

to come, it at all, by way of some untried method in conflict with convention, for obviously they could come in no other way since the Classical method has centuries of failure behind it as far as the solution of these problems is concerned. Why then should you see fit to assail my method because it is in conflict with convention? Why should you not rather have assailed it because you found it in conflict with itself? Why should you not rather have assailed it because you found it did not deliver the goods? I had expected that you would have made a ruling on these two questions:- Is the method consistent with itself? Does it make good? Instead, you have told me in effect that you decline to examine the method to see how it works because it contains the one feature that gives it a chance:- a new outlook.

I want to provide my lay readers with opinions that deal candidly and understandingly with the issues presented and my readers care not at all if these opinions are for or against. I have had many such opinions upon many subjects from many professional people. Why is the man of science so difficult? These opinions were given as a matter of course and paid for as a matter of course. Why is it that the man of science is so out of alignment with the man of affairs?

Yours faithfully

(Signed) Charles Strangman