vacation;
then, the last encounter left one with the
definite impression that he should have a
rest of a month or two before other combats are
fought; finally, the results of tests on not
showing non-polio papers should be interesting
in outcome. Although in the latter connection,
I see no harm in submitting such non-polio
articles when he is approachable, that is, during
the working year.
This brings up the problem of the last "Treatise" paper. Dr. Isklein is known to send suddenly a galley proof in lieu of the
perfunctory acceptance notes. There is a code, one way or another.

I am sorry I have not at hand the carbon copy of the MSS, but so I recollect the Colonel's
corrections, he referred to:

1) Changing "manifest" to "state" in the checked
sentence and inserting "cases" on page 2 (?). This
has been done.

2) The charge of delusion, etc in the last
sentence. The basis for this accusation was removed
by changes here and in another sentence which
should prove satisfactory.

3) The more impassioned criticism, pencilled
by him on page 1: "The difference in close - vast."
In the hurry to get the MSS off our hands, nothing
was done about this. I firmly believe that a
sentence should be inserted in the galley (after
reference, of course) so as to avoid polemics
and "incriminations," and to show that our
debt, is not - den of raging Welld Balla of Bashan, and is ready to listen to Reza - instead of ignoring the Powers. The mention might even fortify the original idea (as it usually does, happen after editorial correction). What comes to as mind is simply recording the amount necessary to infect by superficial contact (Such as, 0.2 to 10% NaF. Sometimes, 1cc usually affected by Thermal, Topical, etc.)

One attempt at such injection would be in the general interest of the paper, and is especially indicated nowadays.

I am somewhat disappointed in the news conveyed by you.Brunseharmen to you about the feed. I feel that private practice is apparently what he desires most and the laboratory to be used as a prop for the former. At any rate, my conscience is clear in that we debt, did well by him in the past 2 years.

I have confidence in the fact that you will consider the contents of this letter with your usual discretion.

With cordial regards to you and wish that you will receive most acceptances from 2 editors.