Mauro, Comeron, Lewis & Massie to Bell.

<u>Unahington. D.C.. Nov. 24. 1908</u>. We are in receipt of your Editorial Hotes and Convents under date of Nov. 18, 1908, in which you criticise the use of the expression "aeroplane having a concave and a convex surface". It is true, as you state, that a plane cannot have a concave and a convex surface but we are not talking of <u>planes</u> but <u>aeroplanes</u>, two very different things. It is true that a plane cannot have a concave and a convex surface, and it is equally true that an aeroplane can have such a concave and convex surface.

There is a clearly defined distinction between a geometrical plane and an "aeroplane". This latter term is not confined to a strugture which would fall within the definition of a geometrical plane. It is defined in the dictionaries as flying machine having supporting surfaces or wings, and in this sense it refers to the entire machine. Thus, we would speak of Wright's machine as an aeroplane, and just as surely the June Bug is an aeroplane.

The term "acroplane" also has a more specific meaning, that is, the supporting surface in that class of machines broadly designated as acroplanes. You will recall that we have the authority of the Wright Brothers (who are cartainly entitled to be regarded as authorities in this art) for the use of the term in this sense.

Referring to your suggestion that there should be some statement or definition in the specification as to the

34

To A.G. Bell, Baddeck, N.S.