

20th March, 1928.
117214

My dear Mr. Joerg,

Many thanks for your very kind letter and for the two copies of the excellent book "Problems of Polar Research" with which I congratulate you and the Society. I am sure it will prove a very useful book for future exploration.

I also have to thank you most cordially for your assistance with my article, and I think the map is excellent. I certainly have no objection to the addition of the two soundings of Wilkins and Storkersson. They can do no harm, as I am sure the sea is deep there but to be quite candid, I have my doubts about both of them. When Storkersson's line was kinked, it proves that it has been on the bottom, and then it is impossible to say what the depth really has been. It may, of course, have been very much less. I also have my doubts that there should be depths as great as 5440 metres. I have never worked by the Behm Echolot myself, but on board the German expedition by the "Meteor" they said it was quite good for small depths down to 1000 metres, but no good for greater depths. It would be most interesting if there really were depths greater than 5000 metres, in the North Polar Basin, but as I have said, I still doubt it. I also think it is very important that you have been so careful with the other bathymetrical material of the map, which has in that way become really worthy of your excellent publication. Peary's soundings north of Grant Land are also very interesting, as they seem to prove that there really is, as I suggested, a relief with drowned fjords in that region, which indicates that there has probably been glacial erosion. It is also of great value that you have taken the trouble to improve the hypsometry on land. I quite agree with the proposed possibility that Nicolai II Land may extend westwards as far as indicated on the map.

Of course, if you wish to keep my m/s map, I have no objection when I have now got such a good printed map instead. I would be very thankful, however, if you could send me in addition to the reprints of my article, also a few extra copies of the map.

I have, of course, no objection to Stefansson's article. On the contrary, it will be very interesting to see his views, although I think they are perfectly erroneous, and I regret that he uses so many words to discuss things which could have been finished in two lines. He is obviously no biologist, and has therefore no understanding of the real central part of the question, i.e. that where the sunlight is absorbed by the ice-cover, there can be extremely