To the Committee on Enteroviruses:

Dr. Gilbert Dalldorf
Dr. John P. Enders
Dr. Henry H. Gelfand
Dr. W. McD. Hammon
Dr. Robert J. Huebner

Dr. Leon Rosen
Dr. Albert B. Sabin
Dr. Herbert A. Wenner
Dr. Marvin H. Harris
Dr. T. E. Boyd

1. The report has been recalled from the Journal.

2. I have heard from all members of the Committee; 7 have voted for publication, and 3 have voted against. In considering the poll, should also recall that Dr. Syvertson voted in favor of the new classification at the December, 1960, meeting. Dr. Enders indicated that if the report is to be published he would like to be identified as a disserter. I am enclosing a copy of a letter received from Dr. Dalldorf which he has not circulated to the rest of you.

3. A few modifications have been made:
   page 2, line 3 now reads: "types; and all those so far examined have the following properties: (1) . . . ."
   page 5: "dissenting" has been added as a footnote to the names of John Enders and Gilbert Dalldorf. Perhaps Bob Huebner's eloquent statement in his answer to John Enders' letter of December 1 might lend them to join with the rest of the committee. I sincerely hope so.
   Table: A footnote has been added:

   "* Cross reactivity has been observed between Coxsackie viruses A3 and 8, A11 and 15, and A13 and 16. Although a separate enterovirus number has been assigned to each further study of their antigenic relationships may show that each pair should be classified under a single enterovirus number."

4. If you approve, please check the enclosed card and drop it in the mail. If not, please indicate any further changes desired.

5. When I have received your cards indicating agreement, the final report will be re-submitted to Virology. Copies will also be sent to Sir Christopher Andrews at his request, to Dr. Cockburn of WHO, and to members of the International Nomenclature Subcommittee on Enteroviruses.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph L. Melnick

December 12, 1961
December 4, 1961

Dear Joe:

The cc of Bill's and your letters have just reached me. I would hope the report be withdrawn. It certainly does not represent a unanimous opinion. Of course I did not know about attendance and had decided to make no protest until I had these last letters.

I think it should be circulated as a suggestion by us to workers throughout the world to avoid criticism and that, probably improved by their suggestions, submitted to the nomenclature committee.

The cation business is so promising it deserves study, confirmation and extension. Bob Spears at SKI has been at this kind of investigation for more than a year and knows considerable about it. You will recall plaque size once promised to be useful in classification.

I may add that the proposed nomenclature could not be used in Africa. I have been drawn into the polio group here, some very competent men. They rely, clinicians and public health fellows, on Jim Gear who serves most of central as well as south Africa. I have been seeing reports the past weeks. He evidently puts specimens in mice as well as TC and his reports are Polio (which he types), Coxsackie A or a Coxsackie B or ECHO. This is all anyone wants to know but it is useful and characterizes the type of disease they face, paralytic polio, epidemic pleurodynia or herpangina. All having considerable significance to those who are responsible for patients. He certainly would mess things up if he reported an enterovirus either type 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 etc etc.

I am in no position to circulate this. Perhaps you will or Bill might.

Are your own new project, did you know we made typing sera in Albany in horses? Hans Winser did it. His reports are in print and might be interesting. An occasional horse will serve. Of course Lepine made antipolic sera in horses for clinical use at one time.

There is no hurry. As an advisory committee we had better be late than foolish.

Yours,