May 7, 1964

Dr. Harding Bliss
Chemical Engineering Dept.
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

Dear Dr. Bliss:

There are several points I would like to make about your letter of May 5 as well as your rejection of my manuscript on transition boiling:

1. I feel it was quite unfair of Rohsenow to send you a copy of his letter of April 27th without so indicating on the copy I received. His charge about my selecting the data from a narrow range was without foundation and I was sure he was as well aware of that as I was. Therefore, in my reply, I did not even bother to discuss that rough graph other than to say that in the final version I had indeed covered the full range reported in Berenson's article. Since there was no distribution indicated on his letter, I did not feel moved to discuss the matter in detail with him. Moreover, since I had two months previously offerred to analyze whatever data he should select, I would think he would be wise enough not to make such a charge. I wish to hear no more about the possibility that I judiciously selected the data. You have my graphs and Berenson's data is clearly presented in the Int Jour Heat etc. I suggest that you have someone check my graphs against Berenson's reported data and let the matter end there one way or the other.

2. I admit that my presentation on the first version of my manuscript on nucleate boiling was distasteful. However, it is my feeling that I made that mistake only once and the manuscript on transition boiling was not at all in bad taste.

3. I am not at all given to exaggeration. I will admit that I sometimes do not accurately gauge the vision of the reader, but I can prove everything I say. If it is ever your feeling that I say something without proof and which is not obvious to you, you have only to so indicate and I will enlarge on the proof.

4. I enclose the graph I got from Rohsenow. I ask you the following question and hope for an answer:

> Can you honestly look at this graph which Rohsenow had made up and not agree that I am correct--that the data do not at all indicate any non-linearity??

5. I want to say very clearly that, in my opinion, your rejection of my manuscript on transition boiling is tantamount to avoiding your function as editor. You are rejecting my manuscript on the basis of two reviews which are not at all scientific. Kreith says I am vague on the stability--if he had read the footnote, he would have noticed that I clearly indicate that a discussion of the stability was beyond the scope of the paper. The clarity of the rest of the paper is beyond question (in my opinion). Griffith says it is unimportant. Now, I would like to observe that they are both wrong, and I would bet that you privately agree with me. Further, it is my feeling that both of these reviews should have been rejedted--certainly the function of the editor is to assure that the reviews have substance. There has never been any manuscript written for which someone could not <u>charge</u> vagueness--or unimportance for that matter. Charges are very easy--easy to come by and easy to forget. I would like you to clearly tell me that these reviews comply with whatever standards you have set for your reviewers. How do you determine whether the reviewers are doing their job?? And what do you feel their job really is--to approve only what everyone knows or to be also searching for the new and unknown????

6. Can you read my letter to Griffith and deny that it establishes the importance of my manuscript which Griffith pretends not to see???

7. It is my frank and honest opinion that, by accepting reviews which are based on nothing more than prejudice, you impede the progress of science. Do you think that a reviewer would have chosen oxygen to phlogiston in Lavoisier's day? Kreith would have said that that oxygen thing is vague and Griffith would have said that oxygen is just another name for phlogiston and the equipment is fail safe so there is nothing to worry about.

8. I want you to know that I am well aware that our association must be painful to you. I would also like you to know that you have only to say the word and you can put an end to it.

9. I fail to see any reason why the simple fact that I have used Berenson's data rather than my own should compel me to publish in the same magazine he did or why that fact should relegate my article to one of secondary importance. For any sensible person, the fact that the data was obtained by some person other than my self and over whom I had no control should add significance to my results. Instead, you seem to have sort of rule which seems to more or less imply that the data belongs to whomever gets it.

10. You have erroneously concluded that I am criticizing Berenson. I am not. I use his data to establish the relationship between his variables and I indicate the manner in which he ended up with the wrong answer in direct contradiction of the data. It is my feeling that it is important to publish the reasons he made this mistake in order that, hopefully, these mistakes will not be made by others.

11. I have tried very hard to play the game your way. To me, it is a very sad commentary on the game you are playing that I should have so much trouble getting my work published. The fact that I should be more successful at getting my work published at an industrial magazine like Nucleonics speaks very poorly of the society journals.

12. I am getting so tired of this entire business that I am considering putting my work in advertisements in Nucleonics Magazine where I will not have to put up with the petty prejudices of the reviewers. It is indeed strange that, here in the twentieth century, there should be such an aversion to progress.

13. I note that you have often sent my work to well known workers in the field of heat transfer and I acknowledge my indebtedness for this favor.

I have little doubt that it is to no avail, but I urge you to reconsider your decision about my manuscript. You have reached the wrong decision. I know that the world will not stop as a result, but it is a wrong decision nonetheless.

Sincerely yours,

Eugene F. Adiutori