

August 6, 1973

Professor John A. Clark  
2214 Avalon Place  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dear Professor Clark,

Thank you for your recent note and your expression of good will. The first chapter will be run off in about four weeks, by which time I hope to have a good estimate of the required number of copies.

I was surprised by your statements that " $h$  must go" and "I have always thought the route of its exit was well known". While I agree that  $h$  must go, I certainly hope that the route of its exit is not well known, since there would be no need for the "new" heat transfer! The reaction I generally get is that noone likes  $h$ , but that noone knows a better way of handling convective heat transfer--or how to design heat transfer equipment without heat transfer coefficients.

With regard to Fourier and his concept of heat transfer, I devote considerable space to him since I consider that my work is a departure from his. With regard to  $h$  and  $k$ ,  $h$  disappears in the "new" heat transfer but  $k$  remains since it does not suffer from the same drawback that makes  $h$  an ineffective concept.

As for Newton's contribution to heat transfer, I don't agree with those who credit Newton with the concept of the heat transfer coefficient. I doubt that anyone could actually read his "Scale of the Degrees of Heat" and conclude that he should be credited with the concept of the heat transfer coefficient.

Please feel free to make negative comments on chapter 1 when you receive it. Also, I would be interested to know the manner in which you felt  $h$  would make its exit because, if everyone knows how to get rid of  $h$ , there would really be little need of the "new" heat transfer.

Sincerely yours,

Eugene F. Adiutori

EA/mh