

May 28, 1971

Dr. H.A. Laitinen,  
School of Chemical Sciences,  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Dear Herb:

You have asked for my opinion about *Chemical Analysis* being made up of chapters from several contributors. Although some examples of that type of book have been reasonably useful as surveys, none come to mind that I would rate as outstanding. More important, none seem to be really suitable as textbooks and *Chemical Analysis* is most valuable as an advanced textbook. My opinion is that it is absolutely necessary to have the second edition produced either by you alone or with a suitable co-author. This I believe to be an objective opinion independent of what follows.

The alternative suggested in your letter of co-authorship is a topic I have been mulling over during the last few days. I am interested and would like to explore the subject further with you. I, along with many others, think that *Chemical Analysis* is exceedingly important to and unique in Analytical Chemistry.

If co-authorship involving me is considered, one point must be brought up immediately. As you may know I am without mathematical sophistication. To the extent that I would influence the general flavor of the writing, it would reflect that fact. Is this personal characteristic acceptable to you? I might add that in PTGC I worked amicably and successfully with Habgood, who is mathematically inclined.

In my two previous book-writing efforts my co-authors and I worked together extremely closely after the first drafts were prepared. I think it was to the substantial benefit of the books produced. Clearly such close collaboration would not be possible in our case. This change is probably of more concern to me than to you - I think it could be worked out satisfactorily.

I will add a few random thoughts:

I obviously do not have a collection of background articles and materials in hand - it would take time to build up what is

.../2

.../2

needed. Furthermore, in recent years I turned over the course based on your book to other members of the division - I would need to warm myself up on several of the topics.

There are several projects, committees, and obligations that I must meet in the next while. It would take several months to wind up some, to disengage myself from others, and to generally clear the decks for the necessary effort. On the assumption that all aspects of the book would be thoroughly looked at (but not necessarily changed) I would look upon this as probably a 2-year project. Having been through the mill I have few illusions left.

In a general way I would think of the 2nd edition as a modernization of the first with the same basic approach and pitched at about the same level.

I am not sure of the extent of the commitment, but a chapter by Pardue, identified as such and properly melded with the others, would seem to be possible. Certainly kinetic methods are far from my area of competence and I would welcome his efforts. I fully agree that the separations section probably needs a good deal of attention now. To keep the volume of the same size and also permit new topics such as ion selective electrodes, (if you think they should be included), probably chapters 6 to 10 should be abbreviated, (even though these are among the best in the present edition). These are offhand comments - I really have not considered possible changes in any detail. To do so properly I would want to consider the reviews, the questions raised by users and of course in the light of the changes in the last decade. I would foresee no particular problem in reaching agreement with you on these matters.

Yours sincerely,

W.E. Harris

WEH/cr