Wilmington, N. C., Aug. 2nd, 1935

Dear Friedman:

I take my seat at my trusty "Royal" (which you made me pur-
chase; and you now write me by hand) to ask you for some information, and
to work off an accumulation of bad temper caused by a futile attempt to un-
derstand Mr. Rowlett's paper, "Further Applications," etc.

I have not a shadow of a doubt that the paper is entirely correct in
premises and conclusions, nor have I any doubt of its value. Furthermore
I am sure it is perfectly clear to you and to your staff. I am also sure
that the reason I do not understand it is that I am ignorant of some fun-
damentals demonstrated elsewhere.

But I submit that a technical paper should stand on its own feet. It
should be intelligible to one moderately versed in the subject of which it
treats. If it deals with matter not generally known, it should provide a
reference to the source of such matter, and a brief summary. This paper
is intended for some one besides its author and his associates. You are,
it is true, building up a continuous tradition in your department. In
case, however, of the interruption of that tradition, the papers you print
should be intelligible to future generations.

On page 2 of the paper in question I read of the employment of "two dif-
ferent keyword-mixed alphabets". The analysis that follows is clear until
I reach page 4 and find the writer talking about 6 alphabets. All I have
reached by trying to understand him is high degree of irritability - I could
cuss in more than six alphabets, not to say languages.

Your own papers deal with matters not generally known even to crypto-
graphers, but they do not suffer from this fault. I hope I have myself
avoided it. It's villainous.

                    Heatedly

                    C./Un.

        Scientific writing frequently suffersnfrom a fault that might be
called intentional obscurity. If a reader does not understand, the writer
smiles half exultingly and half pityingly and says, "Ah, but you don't
know..............."