Dear Al (and other notationers):
By this time I hope you have had a chance to relax and exchange some. topological gems with Dr . Lederberg.

You may recognize one of the enclosed sheets as a direct copy of a tantalizing "chemicotopological hiatus" (a vacancy in our old analyses) that you posed in 1963. I hope you will give my enclosed tabulation the same bit of attention that we gave your ideas theng in the listed "parenthetical" notations, your added specifications are separated from the old ring marks by the slash, for this pedagogial point: which instructions are easiest?

Howard Bonnett's concern also is my apprehension: we are not topological diagnosticians, and if we cannot deduce correct ring loops from a diagram that reveals all symmetry relations, we are not going to do one bit better by redrawing different kinds of diakrams.

The lookup table (my answer to this hiatus) is well along the way. Just a few hours after I had free time with the BioMath machines, I had an arithmetically closed deck of the first 1330 tricyclic combinations, and by fast sorting had excluded invalid (polynuclear, etc.) combinations.

I really was distmrbed by the failure of any of you to see these absolutely infallible simple circuit definitions as I always have seen them. The nonconsecutive line segments are a sharply defined set that begins thus:
$A C, A D B D, A E B E C E, A F B F C F D F, A G B G C G D G E G, A H B H C H D H E H F H$, etc. $\quad$. $A$ 1,2 3, 456,78910 , 1112131415 , 161718192021 , etc. ...
so it is child's play to make checklists from these letter pairs alone.
When you complain that the "locant links" do not show ring sizes, please remind yourselves that these "smallest sets of smallest rings" are pure figments of chemist's minds-- hence trouble. And if we decide first on smallest sums of ring numerals, then on smallest other things, where is there any contradiction such as you implied in your note of August 22, 1963: "The SMALLEST AND FEWEST rings turns out to be impossible-- sometimes you can't have BOTH '' My pathetracers give ALL possible alternatives of longest chains, and alternatives are eliminated by specified minimum measures, no? The only "arbitrary assertions" are these chemically traditional choices, with topological exactness: smallest number of rings, smallest $R_{0} N_{0}$ sum.

If you study the enclosed 165 Apl5 tabulation carefully, you will see absolute relations, such as this: Your "enclosed" (underlined) locants are (1) not in the linking recitation if they are intermediate-chain points, or (2) recited only once if they are chain terminals (a or $k$ in this example). Spiro/quadrivalent points also are revealed directiy in these recitations. Am I getting through to anyone?

5) I hope this new analysis may help convince any doubters (hiya, Bill) that my analytic approach to structural formulas via the concept of bridging atoms and multicyclic points is a sound one, for purposes of this notation.
6) I believe this analytic approach could be applied to other codes or notations since it is really independent of the particular notation were using in most
way. Does any know how Dyson (opps, I mean the IUPAC notation) handles this problem of WHICH structural formula to encode in compounds like these?

I hope you'll all take the time and trouble to plow through this material. I'm sure there are still loose ends, 50 please let know what further difficulties you turn up.

Ill be in Columbus, Ohio from Sunday Aug. 25 through Wed. the 28th doing my bit to present the final report of the NRC project to the parent committee. I know I'll see some of you there. Whether or not I get to go on to the Bureau of Standard's (Tauber's) seminar the next week depends on whether or not Mrs. Brownson and Karl Heumann say it's okay for me to go on the re from Columbus (at ny own expense) and still charge my return trip ticket from Columbus to San Francisco to the NRC project. I just don't know what the regulations are on this sort of thing. If I do get to stay over, could you and I get together, Bill? Over the Labor Day week end, maybe? Or sometime? These seems to be quite a lot we need to talk over in order to get the manual revision going.
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Sincerely,
al
Elbert G. Saith
4)


(Different)
SAMPLE TOPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF CONNECTIVITY TABIES FOR A HEXABRANCHED PENTAGON:


