

25 January 1950

Dear Nathan,

I have considered your suggestions regarding the two chapters in the book but cannot agree. First, the publication of a reply letter also calls for the publication of the letter to which it replies, hence, in the given case, that letter signed by the Russian colleagues. Second, I must not leave the readers in the dark about the fact that the leadership of the Breslau congress prevented the address from being read before the congress. Concealing that would not be honest and—taken in context—would not further the good cause. The people on the Russian side must learn to see that such heavy-handed drastic methods do not pay off.

I have not sent out the letter to Meili for now since, from Albert's letter, the intent to request his share of the inheritance is certainly apparent, not that he really is following through with this plan according to what he has told Meili. As soon as I am clear about this, I shall send out the letter, the only modification being that I will not write in such a way as if the «alteration» will were already finalized.

If my son had based his position on the grounds that he had to support his son in his studies in Switzerland, there would actually not have been anything to object to. I don't know why he did not use that to prop up his cause. The boy traveled to Switzerland about half a year ago with that intention and is thinking of staying there.

I'm embarrassed that I must always pester you with such trifles, but it seems inevitable! With warmest wishes, yours,

A. E.

[ALS]