

August 10, 1956

Mr. William Freeman  
W.H. Freeman and Co.  
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Bill:

A few days ago, I received a copy of Crampton's 'Applied Animal Nutrition'. Just before because it is somewhat out of my usual interests I read through it rather casually. Just because of my high regard for your publishing standards, I thought I did owe you a comment on it.

The book reads rather briskly in the first half, somewhat more tediously later on-- this may be inherent in the subject. Knowing nothing whatever of the pedagogic problems in the field, I would still guess it would make a useful ag. college text.

But frankly, I am somewhat disappointed that the ms. and proofs were not read more critically-- was this in haste? There is more than an allowable sprinkling of typographical slips, mostly misspelling, and I could find a dozen in 20 minutes, so they must be plentiful. How could any proofreader miss a bad margin, as p. 252? (This is trivial in itself, but illustrative). More important, there is a good deal of misleading chemistry and mathematics that a critical scientific review should have picked up. Has any biochemist looked at it? Again just to illustrate, would one conclude from p. 17 that 30% of myosin is not amino acid (if so what?), and Fig. 1-1, p. 18-19 is a nightmare, not in the execution, but in the intent. What is it supposed to mean? Does cellulose go to fatty acid? Where does cytochrome fit in? What is the relationship of malate, pyruvate, oxalacetate? Or is the figure just a mumbo-jumbo to impress a student who, judging from the level of the text, couldn't possibly understand it anyhow?

Does figure 6-A (p. 144) have an inflection point; in fact is it sigmoid? There are going to be a lot of puzzled students this fall. P. 163: where does  $\pm 4.3$  percentage units come from? Certainly not the formula in brackets.

I don't pretend to have given this book an expert reading, and am not sure I would be able to. I am a little disappointed to see a book under your ~~name~~ imprint in which the weeds were so easily found. I may have looked at a poor sample of pages; I would only suggest that you have an independent critic do a thorough postmortem.

Enough of that. I have word now and then from Cavalli, and we haven't totally ignored our joint work. I wish we could settle down to do a single chapter at once, and get it over with (and have something to show you) but it doesn't seem to be going that way.

With best regards,

P.S. Thanks for the book.